WAR AND PUBLIC MEMORY

CASE STUDIES IN TWENTIETH-CENTURY EUROPE

David A. Messenger

WAR AND PUBLIC MEMORY

WAR, MEMORY, AND CULTURE

THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF
WAR & MEMORY
at the UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA

WAR AND PUBLIC MEMORY

CASE STUDIES IN TWENTIETH-CENTURY EUROPE

David A. Messenger

Cover image: Architectural detail of the facade of the Jüdisches Museum
in Berlin, Germany, designed by the architect Daniel Libeskind;
iStock.com/Anticiclo

Cover design: David Nees

In remembrance of my grandfathers, veterans of the
Second World War for the United States and Canada,
Maurice O. Messenger and John W. Murray

CONTENTS

FIGURES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

at South Alabama, for their comments on various chapters of the text. These were invaluable in helping me sharpen my ideas. Many thanks especially go to Steven Trout for encouraging me to take a new look at this project when I thought I had abandoned it.

This book is written in memory of my two grandfathers, veterans of the Second World War. John Murray, Royal Canadian Navy, and Maurice Messenger, US Army Air Force, inspired me not only by their service but also for the love of history they returned from the war with and passed on. Thinking about their sacrifice and effort in the war got me interested in studying the time period and, ultimately, how that war and others are remembered in society. Their encouragement in my endeavors can never be repaid.

As always, this book would be impossible without my immediate family. I thank my wife, Maureena Walker, and my sons, William and Jack, for encouraging me, distracting me, and centering me. I am forever in their debt for their support and for moving across the country and into Alabama, at midlife and midchildhood.

INTRODUCTION

As the Second World War came to an end in April 1945, the Italian newspaper *Il popolo* urged its readers to "forget as quickly as possible!" This volume is testament to the fact that such an act was simply not conceivable. Wars, wrote Mark Mazower, have the capacity to not only bring violence and destruction to the lands over which they are fought but also to open up debates about the relationship of the individual and the community, the citizen and loyalty, rights and obligations, rights and wrongs.[1] How we remember the experience of war after the fact similarly shapes our own debates and discussions on these same issues in times of peace.

This text examines how, over the course of the twentieth century, Europeans came to remember the wars that they themselves, their neighbors, and their relatives fought in. Rather than individual memories of battle, survival, and the home front, it is designed to highlight what we in memory studies call "collective," "social," or "cultural" memory, which is the memory of groups of people. The case studies, generally speaking, are organized on the basis of individual countries—how do the societies of specific nations remember their involvement in war, since wars often are fought at the international or national (civil) level? So how do citizens of a particular nation remember war? How do different groups within a nation remember war? What memories of larger wars, like world wars, cross national boundaries and what memories stay contained with the social, political, and cultural lives of the groups that make up a country?

What collective memory studies come down to, in the end, is the effort to recognize that, while all memories can be thought of as primarily individual, it is not the case that memory dies with the individual. Enough people sitting to gether discussing their memories of the same event will find common ground; the more people in the discussion, the more collective the memory becomes. When those with individual memories of specific events talk to those who do not have any individualized memory, collective memory grows into another stage. The result is a society with some common ideas about the past, some conflicting ideas about the past, and some confused ideas about the

past—but most know something about that past. There emerge some common points of reference in the discussion of history. What that is, how it emerges and changes over time, where it is represented in physical and other forms, these are what the scholar of collective memory is after.

There are many ways to examine these questions. This book is not based on original research, but draws on my reading of the work of many scholars to present a series of case studies to readers. This volume looks at public discourse and public space as ways to "find" memory. Where is public space—in parks, museums, cemeteries, government buildings—used to commemorate past wars? Who are the actors involved in pushing to make such memories of past conflicts broad and shared? How do such commemorations, statues, and museums change over time, and how does the discourse about wars change?

Certainly, there are many other ways to study the impact and memory of war. Cultural production in the form of novels, film, and art is a great example. The medium of fiction both encourages and reveals historical introspection and reflects and encourages society to deal with the past and heal from the violence inherent in wartime. Similarly, an analysis of textbooks and the curriculum in the education system of a given society can tell us a great deal about how the perceived needs of the present shape the teaching of the past and how history often creates a certain concept of society. My approach, for the most part, does not follow these paths. I am trained as a historian and came to the study of war first through the lens of military history and gradually became more interested in what some call the "new" military history or what others call the study of war and society. Chief among my interests in this field was the experience of civilians in war, war crimes, and the transition from war to postwar in societies that had experienced such trauma. As the scope of war grew over the century, as total war came to mean both the soldiers and armaments makers and women and children at home, as occupation and collaboration and resistance came to make every decision of daily life about which side of the war one was on a terrifying one, as totalitarian and authoritarian regimes rose and fell, dealing with war became necessary for everyone. By midcentury, no person in Europe could avoid the consequences of war, the implications of war, and, thus, the memory of war. As I moved into the study of war memory more directly, I became conscious of where war showed up in the public spaces of the cities I visited across the continent—Berlin, Budapest, Warsaw, Krakow, Madrid, Barcelona, Paris. That, among

other reasons, is why the examination of public space and public discourse about past wars forms the basis of the material collected in each chapter, as opposed to a study of war-related fiction and film, or war-related educational curricula.

Europe in the twentieth century was a place where war was an experience shared by many, not only in one or two countries, or in one or two generations, but from fathers to sons, from mothers to daughters. Then, in midcentury, outright violence associated with the First and Second World Wars diminished dramatically, replaced by the Cold War that saw intimidation and the fear of war, and violence, but on a very different scale. And then, at the close of the century, war returned to the continent, in the Balkans and sporadically in other parts of eastern Europe. In the first half of the century, some forty-eight million Europeans were killed in war. In the next fifty years, only about one million were, but many of them, in Bosnia at the end of the century, right in front of the world's eyes and television cameras. If we are to understand Europe in this time, we might ask which Europe was the real one, the bloody, warlike, and genocidal one or the peaceful, tense, but relatively war-free one? However, another way of thinking about the question might be how did the generation that survived the First World War of 1914 to 1918, where eight million people died, come into the Second World War, with five times as many deaths. And how again did those who survived the Second World War remember that conflict so as to give us the fifty years of relatively less violence? How did the memory of war shape those eras that followed it?

This volume asks these questions through a series of case studies focused on different countries and different times. It should be said that the number of conflicts that Europeans fought and became involved with was numerous over the century, so the set of nine case studies examined here are naturally very selective. There is nothing here about Italy, for example, and its memory of the two world wars and the Fascist regime of Benito Mussolini that existed from 1922 to 1943. There is nothing here on Ireland, the uprising against the British in Dublin in 1916, the subsequent war and independence of the south in 1921 and 1922, or the thirty years of the Troubles in Northern Ireland from the mid-1960s through the mid-1990s. Similarly, conflict in the Balkans before and after the First World War and the population movements that followed are not studied. To argue, as I have done above, that war diminished in Europe after 1945 ignores the extra-European conflicts that certainly impacted European society in the era

of decolonization, where nation after nation of peoples long repressed by European colonialism rose up to claim their inherent right to govern themselves. Even before the Second World War, wars the French and Spanish fought in Morocco in the 1920s led into the post-1945 era that saw the Dutch, Belgians, French, and Portuguese fight long and difficult wars, all in vain, attempting to maintain their control over other ethnic, religious, cultural, and national groups. Undoubtedly, the failure of these wars had dramatic effects in Europe, not only politically, as in France or Portugal, where constitutions and regimes collapsed in the wake of the decolonization crisis, but in places like the Netherlands, where immigration from former colonies inevitably changed the population and the way in which colonial wars and the entire colonial enterprise was discussed, debated, and remembered. Nonetheless, the case studies chosen represent the most prominent wars fought on European soil during the twentieth century, and the countries focused on have had significant changes and patterns of how those wars were and are remembered.

Chapter 1 outlines some of the major currents on the study of collective memory and presents the definitions this volume uses in defining memory. This is a vital and necessary step that shapes all the chapters that follow. Moreover, in this chapter there is an outline of why public discourse and public space are used throughout the book as a way to study memory, as opposed to the many other tools available to memory scholars. The remaining chapters are largely arranged in the chronological order in which the wars remembered occurred, although there is an effort to assess collective memory of each conflict through the length of the century and into the twenty-first, where appropriate. In each chapter, a fairly detailed account of the historical facts of the war represents about half of each chapter with the second half turning to the public discourse and public space centered on that war.

The second through fourth chapters take the reader through the First World War and the Armenian genocide, the Bolshevik Revolution and the Polish-Soviet War, and then the Spanish Civil War. In the study of memory, the Second World War and the Holocaust looms large as arguably the most significant events of the twentieth century and is essential to the creation of the field of memory studies. Chapter 2 begins with a focus on how the major powers in the First World War came to remember that conflict and the sacrifice of their soldiers. In chapter 3, the differing memories of that same conflict created by the Soviet Union, Poland, and other eastern European states—all new

states since the end of the war—are examined. Spain and its civil war (1936–39) and dictatorship (1939–75) have led to many memory debates over the last twenty years, and these are the subject of chapter 4.

Thus, chapter 5 does not discuss memory but rather outlines the history from which World War II and Holocaust memory came, which is necessary in order to set up the subsequent chapters. In broad strokes, this chapter tells the story of how the war, occupation, collaboration and resistance, and the Holocaust and crimes against humanity interacted with one another and played out across the continent.

The next three chapters take up the impact of that war on European memory, first by examining how Germany and Germans have dealt with the legacy of Nazism, the Holocaust, and war; and second, how France and Poland, as examples of states that experienced German occupation, have dealt with their memories of war. Chapter 6 examines the memory of Nazism in Germany. Chapter 7 looks at the memory of the war in France and Poland. Chapter 8, the final chapter on World War and the Holocaust, explores the collective memory of Jewish life in Europe after the Holocaust. Chapter 8 examines the idea of "cosmopolitan memory" as applied to this era and thus studies how Holocaust memory has crossed borders and how different countries have developed similar commemorative practices and discourses. In addition, the relationship of Holocaust memory to the memory of a much longer history of Jewish life in Europe, and in specific countries, is addressed.

Finally, chapters 9 and 10 deal with the end of the Cold War and the memory of Communism in eastern Europe through an analysis of broad trends in the region that followed the collapse of Communism. Chapter 9 examines not a physical war, but the context of the Cold War Communist regimes as they are remembered in post-Communist Europe. Finally, chapter 10 deals with the history and memory of the end of Communism in the former Yugoslavia and the descent into war that occurred there in the 1990s, particularly in Bosnia-Herzegovina from 1992 through 1995.

Most of us understand that history is used for present purposes. In most countries, there is a pattern of using and elaborating on historical facts for larger purposes of creating and sustaining a nation. In talking about the origins of a place, in treating leaders and elites from the past as heroes and visionaries, in discussing some kind of "golden age," and in narrating stories of decadence, decline, and recovery, all nations— all groups within nations and various types of collectives—take history and turn it into myth and memory. In a time of severe violence and

conflict, such as a war, the need to do that in order to justify what is happening is clear.

Europe in the twentieth century saw unprecedented levels of violence. Conflict was not new to Europe, but the scale of destruction in that century was. Modernization of technology and governments, the ability to mobilize mass populations, the idea of total war with less distinction between civilians and soldiers, and the power of ideology are all explanations historians have given us to explain the deaths of millions upon millions on the continent. Equally important is the revision or elaboration of memory of war once it has passed in order to make sense of the battle and of the world passed on to the survivors.

ONE

STUDYING THE CULTURAL MEMORY OF WAR
Theory and Practice

We all understand the power of memory. Individual memories consist of images and impressions that we use to understand our own pasts. The cues are sensory, auditory, visual, as well as conceptual. The concept of collective or social or cultural memory (all of which will be defined later) takes these ideas and applies them to broader sections of society, such as national groups, ethnic groups, community groups, and so on. Practices and conceptions of commemoration, discourses of shared political, social, and cultural representations, and sites of community gathering around memorialization all represent collective memory at work. This book seeks to offer readers a broad overview of how the memory and commemoration of war in the twentieth century has shaped identity, discourse, and practice in many different European countries.

Twentieth-century Europe was a society emerging from the first period of nationalism, state building, and memory that developed over the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. War was a fundamental part of that experience. By 1900, as James Sheehan noted, armies had expanded to include popular mass armies and reserves, and industrialization made it possible to have larger and more violent wars than ever before.[1] The story of twentieth-century Europe was in large part the consequences that came from these changes to armies and thus to warfare. States came to see war not only as something to prepare for but something needed for survival. The arms race and expansion of armies and navies that preceded the First World War in 1914 changed society, as the state came to know more and more about its population and drew them into what would become the story of the nation. Civilians became citizens who became soldiers. Civilians who were not soldiers became drawn into war industries and the war effort. By the Second World War, they were also the primary targets of various states' military actions, and total war came to mean much more than just the mobilization of society. The Cold War threatened to break

out into a hot war fought right in the middle of Europe between capitalism and democracy against Communism. When that conflict ended without a significant European land war, a violent and deadly civil war erupted in the former Yugoslavia, and many of the other European states were drawn in to debate what to do, much as they had debated what to do about Russia in 1918 and 1919, Spain in 1936 to 1939, and in their own colonies in the 1940s through the 1960s. In all these cases, civilians were killed in higher numbers than armed soldiers. Before 1950, some sixty million Europeans died in conflict; although the number from 1950 through 2000 is fewer than one million, this meant that while the scale of violence was significantly smaller, the occurrence of violence and war in European history remained present.

Memory, the collective act by which various cultures seek to make sense of these events, was inherently involved in all these conflicts. All these wars were among and between Europeans, creating a history of a century of violence and destruction where each side believed they represented a legitimate political ideology, social movement, or ethos that could only triumph through war. So how then can one remember all this violence? What was its significance to the understanding of European culture? Inevitably debates over memory would come to define how to interpret a century of violence. These debates continue to the present. Different wars or different ways of thinking about these wars may come with different time periods. By emphasizing the politics of memory and debates in various countries, specific sites, museums and memorials that were created, and the actors and agents involved, the case studies collected in the remainder of the text seek to examine and assess the importance of the memory of war to European nation states. Given the legacy of war and violence that beset twentieth-century Europe, understanding how this history of violence is framed in the twentieth and into the twenty-first centuries is necessary in order to understand contemporary Europe and in order to explain how Europe and its citizens give meaning to the past and explain it to one another.

French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs first used the expression *collective memory* in arguing that most memories of the past endure through the frameworks created by social groups and that memories that groups attach themselves to are "always at hand."[2] For Halbwachs, personal memories make sense only due to the fact that we are part of groups who shape these memories. Many scholars, drawing on Sigmund Freud's ideas about the power of repressed, unconscious memories to disrupt the conscious individual, make a stronger distinction

between collective and individual memory.[3] What Freud and Halbwachs share, however, is the belief that the present informs and influences the past. Scholars of collective memory use this as a starting point.

Halbwachs was clear that collective memory is not history. Like history, it continues to be shaped and changes as different interpretations emerge over time. However, the way each changes over time is different. Halbwachs wrote that history creates the impression that everything changes as one moves from one era or period into another; collective memory, by contrast, has no clear boundaries between past and present and constantly transforms as groups evolve.[4] This means power is inherently involved in reinterpretation. How do those in power use collective memory for present concerns? Michel Foucault saw power as emanating from multiple places, and society is in a sense a series of relationships and debates about power and knowledge, who holds it, what it is, what is open and accessible, and what is repressed; the control of collective memory is thus an important factor in any struggle over power.[5] Memory of the past, subject to many different discourses and representations, thus is a place where conflict and debate will occur as it becomes part of this dynamic, this struggle.

If we accept these premises, then it is clear that when we discuss memory we understand that memory is a construct, by which we mean that memories are not objective images of reality but rather they are very subjective and very selective constructions of the past, constructions guided by the present situation and by its political and social contexts. For scholars of collective memory, how the past is represented and constructed is the most important question of analysis. How do constructions of the past change over time or become disputed? Whose constructions matter, and whose are overlooked? Finally, what are common commemorative practices, and where are places that we "find" memory and where people gather to remember? What practices and places are given significance over others? Iwona Irwin-Zarecka stated that collective memory—as a set of ideas, images, feelings about the past—"is best located not in the minds of individuals but in the resources they share."[6] These resources could include certain commemorative practices, specific memorials, museums open to society, and so on. Thus, a study of practices and actions is the best way to judge what memories are or are not relevant in a given society.

What does collective memory and debate about collective memory look like? One example outside of the European context was the debate over the Enola Gay exhibit at the Smithsonian Museum in Washington,

DC, in 1995. The Smithsonian Institution, seen as the national museum of the United States, developed an exhibit due to open in 1995 titled "The Last Act: The Atomic Bomb and the End of World War II." While much of the exhibit referred to the end of the war fought by the United States against Japan in 1944 and 1945, including the decision to use the atomic bomb on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, two of the four parts of the exhibit focused on the aftermath, including the impact on Japanese cities and the numbers of deaths, and then, a final section of the exhibit concluded that the atomic bomb's use started the nuclear arms race that followed World War II between the United States and the Soviet Union. The conclusion drawn was that the first use of the atomic bomb led to the broader endangerment of the world given that the Cold War conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union increased the chance of a nuclear war and global destruction. Veterans' groups and members of the US Congress objected to these two parts of the exhibit. They argued that by emphasizing Japanese suffering and the nuclear arms race that followed World War II the exhibit underrepresented the primary motivation for using the bomb, in their view—to prevent the loss of American lives if an invasion of Japan had occurred instead. They also objected to the presentation of debates many historians engaged in, such as whether Truman's decision was solely motivated by the need to end the war or if he had other reasons to use atomic weapons, most significantly to send a message to the Soviet Union about American military and technological power because Truman perceived the USSR as a potential enemy in the future. With both the emphasis on destruction, the link to the arms race, and the presentation of the scholarly debate over Truman's motives, veterans and others believed that the exhibit stressed Japanese and non-American memory of the bomb's use, not the American memory, which needed to center on the importance of ending the war and preventing the loss of American soldiers' lives.

This debate occurred over the course of 1994, a year before the exhibit was to be launched. Not only were museum curators, historians, and veterans involved but also newspapers and other media, who brought attention to the debate through their coverage. Supporters of the original exhibit represented these attempts to alter the script as too triumphant, ignoring the real impacts of the use of atomic weapons on Japan and the world. Due to pressure from the US Congress, the exhibit was significantly altered.[7] Here, we see that the memory of veterans of their "just war" conflicted with that of Japanese citizens and

many historians over the consequences and reasons for using atomic weapons. The memory of a hugely important historical event became contested territory for how contemporary society wanted to remember and teach future generations. Arguments about memorials in the southern United States featuring soldiers and leaders of the Confederate side of the US Civil War have grown, especially since 2017, in a similar manner, as people have asked whether such memorials to an entity, the Confederate movement, that sought to continue slavery are still appropriate in a multiracial society.

In works by writers like Michel Foucault, and other postmodern or poststructuralist scholars, one important idea was that the concept of "truth," or what "was true," was contingent. This concept (among many) was central to the development of poststructuralist thought, in opposition to the tradition of Enlightenment thought that argued there was such a thing. From here, the idea came about that reality was constructed and that history and the archives that history flows from were no different.[8] Paul Connerton wrote therefore that "master narratives" of the past get developed and embraced by various groups within society, as part of their won construction of "truth."[9] Connerton emphasized that we "preserve versions of the past by representing it to ourselves in words and images."[10] Therefore, for those studying the construction and development of social or collective memory within societies and groups, analysis of those words and images is central. Memory takes what is based in history and attaches it, incorporates it, to other narratives, developed for many different reasons. Understanding this and deconstructing what comes from history and what is added or incorporated are important parts of the process. In this manner, memory studies is related to the significance of postmodernism and poststructuralism within the field of history, often referred to as the new cultural history. The key analytical tools are the study of discourse, or how language is used, and how language "has a life of its own."[11] Indeed, discourse was at the crux of the debate over the Enola Gay exhibit. In what it emphasized and what it did not and in how it was perceived differently by different groups, the exhibit exposed contrary opinions about what we were or were not supposed to remember about the event of the dropping of the first atomic bomb.

Other disciplines and intellectual currents also have contributed to what we now call memory studies, similarly influenced by postmodern and poststructuralist thought. Literary scholars and art historians have focused on aesthetic representation of how past events are represented

in different modes over time, and how those representations participate in the construction of collective memory. Psychologists have focused on the role of trauma in memory and representation, taking concepts applied to individuals and applying them to societies as a whole. Anthropologists and sociologists, focused on groups and societies, have developed the idea of "memory cultures" in studying the plurality of memories in given societies, how they interact with one another, and how they come to define different social groups in a particular place. Communication studies, among others, emphasizes the role of "public" memory and how larger scale commemorative practices and commemorative places (such as museums) reflect or project a collective identity. Many of these scholars work in an interdisciplinary manner, borrowing from each other and from their different disciplines, in order to construct a clear definition of collective memory and to examine how it works in different settings. Thus, discourse analysis is not the only tool we can use for visual rhetoric, the study of how we interpret and make meaning out of what we see, is also of value.

Examining memory in light of these approaches is at the heart of this text. If one accepts the idea that memory is ever changing and constructed, then how can one identify memory? A first step for memory scholars is to study the multimodal methods used to construct identity and link it to the past, such as the study of discourse that museums and memorial sites use, and visual rhetoric, particularly important when looking at public memorials in public space, created by artists. Memory studies also focuses on representation to examine how the past is depicted and commemorated after the fact. Many scholars, in communications and other fields, have moved beyond representation to embrace the concept of materiality, which is the study of how one interacts with the inanimate, such as mementos, memorials, and artifacts. We might best think of discourse as defined as a group of statements linked by their theme and subject; representation is an operation whereby signs stand in for an absent referent; commemoration is the mobilization of various discourses and practices that go into the representation of an event or epoch; and materiality is the study of how physical objects are the medium through which values and ideas are legitimized and transformed.

There are other tools, of course, from many disciplines. As a historian, not a literary scholar, my approach in this book focuses on the discourse and visual rhetoric in sites such as museums and memorials. I do not analyze literary texts, theater, or film, although these are

areas rich for those interested in social memory. I do not focus too much on history curriculum within national and regional education systems, although memory debates are significant here as well. I am greatly influenced by geography in seeing how space, especially public space, is created due to its "social nature" and how that has implications for the study of collective memory for "social memory and social space conjoin to produce much of the context for modern identities."[12] Therefore, the case studies that follow this chapter use discourse and visual rhetoric analysis to emphasize the construction and use of public space, such as museums, memorials, and commemorative ceremonies held in public to try to discover how social and cultural memory of different European societies have been developed, debated, and changed over the course of the twentieth century. The naming and renaming of streets, public squares, and other public spaces for individuals or movements of the past are important examples of how collective memory emerges in societies. In Spain, a 2007 law initiated a renaming process to remove names associated with the dictatorship of Gen. Francisco Franco (1939–75) and rename streets for victims of Francoist violence or victims of terrorist attacks; a "de-communization" law in Ukraine in 2015 sought to remove names associated with the period of Soviet Communist rule over Ukraine (1917–92), and Poland passed a similar law in 2017. Debates over renaming inherently involve memory issues for they remove from public space the names and ideas of political actors, minority groups, and others and replace them with other political or ethnic actors, demonstrating which history society values.[13]

If Halbwachs began the process in the twentieth century of conceptualizing collective memory, others have subsequently added other elements to his initial thoughts, and what has emerged is three terms, sometimes used interchangeably but each with enough value on its own to be considered separately: collective, social, and cultural memory. While different scholars use and prefer different terms, there is enough overlap to consider them to be complementary terms rather than competing ones.

Jeffrey Olick, writing at the end of the twentieth century, expanded upon the work of Halbwachs and others to make an argument for the power of collective memory. Olick began by theorizing that, while Halbwachs's original idea that memory was part of a "social framework," there is often no room in Halbwachs's version for individual memories.[14] Olick, however, argued that memory is also held within the individual. Starting with the individual, then, Olick argued that the

aggregate individual memories of a group are important; this he terms
collected memory. From here, however, Olick defined *collective mem-
ory* as emphasizing the social framework through which memory also
occurs. People are in fact members of both collected memory groups
and collective groups. Over time, however, the social framework of col-
lective memory makes it the stronger force, and it becomes more dif-
ficult for alternative individual memories to dominate thoughts about
the past. Thus, the "mythology, tradition, heritage and the like" become
part of collective memory and an important social influence.[15] Scholars
of collective memory, then, focus on the social processes, institutions,
and structures in and through which memory is constructed. While
Olick argued that we need to embrace both terms, being clear that what
to study in the study of collective memory will immediately draw the
scholar to study society's structures, networks, and political cultures
in the search for collective memory as well as the construction of the
memory itself. In this way, collective memory is another way to study
sociology, which Olick, trained as a sociologist like Halbwachs, found
appealing.[16]

Others have built on this idea and embraced the notion of "social"
memory. Peter Burke defined social memory as a "social history of
remembering."[17] He emphasized that memory of different historical
events changes not only over time but also by which groups latch on to
certain memories and by the media that transmit memory: oral history,
written text, photos and film, commemorative acts, and public space.
Burke drew on the sociological thought of Emile Durkheim, which
focused on community, consensus, and cohesion. Thinking of memory
groups as "memory communities" brings one back to the social groups
that make up any given society. In this regard, Burke argued that social
memory is a better phrase to use than collective memory. Durkheim's
emphasis on the social mechanisms through which society constructs
community from disparate individual identities is really about the cre-
ation of solidarity. Memory can be a useful and powerful tool in this
regard; hence, the importance Burke gave to the word *social* in his defi-
nition of social memory.

Finally, there are scholars who prefer to use the phrase *cultural
memory*. These scholars draw largely on the work of Aleida Assmann
and Jan Assmann in Germany in the 1990s. Jan Assmann actually
developed two concepts, communicative memory and cultural mem-
ory.[18] Communicative memory refers to everyday interactions and
draws upon oral history of the more recent past. Cultural memory,

by contrast, is more purposefully established and institutionalized by experts who proclaim a particular memory is foundational to a particular society or culture and must be celebrated in festival, commemorative action, or other ways. Such cultural memory is found in texts, images, and rituals of a society that then draws upon these artifacts to help construct an identity as a group. Like Halbwachs and others, the Assmanns concede that such identities are never set in stone but have an inherent capacity to reconstruct themselves in different forms over time; what is most important, however, is the organized and institutionalized nature of memory by elites (or "gatekeepers" of memory), the obligation to remember that such organization imposes on society, and the direct link between memory and group self-image/identity. Aleida Assmann further developed this definition of cultural memory when she wrote about the difference between "functional" or "working" memory and "archival memory"; what matters to memory studies is the working memory, the "meaningful elements" of memory of a particular event or past configured to form a relevant story easily recognizable by members of the group or society, as opposed to "archival memory," which is more passive, storing historical materials but not presenting them in public as working memory seeks to do. Commemoration, as the mobilization of discourses and practices that gives representation to an event, is inherently cultural work, seeking to provide society with common touchstones of identity.[19]

These definitions of cultural memory are somewhat problematic, as they emphasize the institutionalization of memory, and they focus on institutions like official sites and museums, thus allowing ideas of who is in power to dominate their analysis and not giving much space to alternative or subversive forms of memory. As many of the case studies in this book demonstrate, such alternative narratives have been cases where the institutions failed to supplant a memory that originated elsewhere, often "from below." What we call the politics of memory—debates over what discourses should predominate and become accessible to the broader public—ensue in what essentially become debates in public over identity, and using the framework of such debates is often an effective way to study memory in different societies. Cultural memory's focus on institutionalized memory can take away from such a perspective.

Collective, social, or cultural memory, and indeed the broader field of memory studies, is a rich theoretical area of research that requires a definition of terms as much as a set of relevant case studies. This text

adopts the key elements of Aleida Assmann's and Jan Assmann's definition of cultural memory, defined in the text as both cultural memory and collective memory. Particular emphasis in each case study will be on how institutions, individuals, and various groups in society develop a working memory of the past in contemporary society; how that past (or pasts) is (are) formulated or presented in various forms of media, how conflicts or debates about memory play out in different spaces, and how identities or self-images of the society are constructed from such memories. A particular emphasis, perhaps in contrast to the Assmanns' work, is that we will focus our analysis not only on institutions but also on challenges to those institutions and their constructions of memory.

Now that we have defined our terms, what is the next step in the study of memory? How do we interpret institutional and official construction of the past that come into the public sphere from various institutions and groups in society, and how do we assess rhetoric that challenges them? Here the notion of "framing" can help us. If we see how different groups and societies frame history, we become able to see the constructions and main representational themes that cultural memory evokes. Then, we can establish a range of public meanings by examining public space such as museum exhibits, memorials, commemorative activities, and festivals and study other connected questions like when it was produced, who was involved, and under what political, social, and other circumstances that memory came to be.

If we accept that museums, memorials, commemorative activities, and artistic and cultural representations of the past can be grouped together as memory projects, then focused study of how those projects frame history, the debates over the projects, how they change over time in either form, use, or significance provides us with the ability to see how memory matters to a particular time and place. Many scholars of memory have adopted this practical approach and focused on particular debates over the how history is presented in order to demonstrate that if society feels it is important to debate something in depth, then that shows that historical memory is itself an important "symbolic resource" for "maintaining social bonds and claiming authority, for mobilizing action and legitimating it."[20]

This text takes as its approach a focus on institutional memory as it relates to war and a focus on sites of memory as the most significant memory projects. This is because our emphasis is on wars fought mostly by national armies, where the primary institutional actor in

memory construction is the state and its political elites. Over time, other actors emerge, through veterans' groups, minority populations, and alternative political movements, and thus, a secondary focus will be on those memory actors or agents, both official state actors and others offering alternatives. The institutional focus emphasizes public discourse about the events of Europe's twentieth-century wars. Institutional memory study focuses on political elites and their supporters and opponents in debates over the constructed meaning of the past, in the first instance; and secondly on how different constructions are propagated and imposed, or attempted to be imposed, on members of the broader society. Jacques Le Goff wrote that becoming a "master" of memory is "one of the great preoccupations of the classes, groups and individuals who have dominated and continue to dominate historical societies."[21] Tztevan Todorov similarly saw memory as very political, and thus, groups embrace or reject certain memories in the contestation of power with an advantage to those that control memory. Todorov drew on the control of memory through censorship in totalitarian societies, such as under Communism in the twentieth century, to underline how memory became an attempt to eliminate alternative viewpoints in the aspiration to create a totalitarian society. When the imposition of totalitarianism is not complete, memory becomes a political battle between different social groups in society.[22] Thus, institutional memory and debates surrounding it are part of the politics of the contemporary. Control of the narrative provides power; cultural memory, and especially the cultural memory of past wars, is linked to the agendas of those in power and how they want to use the past for present purposes.

If the institutional focus, described earlier as related to the concept of "the politics of memory," is dominant, the site-based approach draws upon the work of many geographers, such as Kenneth Foote, who wrote about "shadowed ground" or the connection between landscape and memory in the American context. Foote argued that landscapes and sites come to represent memory when they are sanctified and/or designated (often officially).[23] A focus on specific sites like memorials and museums is grounded in the awareness that public space matters, as it is most accessible to the broader population. It acknowledges that the creation of public memory spaces is shaped by economic, physical, and political limits as well as political, cultural, and economic climates.[24] The emphasis is not just on sites constructed for the purpose of displaying memory, such as the Imperial War Museum in London

(fig. 1.1), but also the sites of places where history occurred that have been preserved and have a connection to war, such as the sites of former Nazi concentration camps in Europe or the site of the former Nazi Party Congress hall in Nuremberg, Germany (fig. 1.2).

While the emphasis here is on the construction of discourses, visual rhetorics, and other forms of representation of the past in the sites and public spaces where the framing of memory can be found, it is still important to focus on the actors, especially—but not only—political elites, who push for the creation of public space, who present the predominant narratives or frames for thinking about the past, as well as their opponents who offer different discourses. These individuals and groups are often called memory entrepreneurs and could include political actors using memory for political gain, minority groups seeking to establish their history in society, and even historians who believe the story is not being told correctly.[25] What their activism demonstrates is that memory can be studied as part of political mobilization, contestations to authority, and debates over what is the norm that needs to be passed on.

The nation, as suggested by the Assmanns, is the most common place to examine collective memory. Here, we find institutional memory, memory in public spaces, and memory agents or actors. This is especially the case when studying the memory of war. Benedict Anderson wrote in

Figure 1.1. Cannons at the entrance of the Imperial War Museum, London. Photo by iStock/annaj77.

Figure 1.2. View of former Nazi Congress Hall in Nuremberg, Germany. Photo by iStock/trabantos.

1983 of the nation as an "imagined community": imagined in the first instance because most members would never meet face to face, but they nonetheless saw themselves as a group, "living lives parallel to those of other substantial groups of people"; imagined in a second sense as limited, in that the nation had boundaries, often defined in early nationalism by the extent of vernacular language usage.[26]

Given Anderson's emphasis on the nation as a constructed community, which is really another way of saying an imagined community, it is no surprise that memory scholars have often looked to nations in order to find memory. Many scholars focus on the period of 1870 to 1914 as the period of growing nationalism in Europe. They emphasize the need to establish social cohesion in new or emerging nation-states, the need to establish or legitimize institutions and authority, and the need to inculcate beliefs, value systems, and conventions of behavior in the newly united population. Creating national traditions and practices served all these purposes and were meant to convince the population that they had a shared past, whether or not that was actually the case.

In the aftermath of war, acts of commemoration seek to reproduce a "commemorative narrative, a story about a particular past that accounts for this ritualized remembrance and provides a moral message for the group members."[27] In one of the first examples of modern, mechanized war—the American Civil War—the accounting of the dead was in part to give value to the individual sacrifice in a world of mass slaughter.[28] As nationalism grew in Europe over the course of the nineteenth century, so too did militarism, and a similar explanation for the dangers one might encounter in battle was needed. As Michael Howard wrote,

by the end of the nineteenth century, war was considered not only an interest of the ruling elite and the officers of the military but also for the people.[29] The armed forces were seen as "the embodiment of the Nation." This was true whether the state was a republic, as in France, a constitutional monarchy, as in Great Britain, or a fairly strong monarchy ruling an empire, as in Germany or Austria-Hungary. This was more than just nationalistic fervor. Even liberals who supported the rights of small nations to form nation-states on the basis of national identity came to accept the notion of "just war" in pursuit of national unity. War was a nationalistic moment that then led to commemoration of war as the continued construction of the nation. This meshes with Anderson's argument that what the sense of national "fraternity" allowed, by the late nineteenth century, was the ability of many in the nation to accept dying for the nation—to accept fratricide—as a new form of consciousness.[30]

With the growth of nationalism and the importance of war to nationalist sentiment, so too came what Jay Winter called the "first generation" of modern collective memory in Europe, from 1870 through the First World War. While not the first time public space was used to memorialize conflict and the nation, this era was marked by the fact that the nation's masses were educated into accepting public commemoration and memorialization as normal. Nancy Wingfield and Maria Bucur wrote, "As the ritual articulation of myths, commemorations and public celebrations play an important part in a usable national history."[31] Official, or institutional, commemorative practices regarding wars, then, provide an insight into this first period of modern collective memory making in Europe. Similarly, official sites like military monuments fused more traditional local memories with national ones. Memorials came to connect the broader public with the political cause of the nation that the dead fought for.

In France, war cemeteries over the course of the nineteenth century, but especially following the 1870 Franco-Prussian war, came to be defined by tombs that were marked "morts pour la France," or died for France. In this way, local memorials changed from being primarily religious and local to becoming secularized and nationalized, making connections between war, national identity, and the local population. There were also larger sites built, meant to be for a larger audience. One of these was in Germany, where a new memorial was constructed between 1890 and 1896 on the ruins of a medieval imperial castle in Kyffhausen. The memorial includes statues of Frederick I, from the medieval era,

and Kaiser Wilhelm I, who completed the unification of Germany with a series of wars in the 1860s, culminating in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 to 1871. The German War Veterans Association proposed and supported the memorial, which was meant to evoke the natural course of history that led to German unification through a series of heroic wars. In these ways, authorities in nineteenth-century Europe, as well as their local supporters, established a new politics of memory that put the nation front and center and thus paralleled the process of nationalism that political and social historians have both studied.

In the twentieth century, war became a crucial part of the memorialization process in many nations but a more difficult one. Poland was removed from the map of Europe in 1795, partitioned between the Prussian (later German), Austrian, and Russian Empires until the end of World War I in 1918. However, the reconstitution of Poland following the war was not as complete a reconstruction as imagined by Polish nationalists, for fully one-third of the population did not identify as Polish. As a result, the many residents of Poland saw the war itself not as a great victory, which it certainly was for many Polish nationalists. Into the 1920s, then, war and its aftermath would lead to arguments and debates about the nation that were not easily resolved; "social and ethnic markers of national belonging" were made and remade on battlefields and in communities afterward.[32]

As Philipp Ther wrote, many policies that emerged in Europe's twentieth-century conflicts involved the forced removal of populations across borders or, worse, into death camps with the goal of creating a homogenized nationally defined state.[33] The situations produced by war across Europe added to and complicated the subsequent process of memorialization and remembrance. The Nazi Holocaust of the Jews and other biologically defined groups in Europe during the Second World War was the most prominent example, but others exist, from the Balkan wars of 1912 to 1913 to Balkans conflicts in the former Yugoslavia during the 1990s. Moreover, most of these episodes emerged not from the spontaneous actions of regular citizens but rather from organized processes of war and international conflict led by nation-states.[34]

If we thus seek to find memory at the national level, wars in twentieth-century Europe are vital to the memory-making process and to debates about which memories are most significant. The case studies in this book seek to examine how different nations have grappled with these wars of the twentieth century. Over time, of course, the memories that matter most change, since the nature of the present circumstances

change. Different groups take power and rise and fall, and different ideological, social, and other issues become dominant. The politics of memory approach recognizes the inevitability of change because social change and the redistribution of power revise understandings of the past. The social and cultural construction of the official past thus also changes, or at least is contested, as various groups will advocate for a change in official or institutional memory. The past, then, becomes a political fact, part of the dynamic of establishing authority and creating dissent that marks all political systems whether democratic or not and that marks all social systems as well.

TWO

LOCAL, NATIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL MEMORY OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

When war broke out in Europe on August 1, 1914, citizens and leaders of nearly every country involved were convinced the war would be brief: it would be over by Christmas, at the latest. The June assassination of the Archduke of Austria, Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina, by a Serbian activist who wanted Bosnia to be part of Serbia and not the Austro-Hungarian Empire, set in motion a series of events that seemed, on the surface, to suggest a short conflict. Austria-Hungary challenged Serbia to investigate the crime and won the support of its ally the German Empire in case any conflict erupted. Meanwhile, Serbia appealed to Russia, which began to mobilize in case of war breaking out in the Balkans. Russia's ally France looked on warily. In turn, the leadership of the German Empire decided that war was inevitable and decided to go on the offensive, attacking France through Belgium in August, which brought a declaration of war from Great Britain as well because Britain guaranteed Belgium's position in Europe. The complex system of alliances that the events in Sarajevo triggered ensured that once the fighting bogged down each side, with the support of its allies, could commit to a longer conflict. The Entente of Russia, France, and Britain faced off against the alliance of Germany and Austria-Hungary. In 1915, Italy joined the Entente, and the Ottoman Empire of Turkey joined the Germans and Austrians.

On the western Front, the German advance began in August, but the French general Joffre stopped them at the Battle of the Marne in September 1914: this ended the German army's plan for a quick defeat of France in order to be able to turn east and confront the larger army of the Russian Empire. As a result, the Germans adopted a more defensive position and dug in, developing a system of trenches that soldiers were prepared to defend. By November 1914, the British Expeditionary Force

(BEF) was fully engaged at Ypres, the last "open" battle of the western front: Britain lost fifty thousand, about half of the total force sent to Belgium. As a result, Britain and France similarly adopted the model of trenches to fight following Ypres. As a result, from November 1914, the war on the western front settled into stagnation with both sides facing each other from an increasingly more elaborate series of trenches that favored defense over offense. For the next three years, the fighting was restricted to a line stretching almost four hundred miles from near the Franco-Swiss border, along Belgium and across into northern France.

The emergence of trench warfare shocked everyone, military planners and soldiers alike. The previous European wars of Napoleon, of Bismarck in the 1860s, and in the colonies throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had been wars of movement, and that was what everyone had trained for. Thus, the idea of trench warfare took some time for military planners to accept. In the spring of 1915, Joffre designed a series of offensive attacks that saw his army jump out of the trenches and run right at the Germans. In two battles in 1915, the French lost 400,000 and 145,000, which demonstrated the ineffectiveness of offensive war under the circumstances that had emerged in the western part of Europe. The British government in 1915 instituted conscription in order to replace their losses, and other nations followed. By 1916, the Germans felt like they were in control, and they launched a series of offensives, starting in February at Verdun; the French general in charge, Pétain, was able to turn the Germans back by designing a new supply system and rotating troops, who now served a maximum of two weeks on the front lines. As a result, by July 1916, the Germans were defeated and ceased offensive operations, but each side lost about 350,000. Nonetheless, the British launched an attack at the Somme immediately following the German defeat and lost 60,000 men the first day; their offensive ended in September, with total losses at the Battle of the Somme numbering 500,000 Germans and 410,000 British soldiers.

War on the eastern front was very different: here, it was much more of a war of movement. As a result, despite the fact that the same number of soldiers fought in the east as in the west, the fighting was never as intense. The Entente powers here were led by Russia, while both the Central powers, Austria-Hungary and Germany, were involved. Gen. Paul von Hindenburg and his chief of staff, Erich Ludendorff, led the German campaign and met with immediate success at Tannenberg in August 1914 where they took 120,000 prisoners of the 200,000 Russian soldiers. Over the course of 1914 to 1915, the Germans were on

the offensive, entering Russian territory in Poland and Lithuania; by the summer of 1915, the tsar, Nicholas II, removed his leading military generals and assumed command of the Russian army himself. By September 1915, the Germans had pushed the Russians back two hundred miles from their positions at the start of the war; yet, Hindenburg and Ludendorff could not achieve a decisive victory after Tannenberg for the Russians simply retreated further back into their own territory, and the Germans had not the men nor the supplies to chase them across Russia. By 1916, the war in the east changed as the Russian army launched a series of offensives, resulting in the loss of nearly one million soldiers but not significant territorial changes. In addition, there were hundreds of thousands of refugees in Russia, either going east or south to try and stay ahead of the fighting. Despite Tsar Nicholas II's efforts at leadership, his position, which had been weak since the failed revolution of 1905, was damaged even more.

The British entered the war in the east in the Dardanelles, along the Aegean Sea, the southeastern edge of Europe where Germany's ally Ottoman Turkey was located. Again, the British experienced high losses, especially in the failed effort to land an amphibious force at the Gallipoli Peninsula of Turkey, where some seventy-four thousand Allied troops lost their lives, as did sixty thousand Turks. The British found their greatest success in the Middle East, where they worked with Arabs to turn back Ottoman rule.

By the end of 1916, the British experienced deaths and casualties at a rate of four thousand per day, which meant more and more men were thus conscripted into the army as the war continued. Similarly, the French also conscripted hundreds of thousands. Fighting this war became a common experience across all families and communities in these countries, as in Germany too. Moreover, the French and Belgians experienced the war on their territory, where prime agricultural land was mutilated and citizens fell under German occupation. As a result, by 1916, most of France was forced to ration their food, and the French, lacking a large industrial infrastructure, came to rely on arms and munitions supplied by the United States and Great Britain, especially after the British government created a Ministry of Munitions to coordinate wartime production in 1916.

Mass mobilization of workforces and the rapid increase in industrial output in all the major combatant countries was one aspect of what historians call "total war." Another was in the creation of new tactics and equipment to fight in the conditions of trench warfare. Defensive

weapons to aid in fighting from trenches came first, in particular, the machine gun: accurate, long range, but not mobile. Countless times on the western front, the number of machine guns in a particular stretch of trench outnumbered the number of soldiers running at them on the attack. Similar advances in artillery and large-scale weapons meant that by the Battle of Passchendaele in 1916 five tons of shells were used for every linear yard of battlefield. On the sea, the British attempt to blockade Germany, which required imports of food in order to feed its population, was met by the German development of full-scale submarine warfare as a way to defeat the power of the British navy. By the end of the war, airplane warfare was devised as a method to combat trench warfare, and air fights between planes broke out on a large scale for the first time. Near the end of the war, aircraft began to develop aerial bombing techniques. Finally, near the end of the war, tanks would appear as a solution to moving across devastated, dangerous, and muddy battlefields.

Morale declined greatly over the winter of 1916 and 1917 in both trenches and on the home front. In Germany, a cold snap that winter ruined crops, and by spring 1917, there was a strike of three hundred thousand workers in Berlin when bread rations were further reduced. In March 1918, Russia left the war as a result of the Russian Revolution that brought the Bolshevik movement to power and overthrew the tsar. The Bolshevik government under Lenin gave away much of the territory it lost to the Germans in order to leave the conflict and focus on revolution at home. April 1917 saw the entrance of the United States into the war on the British and French side in the west, following German submarine attacks against transport and passenger ships that sailed between the United States and Britain. By the time German troops had turned from the east to launch a spring 1918 offensive in the west, new American troops had arrived in France to supplement the weary forces of the British and French. German military leader Ludendorff gambled that Germany could break the British and French lines before a significant number of American troops arrived in Europe, and the French army was pushed back to the Marne, only thirty-seven miles from Paris. However, the Allied forces appointed Marshal Ferdinand Foch as supreme commander, and he organized a systematic defense against this attack; by July, he counterattacked using recently arrived American troops, and by August, the Germans had been pushed back farther than at any point since 1914, across Belgium nearly to the German border. By October 1918, Ludendorff conceded to the German

government that the war was unwinnable, so Prince Max of Baden was appointed chancellor with the mission of requesting an armistice.

That armistice came on November 11, 1918, forcing the Germans to retreat back into Germany and turn over their weapons. This, then, prepared the ground for the peace treaty, which came in a series of documents given to the losing states by the victorious ones in June 1919. The Treaty of Versailles, which impacted Germany, blamed the Germans for starting the war (the infamous War Guilt Clause, article 231), limited the German army to one hundred thousand troops, forbade any air or naval forces, and took away territory from Germany in the west and in the east in large amounts. The Treaty of St.-Germain-en-Laye dissolved the Austro-Hungarian Empire, preparing for the independence of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Hungary. Finally, the Treaty of Trianon created the independent Hungarian state and removed some of its prewar territory for its role as an antagonist in the war as an equal part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The peace treaty that dealt with Turkey, the Treaty of Lausanne, did not come about until 1923 after the failed Treaty of Sèvres. Turkey gave up claims to the Ottoman Empire and ceded territory in Syria, Iraq, Greece, and Bulgaria. Population exchanges between Greeks and Bulgarians in Turkey and Turks in Greece and Bulgaria were subsequently organized.

The First World War led to the deaths of some 8 to 10 million soldiers: Germany lost 2 million, Austria-Hungary 1.5 million, Russia 1.75 million, France and its colonies 1.4 million, Britain and its empire lost nearly 1 million.[1] Outside Russia, 5 million civilians had died due to starvation, cold, and a 1918 influenza epidemic, which spread across Europe. These numbers were shocking to the European public, and they underscored the level of violence that occurred in the war. In this way, the First World War serves as an appropriate place to think about how memory came to be a prominent part of conflict in the twentieth century, for the survivors of that war had to deal in very public ways with the trauma that that level of violence resulted in. Beyond the violence of the front lines, the war saw significant violence against civilians. British and French propaganda in 1914 and 1915 spoke of German atrocities against civilians in Belgium, and many have argued this material in part contributed to the War Guilt Clause of the Treaty of Versailles, which put all blame on the Germans. While there was much dispute after the war over whether or not these war crimes actually occurred, the consensus is that they did.[2] There was also extensive rape of women near front lines, particularly in the Balkan war by Austrian, Russian,

and Serbian forces. In northern France, German occupation authorities used forced labor, and there were reprisals against communities that did not cooperate with the German authorities. Once the British and French began to bomb German cities on the border in 1916, the Germans retaliated by deporting French and Belgian women under the occupation to Germany.

The most significant civilian casualties of the First World War came in Turkey, where the genocide of the Armenian population occurred. Armenians had been settled in the Caucasus region for thousands of years, in territory that by the First World War was divided between Russia and Turkey. Within the Ottoman lands, Armenians had been attacked and persecuted by the regime, especially since the Young Turk revolution of 1908, which sought to abandon a multiethnic Ottoman Empire in favor of a Turkish one. Armenians in the Ottoman army were released in March 1915. Armenian villages were then searched for all weapons, and Armenian community leaders were arrested. Soon enough, once the government declared villages free of weapons, the entire population of the village was marched out toward what is now northern Syria and Iraq. Along the way, the Ottoman army shot many men. Once at the camps that had been established to isolate Armenians from others, they were left to die in the desert. Anywhere from eight hundred thousand to one million Armenians died, and more than a million were deported. Over the course of 1915, some two hundred thousand to three hundred thousand Ottoman Armenians entered Russia as refugees, many heading for cities such as Moscow and Petrograd. Those numbers increased as the Russian army moved into occupy Ottoman territory in early 1916. In the spring of 1918, Turkish forces crossed the Russian border as Russian became consumed by the Bolshevik Revolution and civil war, and Russian Armenia, along with Georgia and Azerbaijan, briefly was independent but under attack for a short time. The surrender of the Ottoman Empire and the removal of the Young Turk movement from government in October 1918 brought an end to the violence in the short-term. However, a new nationalist movement, led by Mustafa Kemal, emerged in 1919 and 1920, leading to violence and fighting in various parts of Turkey. By 1920, Kemal crushed the Armenian republic, and the Soviet Union once again gained control of Russian Armenia. The Turkish government pushed to eliminate all Armenians in the country as part of its war with Greece, and the sacking of the city of Smyrna in 1922 achieved this goal. Only the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923, which ended the Turko-Greek war, ended violence,

but its terms did not deal with any of the crimes committed against Armenians.

GREAT WAR MEMORY, SHELL SHOCK, AND CULTURE FOLLOWING WWI

Jay Winter, one of the preeminent historians of memory and the First World War, contended that the memory of war had already begun before the fighting ended. In the era of mass conscription, soldiers' letters home set the tone for how communities and nations would remember the war. Never before were there so many letters and postcards as during the war; they should be thought of as establishing a "set of codes" by which individual memories about warfare and fighting subsequently became associated with the memory of war. Indeed, many families published letters of dead relatives following the war.[3] What emerged from these letters—whether from the British or French victors or the Germans, Austrians, and other defeated combatants—was the idea that war was evil but necessary, a Christian necessity in many cases, and that soldiers at the front held romantic and sentimental images of home and family, which they were fighting for.[4]

The other side of the conflict was the realization, beginning in 1915 but very clear by war's end, of the cost of trauma on soldiers who had fought in the trenches and battlefields of the war. Doctors were reluctant to diagnose distress in men, so they termed it *shell shock*. It ended up being very similar to what today we call posttraumatic stress disorder and recognize as a major part of what soldiers who experience combat deal with. In this era, military doctors were generally more conservative and more narrowly trained than other medical professionals, and the range of study and knowledge relating to psychiatry that we use today was not available.[5] Society as a whole was even more hesitant to consider the impact of war as a psychological issue, and any diagnosis of mental strain or mental illness was a challenge to traditional conceptions of masculinity. Thus, by the end of 1915, battlefield doctors were using the term *shell shock* regularly. It was still relatively unknown in society as a whole. In Britain, an April 1915 bill that passed the House of Commons gave special provisions for the care of soldiers who had to be confined to nursing homes for mental reasons, as did the 1915 War Pensions Bill. Special hospitals and nursing homes were created during and after the war, which helped spread understanding of the concept of shell shock as well. However, after the conflict, states in Europe did not promote discussion or awareness of mental illness and war. A British

government commission to study shell shock, led by Lord Southborough from 1920 to 1922, had as its main goal to reassure the public that nothing new had happened and everything was under control, in short, to let the public know that most soldiers who survived the war were fine and if not, then that shell shock was a temporary condition not a sign of permanent mental illness.

As a result, shell shock entered the broader cultural and social realm through the work of artists, many of them veterans, who loosely and collectively are often called the "lost generation." They formed some of the first cultural memories of the war that came to a broader public consciousness. The phrase *shell shock* first appeared in Ernest Hemingway's novel *The Sun Also Rises* (1926). In Europe, shell shock featured prominently in the 1918 novel by Rebecca West titled *Return of the Soldier* and in Virginia Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925). Poetry written by soldiers in the war gained prominence, such as the five war sonnets of Rupert Brooke, written in 1914 before Brooke was killed in action in 1915, or those of Wilfred Owen, who was killed in 1918, just before the armistice. One of the most famous uses of the trauma of war and its impact came from the German veteran Erich Maria Remarque's 1929 novel, *All Quiet on the Western Front*, which Remarque called a novel for a generation of men "destroyed by war."

Following the end of the First World War, there were numerous cultural productions in writing, art, theater, and film that depicted the war and wartime experience in a negative light. Most prominently was the production of the "war poets" who survived, especially in Great Britain. One example was Siegfried Sassoon, who wrote in 1928 of "the doomed, conscripted, unvictorious ones" in reflecting on the soldiers from the victorious side in the war.[6] Paul Fussell, in his groundbreaking 1975 work *The Great War and Modern Memory*, portrayed the cultural production of the immediate postwar as one that emphasized the theme of disillusionment consistent throughout these works; high culture became modernist culture due to the impact of the war and its break with traditional ideas of culture, in this case in seeing no victory in the battles that had actually won the war for the British side.[7] Fussell's study, limited to a small group of poets is important, although we cannot assume the way in which the war was remembered by those he examined was universal.

In reality, as Jay Winter argued, both "traditional" memories of a war fought for family, community, and country—and thus creating a proud postwar cult of soldiers—and newer "modernist," disillusioning

ideas of war coexisted in Europe during the 1920s.[8] What united both these memory paths was loss. Loss pervaded everything in postwar life, from high culture and artistic production down to community life and local memorialization. The diversity of places to find memory after the First World War is as striking as the diversity of ways in which loss and bereavement and sacrifice were represented. Examining sites where the war was memorialized, from local commemorative spaces to the national Neue Wache in Germany allows us to examine how the themes of sacrifice and more modernists ideas of the war came to shape European cultural memory in the years following the conflict.

LOCAL COMMEMORATION ACROSS SOCIETIES

How much of the cultural work associated with the trauma of war translated into the popular memory and commemoration of war? This is an important question for those interested in the broader social functions of memory and in what earlier was identified as the institutional memory. The institutions of relevance in Europe after the First World War include government, churches, and locally based organizations. In the case of World War I, soldiers embraced the connection to home and family far more than those created by trauma and shell shock. Village elders, parents and siblings of the dead, and community activists came to work together as the social agents of memory throughout the 1920s, united in the memory of the dead in what Winter called a kind of "fictive kin group."[9] Building from the soldiers' own memory of the community and family, then, individual and collective memory of the soldiers who fought merged. The most obvious places for this to occur were in cemeteries in towns and villages where soldiers' remains could be reburied or in those cemeteries or town squares where memorials naming individual soldiers were constructed. War memorials are sites for both individual and collective grieving, so significant as locations to measure memory that Jay Winter called them "documents" and "visible signs of this moment of collective bereavement."[10]

This was not an entirely new trend; ever since the rise of conscripted armies in the late nineteenth century, such as during the 1870 to 1871 Franco-Prussian War, the commemoration of war moved away from a celebration of monarchs and generals to a more "secular cult" that focused on the individual solider. The First World War made this universal across Europe (e.g., fig. 2.1). In the 1920s, many local memorials were not only created by community activists but funded by the community in the form of subscriptions or special taxes. Soon enough,

Figure 2.1. War memorial at Plymouth Hoe, Devon, England. Photo by iStock/Ian Woolcock.

companies formed that sold standard type village monuments, often depicting death or the nation as a female figure, with space to allow names to be added. The inauguration of a local memorial would be a major event in the community, involving schoolchildren, mayors, and other local elite. These sites came to represent the common or popular memory of the conflict, a way to think of the war as noble for those who had sacrificed their lives. The local and government institutions that had activated the process of creating such spaces shaped the themes that those who designed such memorials wanted people to use when remembering this difficult past.

Some of these local memorials were religious and some secular, many contained elements of both, and a public or church setting did not always make the difference of which was used. More overtly religious memorials drew upon nineteenth-century funerary traditions, and these were more prominent in Germany, where a larger number of these memorials were found in cemeteries compared to public squares. Many images of these German memorials drew upon images of the fallen soldier and the equivalence of his death with that of Christ. More secular memorials, common in France, emphasize the "cult of the fallen" and allow viewers to imagine the sacrifice for either family, community, or nation or some combination of all three. What was

clear, in all cases, was the predominant element of sacrifice, without any appeal to anger or triumph. The use of mothers, children, and the elderly in war memorials made the connection with sacrifice even clearer, although many secular French memorials do not depict human figures at all.

As criticism of the war and its cost grew in the 1920s and 1930s, the local memorial could still be held up as justifying the sacrifice made by local soldiers for their community. Thus, Antoine Prost could emphasize that such monuments as the battle site at Verdun in his native France could be interpreted as both patriotic, from the official state discourse, and pacifist, from the view of soldiers' remembering their combat.[11] Similarly in Germany, references to *Heimat* (homeland) allowed many to conflate local community and nation. What is significant about local commemoration activities after the First World War was that conflation of family memory, local memory, and national memory allowed individuals to stress one or the other or link them all. One example of this was the British tradition of standing for two minutes of silence at eleven o'clock in the morning on November 11 to commemorate the armistice signing that ended the war. King George V at Buckingham Palace inaugurated the tradition on November 11, 1919, and in a ceremony at the newly erected Cenotaph in Whitehall. The king declared the day one of peace and reflection, and the Cenotaph, standing as an empty tomb meant to represent all who died, was deliberately constructed as a monument that mirrored the local monuments, which emphasized sacrifice not triumph. From 1919 on, November 11 and its two minutes of silence moved from the capital city to communities across Britain, sharing the same spirit. While nationalism was present in these commemorations and memorials, it was linked to sacrifice and the individual in a way that was far less common in war memorials and war commemorations that had come before 1914. Even in military sites such as the memorial to the missing of the Somme battle at Thiepval, this attitude prevailed. Here, the memorial is for some seventy-three thousand British and French soldiers killed at the Somme whose bodies were never found. The rise of tombs of the unknown soldier was similar. Britain inaugurated a Tomb of the Unknown Warrior on Armistice Day in 1920 in Westminster Abbey and France, at the same time, in the Arc de Triomphe in Paris. By 1921, Italy too followed suit. Here, the sacrifice of one unidentified soldier symbolizes the sacrifice of all soldiers.

While sacrifice was meant to honor the dead, the impact of shell shock and an understanding of the immense level of destruction

that had occurred was not absent in the cultural memory of the war. Indeed, such acknowledgments had to accompany any justification of the sacrifices made by dead individual soldiers by paying attention to those who had survived such horror. Disabled veterans were the physical reminder of the barbarity of modern war. In addition to the state providing pensions to wounded soldiers, many private charities arose in Britain and France to assist in taking care of those wounded, and the wounded were commemorated in a variety of ways.

In Britain, the War Seal Foundation was created to provide housing and work for disabled veterans and keep them from workhouses and other traditional forms of dealing with the unemployed and perennially poor. Similarly, in postwar Germany, many charities arose to step in where the state did not, and then, the state responded with close monitoring of charities and the passage of laws to distinguish unemployed or poor veterans from others; for example, the 1920 Law for the Severely Disabled protected disabled veterans from layoffs in most workplaces and required businesses of more than twenty-five employees to employ disabled veterans in such a way as to constitute at least 2 percent of their workforce. By 1931, at least 350,000 men had benefitted from this one piece of legislation. Those who could not work at all were given a pension equivalent to 90 percent of their wartime wages. However, due to hyperinflation that hit Germany by 1923, the government of the Weimar Republic and its charities never could meet the economic requirements of most disabled veterans. Veterans could only conclude that the state did not support their sacrifice. One consequence of this was that veterans in Germany became more politicized than in Britain or France. Nonetheless, in all of these societies, the disabled achieved material reintegration into society, which suggests a strong sense of commitment and a memory of sacrifice that dominated local commemorations that was also present in national policy making.

The use of the disabled soldier in public commemoration and artistic representation was as significant as the variety of policies meant to address their specific needs following the Great War. Disabled veterans led the Bastille Day victory parade in France in 1919. In Germany, depictions of the disabled veterans and the horror of trench warfare became famous in the artwork of Otto Dix and Ernst Friedrich, and later the portrayal of the disabled became key in the growth of pacifism as a political movement. These images joined with those evoked by the war poets and literary representations of the trenches such as the 1929 volume *All Quiet on the Western Front* by former German soldier Erich

Remarque. Together, these works are seen as evidence that the First World War gave birth to modernism and its themes of apocalypse and pacifism. Certainly, there is strong evidence to support this interpretation. However, in local commemorative activity across Europe, it is also important to see how many different ways themes of sacrifice could be interpreted. What was unique about the memory of the First World War in the first decade following the conflict was the strength of sacrifice in all places, as opposed to triumph or anger. However, national differences in commemoration and commemorative activities were also important.

CEREMONY, MEMORY, AND POLITICS

Commemoration of the sacrifice made by French soldiers in the Great War was an essential part of life in France in the decade following the conflict. A law passed by the French parliament in 1919 left commemoration up to local officials with the possibility of state subsidy. Nearly all of France's thirty-six thousand communes responded, using fund-raising, community committees, local government, and appeals to the departmental and national governments to build memorial spaces in their towns and villages. Across the nation, regional review boards sought to impose some basic standards of commemoration, which helped spur a small industry in commemorative art and its production. Dedications involved politicians of all stripes, local and outside notables, and detailed coverage by the press. To underline the significance of sacrifice made earlier in this chapter, many French dedication ceremonies involved the ceremonial or real reburial of soldier remains, especially if the local memorial was located in a cemetery. Religious and civic elements were part of the event, followed by a community banquet. Often, there was a reading of names of those from the town killed in battle. Making memories in almost every local community was, in France, "the central commemorative practice of the interwar years."[12]

Beyond sacrifice, what themes emerged from such ceremonies in France? One important theme was that of union. Recalling the end of normal politics and the creation of a coalition government, supported by the Catholic Church, the *union sacrée*, during the First World War, called for union in commemorative ceremonies at war memorials. Veterans, especially those who eschewed politics, drew upon this theme in comments or speeches made at these events. Union here can be taken as a patriotic sentiment, but one devoid of any concept of triumph that might be considered natural following France's victory in

the war, especially given the broad consensus in France that Germany had started the First World War. Given the political upheaval in French politics during the 1920s, union was an appeal not to the left or right but to a form of nationalism that was, for some, pacifist, and for others, more anti-German. For many, it was both.

In Germany, by contrast, ceremonies involving veterans very quickly turned more political, and a much larger number of veterans became politicized and used memory in that process than occurred in France of Britain. This began even before the war ended, with the important role that soldiers played in the November 1918 German Revolution. There can be no question that the war, and the general weariness of the German population with war and ultimately with defeat, created conditions favorable to revolution. Opposition to the conditions of war was growing in Germany as elsewhere throughout 1917 and 1918, and both workers and soldiers rebelled against increasingly diminished rations and supplies; in 1917, a series of strikes in Berlin broke out, the largest involving three hundred thousand workers and in March a brutally suppressed sailors' mutiny was ended.

The Social Democratic Party (SPD), which had supported the German decision to engage in war in 1914, split into two sections in January 1917. Those who were now vocal antiwar critics left the party and formed the Independent Social Democratic Party (USPD). The USPD had its first large-scale success in January 1918, when it organized a strike of some four hundred thousand workers in Berlin. The manifesto of the strike called both for greater food supplies and for an end to the war, including a peace treaty without any territorial annexations; it also called for an immediate and drastic "democratization" of Germany that threatened the status of Emperor Wilhelm II and the concept of the monarchy itself. Moreover, the left wing of the USPD, the Spartacists, led by Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, demanded an immediate world revolution. The Spartacists were doctrinaire intellectual Marxists, who were inspired by the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia and more eager to use violence and force before being assured that they would come to power. The failure of the German spring offensive in 1918 only further radicalized the situation, which led, in part, to the German decision to ask for peace in October 1918. Soldiers on the front were surrendering to the British and French in massive numbers by August 1918 rather than continuing to fight, and by the end of October 1917, in Kiel a mutiny of soldiers and sailors, approaching forty thousand in number, led to widespread

violence in the streets. The result was the capture of Kiel by a workers', soldiers', and sailors' council on November 4, 1918, just as terms of the armistice were being set.

The success in Kiel led to the creation of similar councils throughout Germany, especially in the major cities, and on November 9, just before the armistice was signed, Kaiser Wilhelm II abdicated, under pressure both from the streets and from the Americans who demanded his resignation as one condition of the armistice. The head of the SPD, Friedrich Ebert, became head of the new German government, and the SPD declared that the new government was to be a democratic republic not an authoritarian monarchy. The imperial monarchy had collapsed with ease, with little violence, for only fifteen were killed across Germany in the midst of all this. The streets of Berlin on November 9 were filled with workers, soldiers, civilians, and one day later, most major cities were under the authority of the workers' and soldiers' councils. Moreover, this revolution was widespread, for in the agricultural sections of Bavaria, these councils governed 69 of the 119 towns with an average population of 1,500. This was not a small group in arms, but a true revolt of the masses.

The SPD, now in government, was hesitant about the revolt and feared that it was either more leftist than the SPD, thereby demanding more, or that it was simply out of control. Thus, Ebert sought immediately to consolidate his power and control the situation, and in this, he was assisted by what might at first seem like an unlikely ally: the German army. The army was a bastion of traditional Prussian autocratic thinking, full of conservative aristocrats, and an organization that did not have proletarian or even middle-class leaders. Yet, the army had already admitted that the war was lost; they acknowledged that the kaiser had to abdicate. So on the night of November 9, just as Ebert took power, the head of the German army, Gen. Wilhelm Groener, telephoned the new chancellor and offered a deal: the army, opposed to the emergence of a Bolshevik radical state, promised to fight Bolshevism while respecting the authority of workers' and soldiers' councils if the government would support the maintenance of the army and its officer class. Ebert agreed: he also was opposed to Bolshevism and was willing to accept the worker's and soldiers' councils only until a new constituent assembly could be elected to write a constitution. The result was that the generals supported a republic that tolerated the army and its privileges rather than fight what it saw as a losing battle; Ebert tolerated the army in order to impose internal peace and avoid a revolution to

which he was fundamentally opposed. In this regard, the deal reached by Groener and Ebert represented most Germans: when the constituent assembly did meet in December 1918 to start the process of writing a new constitution, the moderate democrats of the SPD far outnumbered the representatives of the radical and revolutionary left. Indeed, in cities and towns throughout the last two months of 1918, the workers' and soldiers' councils found it easy to work with the traditional bureaucrats and with the middle-class shopkeepers and employers in restoring calm and reorganizing food and other supplies for the population. In February 1919, when the new constitution established the Weimar Republic, the authority of workers' and soldiers' councils was taken away.

The Spartacists, who left the USPD and formed the German Communist Party (KPD) on January 1, 1919, opposed this. Under the leadership of Liebknecht, they advocated the use of violence to overthrow the government, and in January, they began to occupy government buildings in Berlin. While the army was used to quell the revolt there, killing Luxemburg and Liebknecht in the process, in Bavaria the USPD seized power and proclaimed a Soviet-style republic in April 1919. In January in Berlin and elsewhere and in the spring in Bavaria, the army and the newly created *Freikorps* (free corps), put down the uprisings; the free corps were private (i.e., nongovernmental) paramilitary organizations of former soldiers created after demobilization of the conscripts, some right wing, many others unemployed and simply hoping to recapture the experience of camaraderie they had felt in the war. War Minister Noske authorized their creation and their use in the fighting against Communists.

Thus, soldiers were politicized immediately after the war, either on the left with the soldiers' and workers' councils and/or the USPD or on the right with the Friekorps. Throughout the Weimar Republic, political groups from left, right, and center, in addition to their other activism, would contest the meaning of the First World War and the subsequent events in Germany. Thus, there was no dominant memory of the war and even when German commemorations paralleled Western ones, such as on the focus on sacrifice, there would be debate over what sacrifice meant in ways that were never as political in Britain and France. The creation of a new form of government, with Weimar democracy, also encouraged debates over ritual and old commemoration styles that simply were no longer relevant, and symbols and ceremony in commemoration became part of the construction of a new

political culture, a construction that in the Weimar Republic was never one grounded in national consensus but always under debate.

This was not only because Germany, in comparison with France, had lost the war. Among German veterans, there was not the same level of commitment to pacifism or the desire to be unaffiliated politically, although there certainly were those types of veterans in Germany. But the break that occurred with Weimar did not give German veterans any common language or common traditions to draw upon, traditions or practices that might overcome political division. Rather than unite as veterans, they divided into the SPD and liberal republicans, as conservative and nationalist right-wingers and, in a third group, as Catholics; in these ways, they resembled the rest of Weimar Germany. Each group brought not only its own politics but also its own way of interpreting the war, and the proliferation of postwar veterans' organizations along distinct political lines was striking. The largest organizations were the nationalist right-wing Stahlhelm, with a peak of 350,000 members in 1932; the republican Reichsbanner Schwatrz-Rot-Gold, with 900,000 members, made up almost exclusively of the SDP; the Reich League for Disabled War Veterans, with 830,000 members at its height in 1922; and the Communist Party veterans' association, with some 127,000 members. Political activists thus became important memory actors as well in Germany.

While all groups placed an important emphasis on sacrifice and on the testimony of surviving soldiers in memorializing the war, they differed in the implications to be drawn from such testimony. Republican and left-wing soldiers analyzed the events of 1918 and found that the Wilhelmine elite had failed Germany, which served to justify the Weimar Republic's existence in the 1920s, despite its many economic and political problems. This meant that many of the commemorative ceremonies held by the social democratic Reichsbanner also stressed veteran ties to the working class and the necessity of uniting both groups in defense of Weimar. Meanwhile, when the Stahlhelm proposed a national memorial in 1925, many leaders within the organization made it clear that any such artistic creation should not be affiliated with any Jewish organizations.

Eventually, the guardhouse to the former Prussian Palace in Berlin, Neue Wache, was reimagined as a national war memorial in 1931. Six architects were commissioned to create a national memorial to the soldiers who had served in World War I. Heinrich Tessenow's design was selected: an austere, dim interior with a two-meter-high altar-like block of black granite in the center, below a circular opening in the roof to let in light. This memorial was officially titled the Memorial Site for

the Fallen of the World War. The design, seen as austere, "sobering," was interpreted as a rejection of a more traditional, patriotic celebration of military victory.[13] The Social Democratic and Prussian prime minister Otto Braun, at the 1931 opening, argued that the memorial was a "tomb" for past militarism.

Yet, the site itself was originally constructed in 1818 to commemorate the victory over Napoleon, and for many, the use of this site created to celebrate military victory was evidence, to many, that Germany had not "lost" the First World War. Publications sold at the site spoke of the great "unity" of Germany at the start of the war in 1914. At the inauguration in 1931, the Reich president and former World War I military leader, Paul von Hindenburg, argued at the opening that the purpose of the memorial was "to contribute to the development of inner unity," which included celebration of a military past.[14] In short, many aspects of this memorial suggested sacrifice but were interpreted as strength, victory, and glory. So even at this site, alternative explanations of its meaning existed. While clearly invoking sacrifice, was that sacrifice worthy, indicative of a state that would again see glory, as Hindenburg and many conservatives suggested? Or was it sacrifice meant never to be repeated, as many pacifists interpreted it? The site itself encouraged multiple memories of the First World War that represented how conflicted Germany was over that conflict. After the Nazis took power in 1933, the memorial remained, but it became a place for military parades and military funerals to stop and pause at, to give tribute to sacrifice, not a place to remember the horror of war.

These divisive and politicized memories of the First World War came to an end with the rise of the Nazi Party to power in January 1933 and the consolidation of the Nazi dictatorship a year later. Only then did a common, singular official memory of World War I emerge in Germany, with a constructed memory of the "stab in the back" by Jewish republicans and the SPD explaining Germany's defeat. Although the cult of the fallen soldier was as prominent in Germany as elsewhere in the 1920s, especially at local cemeteries and in local memorials, memory was also much more politicized than elsewhere long before the Nazis took power.

Although the focus of the chapter to this point has been on how the First World War was remembered in Europe immediately following the conflict, it is important to note that the commemoration of the First World War did not disappear with the appearance of the Second World War. Recognizing November 11 and the wearing of a poppy to commemorate the dead remains important in the British calendar. In 2011, France

opened a new Museum of the Great War in Meaux. The centenary of the outbreak of war, 2014, and in the years following led to many events in Europe, including a series of events in Britain, costing millions, to highlight the outbreak of war on August 4, 1914, the July 1, 1916, Battle of the Somme, and the end of the war in armistice, November 11. Many themes established in the aftermath of the war that continued a century later, most notably that of sacrifice, for official, government-sponsored events emphasized "that it was 'proper' both to serve and die for your country."[15] These ceremonies, too, were "front-loaded," emphasizing the early and more enthusiastic years of the war, less so the more difficult and destructive ones, and the violence of this period.[16] In Germany, without surprise, there were almost no official events.

REMEMBERING GENOCIDE AMONG ARMENIANS

Historians have been engaged in a battle over the interpretation of the Armenian genocide since it came to an end in 1923. Nationalist scholars representing both sides, the victims and the perpetrators, have dominated this debate. Armenian historians have argued that the Ottoman determination to destroy the Armenians was rooted in pan-Turkish nationalist ideology that predated World War I and that the decision to unleash the genocidal attack was long premeditated. For their part, Turkish nationalist historians have denied that any genocide took place but rather that the Ottoman government, in the middle of war, responded to a rebellion, and what resulted was a reasonable and understandable response of a government to a rebellious and seditious population in a time of war. The Turkish government, to this date, has not admitted that genocide took place.[17]

Given these circumstances, it is not surprising that debates about the memory of the event are as controversial as debates about the event itself. The Treaty of Lausanne, which ended fighting in Turkey and Greece in 1923, did not mention any of the violence that had been committed against the Armenian populations of Turkey and Russia. Armenian survivors abandoned Turkey and lived as exiles, mostly in France. Private agencies, many from the United States, cared for refugees in Syria, Egypt, and Greece after the First World War. Kemal, meanwhile, denied any involvement in the genocide and set about normalizing his relations with Western governments like the United States. Memoirs and films about the genocide emerged from the refugees, and protests by the Turkish government in the United States led to the cancellation of a planned 1934 film about the genocide and the experience of an Armenian village.

The emergence of the Cold War following World War II further strength-
ened US-Turkish ties since Turkey bordered the Soviet Union.

Nothing much happened until 1965, the fiftieth anniversary of
the start of the genocide, when Armenian exiles in the Soviet Union
and throughout the world initiated a series of public marches and com-
memorative events. Some one hundred thousand Armenians protested
in Yerevan, the capital of Soviet Armenia, and eighty-five thousand in
Beirut, Lebanon, and three thousand came to a memorial mass in Paris
at the Notre-Dame Cathedral. The activism of 1965 brought the Turkish
government back into the debate and made the debate more public.[18]
The Turkish government responded by making its denial of genocide
much more public than it ever had been, arguing in the late 1960s and
1970s that Armenian deaths in the war were a result of an Armenian
uprising that the Turkish government had to fight and that at most one
hundred thousand people had died. As those who survived the expe-
rience passed away, debate moved into the realm of historians, jour-
nalists, and others from both sides. The Turkish government upped its
numbers by the 1980s to claim that perhaps 200,000 to 400,000 Arme-
nians died, but not the 1.5 million claimed by Armenians; the Turks
noted that in Turkey during World War I some 1 to 3 million Muslim
civilians died. Meanwhile, throughout the world, the Armenian com-
munity mobilized to build memorials and hold programs of commem-
oration on the chosen anniversary of April 24.

The genocide and the issue of memory and denial emerged inter-
nationally by 1973, when a United Nations committee chronicling
human rights violations in Turkey made passing reference to the geno-
cide and its denial. Efforts of the exile community moved to pressure
the US Congress to pass a resolution calling the events of 1915 to 1923
a genocide; the resolution passed in the House of Representatives in
April 1975, although it did not name Turkey at all. By 1980, Ronald Rea-
gan, as a candidate for the presidency of the United States, issued a
statement recognizing the Armenian genocide, and another resolution
passed in the House in 1984, this time naming Turkey as the location of
the violence. However, a resolution naming the events genocide failed
in the US Senate in 1990. Activists in France and elsewhere similarly
encouraged other countries to get involved, and France not only recog-
nized the Armenian genocide as a fact in an October 2006 parliamen-
tary bill but also promised fines and imprisonment to those who denied
it. Other countries, such as the United Kingdom, refuse to say whether
the events of 1916 to 1923 match a legal definition of genocide.[19]

Armenian activists have also looked to other international forums, such as the court systems in numerous countries, to seek compensation, and American and other officials have more or less accepted that the event was genocide, although public use of that word is still discouraged. When Armenia gained independence from the collapsing Soviet Union in 1993, Turkey and Armenia had no formal diplomatic relations, and their border was closed. However, Armenia and Turkey do talk through the Black Sea Economic Cooperation organization, based in Istanbul. Within Turkey, there is a movement to name the event as a genocide, and Turkish, Armenian, and other scholars have held workshops and shared research outside of Turkey. In 2008 and 2009, the governments of each country held a series of talks, and diplomatic relations began in 2010. Even among Turks willing to admit genocide, however, there is a reluctance to discuss it openly for so much of other ideas about how the contemporary Turkish state was created are wrapped up in the events of the era of the First World War.[20]

The most significant work to memorialize the genocide in terms of sites has come since the independence of Armenia following the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s. A decree of May 1994 established a state commission meant to organize events for the eightieth anniversary of the genocide in 1995. In September 1995, Armenia opened its Armenian Genocide Museum-Institute in the capital city of Yerevan and the museum's permanent exhibit was expanded in 2015. The museum site also includes a memorial where an annual commemorative event on April 24, Remembrance Day in Armenia, is held. The monument depicts the rebirth of the Armenian people following the genocide, with an eternal flame under slabs of concrete representing the various regions of the Ottoman Empire where the genocide occurred (fig. 2.2). The references to 1915 are numerous in Yerevan, in billboards and on other artistic works.[21] Members of the Armenian diaspora are also still active in raising awareness, through events like an annual poster competition sponsored by ArmenianGenocidePosters.org.

CONCLUSION

In the case of the Armenian genocide, as in others, the memory of the First World War still is fresh. Understanding how different combatants remembered their dead, noting, for example, the significant difference between a memory of sacrifice in France and that of politicization in Germany, tells us much about how these societies dealt with the war in the immediate aftermath of the conflict as well as in subsequent

Figure 2.2. Armenian genocide memorial, Armenia's official memorial dedicated to the victims of the Armenian genocide, in Yerevan, Armenia. Photo by iStock/takespicsforfun.

generations. Sites such as the local memorial statues of Britain, the German Neue Wache in the aftermath of the war, and the Armenian genocide memorial today in Yerevan demonstrate how memory of the war has been mobilized over time and space. Understanding how disabled veterans were dealt with in the 1920s and 1930s reveals much about the place of the war in national memory practices, even as another war loomed that would soon impact the continent and national memories again.

THREE

THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION, COMMUNISM, AND SUCCESSOR STATES AFTER THE FIRST WORLD WAR
Memory and Identity in Interwar Eastern Europe

The Russian Empire was drawn into the First World War due to its alliance with France, first created in 1894. The basis for the Russo-French alliance was to deter Germany by surrounding it, since France sat on Germany's west and Russia, by virtue of its control over most of central and northern Poland, on its east. At France's request, the Russian army began planning offensives against both Germany and Austria-Hungary in mid-July through early August 1914. The Russians then launched an attack at Tannenberg in August, but the Germans defeated them. The Russians were initially more successful against the Austro-Hungarian army, winning victories at L'viv and entering Polish Galicia, then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. On the whole, the Russian war effort was balanced, losing to the Germans who advanced quickly into Russian territory but holding their own and even pushing back on the Austro-Hungarian side, while doing well against the Ottoman Empire in the south. The situation briefly improved at the end of 1915 and into 1916 as conscripts became better trained and more organized. In June 1916, the Russian army defeated the Austrians at Lutsk, capturing two hundred thousand Austrian troops, which represented half of all Austrian forces in the east. However, Austria was able to hang on and stay in the war, and Russia suffered almost five hundred thousand of its own casualties on this front.

Much of the scholarly debate over Russia's war effort focuses on civilian morale, with many concluding that any enthusiasm for the war was gone by 1916 to 1917.[1] While it is wrong to generalize about all of the Russian population, it is definitely clear that war weariness set in. By 1917, Russia had lost 1.7 million men in the war, and German forces continued to control most of Russian Poland. As food shortages beset civilians on the home front, strikes and opposition to the government emerged with some ten thousand women protesting

bread rationing in St. Petersburg in February 1917 and a growing movement of peasants refusing to sell their grain to the government at the low prices set. Many political leaders looked to Tsar Nicholas II, who had personally taken command of the army in 1916, to change things for the better, but his lack of success as a military leader made things worse. Eventually, the political elites of Russia persuaded him to abdicate in February 1917, and the first of what Ronald Suny called "overlapping revolutions" emerged in the form of a "dual government" with workers sharing power with a provisional government under the Social Revolutionary Party led by Alexander Kerensky.[2] However, over the next months the situation did not fundamentally change. In October 1917, members of the Bolshevik wing of the Social Democratic Party, which called for an end to war and immediate land reform, took action, and their actions coincided with a peasant revolt. The Bolsheviks seized government buildings in St. Petersburg and disbanded the provisional government, taking over on October 25, 1917. Events were bloodier in Moscow, but the Bolsheviks emerged in charge there too. Their leader, the previously exiled V. I. Lenin, created a Congress of Soviets under Bolshevik leadership to govern and to bring about a socialist revolution in Russia. By December 2, 1917, an armistice with Germany had been signed ending fighting on the eastern front, and in March 1918, Lenin took the new government out of the war with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which awarded to Germany territory in the Baltics and Ukraine and to Turkey territory in Transcaucasia.

This chaotic end to the First World War in Russia had many implications for the memory of the conflict and the revolutions that followed. This chapter examines how the necessity of constructing a new state in the Soviet Union competed with the desire of veterans and others to remember the war. Moreover, a civil war soon followed and then a war with Poland over the Soviet western border, which had implications for Polish memory as well as Soviet. In these difficult times, memory was a powerful tool to be used in the construction of new and emerging states. This chapter focuses on the memories of the immediate past and the development of a cultural memory of the war in these states during the period between World Wars One and Two. Commemorations and celebrations of the past were crucial in these states, more so than the development of specific sites of memory. Of course, the memories of this time would take different directions after World War II and through the present day.

THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION AND CIVIL WAR

As soon as the Bolsheviks had secured power and established the Congress of Soviets, the construction of a new socialist state began and the narrative of a revolution, not a coup, was set. In November 1917, elections for a constituent assembly were held, newspapers were shut down under the pretext of being supporters of the bourgeoisie, and repression against non-Bolshevik socialists was carried out. Soon enough, a counterrevolutionary force emerged, the White Russians. The Bolsheviks only held Moscow, St. Petersburg (now renamed Petrograd), and the Russian heartland in between the two cities. In the midst of this, the Bolsheviks changed their name to the Communist Party and fought the forces of counterrevolution that established themselves in the south, in Siberia, and elsewhere. Attacks against civilians occurred on each side. The civil war meant that the Bolsheviks did not control large parts of Russian territory. It also was clear that their ability to rule and to convince the broader population what they stood for was in doubt, especially in places such as Ukraine, where the White Russians established a stronghold. Crisis, disarray, and ignorance confronted the Bolsheviks just as much as the forces of the White Russians. By 1919, food rations were more severe than they had been in 1918, and there was no possibility of increasing them even for the second anniversary of the Bolshevik revolt, now officially celebrated on November 7. However, under the leadership of Lev Trotsky, the Red Army reorganized itself, began a process of conscription, and prepared better campaigns. The anti-Bolshevik forces bickered among themselves, leading to a coup within the White Russian government by November 1918. The new government turned to terror, driving many civilians to the side of the Bolsheviks, and different elements of the White Russian leadership acted more or less independently as warlords, rather than as a part of the government. Moreover, the Bolsheviks occupied the heartland of Russia and its industrial base, while the White Russians were confined to the peripheries, giving them a clear advantage in producing supplies and weapons.[3] By the winter of 1919 and 1920, the Bolshevik Red Army finally had the upper hand against the forces of the White Russians with victories in Ukraine and then Siberia. With the civil war ended, the anniversary celebrations in October and November 1920 included a re-creation of the storming of the Winter Palace in Petrograd in 1917, and the successful creation of what soon became the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR).

THE FIRST WORLD WAR, POLISH INDEPENDENCE,
AND THE SOVIET-POLISH WAR

Poland, divided between the Russian, Austrian, and German Empires before World War I, had an active nationalist movement throughout the nineteenth century that became more and more active in both Russian-controlled Poland and Austrian-controlled Polish Galicia after the aborted 1905 revolution in Russia. Polish troops fought for the Austrian army in the First World War and organized for the first time as distinct Polish legions involving some twenty-five thousand to thirty thousand Poles in the conflict. They symbolized the idea of Polish independence even as they fought on the Austrian side. They were led by Gen. Josef Pilsudski, a nationalist who previously had been head of the Polish Socialist Party. By November 1916, as Russia retreated from its Polish territories, the Central powers, led by Austria, declared a desire to create a new Polish Kingdom, and a provisional government was established in 1917. Germany did not cede control of its Polish territory, however, leading eventually to Pilsudski's arrest. However, once Germany moved toward an armistice, in October 1918, it abandoned any effort to control Poland, and following the armistice of November 11, Pilsudski was released from German custody. By November 14, he was the head of government. The beginnings of an independent Poland emerged.

The year 1919 saw Poland's independence confirmed in the negotiations in Paris that formally ended World War I. That same year Pilsudski led the Polish army in a series of campaigns along its eastern border with Russia to establish more expansive boundaries for his new state. Initially, these campaigns focused on Lithuania and eastern Ukraine, specifically the city of L'viv. By April 1920, the Polish army directly engaged the Red Army in combat, and the Soviet forces entered Poland, pushing almost to the edge of Warsaw. Ultimately, Pilsudski achieved victory on the battlefield as the Red Army was overstretched and had difficulty keeping its supply lines functioning. While the conflict drew obvious comparisons with the Russian Empire's rule over most of Poland in the nineteenth century, the efforts of the Red Army to set up peasants' and workers' councils in the Polish lands it had taken in spring 1920 gave a clear Communism versus anti-Communism component to the conflict. Western powers brokered a treaty in Riga in 1921, and Pilsudski got much of what he had sought in the war. Poland's eastern borders were expanded to include large swaths of non-Poles, representing almost a third of all of Poland's population. Antagonism between the Soviet Union and Poland went on following the end of the

conflict, and, as will be seen, came to shape the memory of this era in the years to come.

Meanwhile, Hungary was declared an independent republic on November 16, 1918, following the end of the First World War and the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Then, in March 1919, a Bolshevik-inspired coup occurred, and the leader of the Hungarian Socialist Party, Béla Kun, established a Communist dictatorship. A series of short wars occurred between Hungarian forces and those of Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia over the course of 1919, disputing the distribution of the territories formerly ruled by Hungary as part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The main issue of contention was the existence of many non-Hungarian ethnic groups as majority populations in certain segments of the territories under dispute. In the midst of this, civil conflict between the Communists, led by Kun, and Hungarian nationalists also erupted, leading to the ultimate victory over both Romania and Kun by conservative nationalist forces led by Adm. Miklos Horthy, who entered Budapest on November 16, 1919, a year to the day the republic was declared. Horthy established a regency in the name of the Hungarian monarch and ruled as regent into the Second World War. This ended a year of violence that followed the end of the First World War. The implications of these wars and the First World War, which Hungary lost as part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, came in June 1920 with the Treaty of Trianon that permanently altered Hungary by removing about two-thirds of the territory ruled by Hungarians between 1867 and 1919 as part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

These three conflicts and the regime changes that were part of them, in Russia/Soviet Union, in Poland, and in Hungary, came to dramatically shape the memory of the First World War and the memory of its aftermath in these parts of eastern Europe. Each of the new governments ruled over new territories and had many motives to use the past in certain ways to help give legitimacy to their new regimes. Popular memory could and could not always be engaged with. The result was a specific memory of this time period that was very different from the way in which the First World War was remembered in the west.

MEMORY OF WAR AND REVOLUTION IN THE USSR

Through the Bolshevik Revolution, Lenin took over in 1917 and took Russia out of the war in 1918. There then followed a civil war that led to the Bolshevik victory and creation of the USSR, meaning there was no more Russia or Russian tsar that millions had fought for between 1914

and 1918. The First World War was less significant than the decades of revolt and violence that both preceded and followed it. However, the Russian Revolution arose when it did because of the circumstances of the war, and some Tsarist supporters saw war as necessary in order to gain control of what was already a crisis situation in the Russian Empire. Yet, this was not a war that the new Soviet regime wanted to build on, and as a result, there was little official recognition of the war between 1918 and 1929. Public commemoration, understandably, focused more on the revolution and the civil war. As a result, places like the Moscow City Fraternal Cemetery, developed by the grand duchess of the royal family in 1915 to bury the war dead, fell into neglect and disrepair.

However, memorialization of the First World War was present and visible in parts of the Soviet Union. Both the city of Moscow and the Red Army developed historical museums to tell of the First World War. The Moscow Military Museum opened in September 1923, with up to one thousand visitors per month in its early years.[4] The museum did not shy away from the tsarist past nor the evidence of military victory in tsarist history. However, the theme of imperialism was very present along with the implication that imperialist military action was, ultimately, wrong. Thus, the First World War was seen as the culmination of tsarist imperialist abuse of soldiers, which was recognized by the soldiers, who then became Bolshevik revolutionaries. Karen Petrone argued that we cannot overlook the evidence in the museum that gave some glory to tsarist military history but that the exhibit's main goal was to convince visitors of the large gulf between ordinary soldiers and officers with the officers depicted as imperial and the soldiers as more representative of the country that eventually became the Soviet Union.[5] In this way, the story of the war was not one of military pride but rather one that emphasized the social division that the subsequent Bolshevik Revolution responded to. Newspaper accounts later in the 1920s similarly sought to link individual suffering of soldiers in battle to the tsarist and Russian bourgeoisie conspiracy to weaken the proletariat, as part of a larger imperialist war.[6] Such institutionalization of memory politics in the new Soviet Union set clear boundaries on which memories were publicly acceptable and encouraged and which were not, as discussed in chapter 1 concerning the role of institutions in shaping cultural memory. In the case of the Soviet Union, we can see how the institutions of the state not only shaped the memory but delineated the boundaries that were

acceptable when it came to deciding how to remember the immediate past (fig. 3.1).

Over time, public celebrations took a more martial tone, linking the Bolshevik Revolution and the civil war in glorifying the Red Army and the current conflict. In some ways, this involved the population more than the actual October Revolution had, for everyone felt the daily hardships experienced in the context of civil war. Parades focused on soldiers, linked with workers and sailors, and were almost exclusively centered on Petrograd and Moscow; here, too, the portrayal of the civil war as a contrast between the Red Army (revolutionaries) and White Russians (old imperialists) neglected other voices, such as that of the Social Revolutionary Party that had ruled Russia in the months between the tsar's removal and Lenin's seizure of power or the Mensheviks who came from within the same Social Democratic movement as the Bolsheviks. Only over time did Bolshevik merge into Communism, and this became more apparent as the civil war increasingly tilted in favor of the Red Army by 1920 and into 1921. In 1920, the third anniversary of the October Revolution, a re-creation of the storming of the Winter Palace in Petrograd was staged in a very theatrical manner. Once the civil war ended, more institutionalized productions such as this became the norm. An overhaul of military training from 1923

Figure 3.1. Fragment of the Monument to Heroes of the First World War on Poklonnaya Hill, Moscow, Russia. Photo by iStock/Free Wind 2014.

to 1925 meant to teach Communism to soldiers took place within the army, using a "caricatured version of the tsarist army" as a contrast to the modern ways of the Communist force.[7] In towns and villages, veterans were given benefits that made them a semiprivileged class and provided a clear contrast with older village elders from the tsarist era. The Red Army became an important part of the new Communist state, and the history of the war played a role in that construction.

The consolidation of the Communist state along authoritarian lines following the civil war gave authorities control over public memorialization, and thus, the state and party institutions mobilized the cultural memory in what became, by 1923, the USSR. In 1921, the party created an organization within the party, the Commission on the History of the October Revolution and the Russian Communist Party, to prepare an official history and guide the public commemorations that would follow. Lectures and presentations on current political policies often accompanied museum exhibits about the Russian Revolution, making the museums not only a place of commemoration but also a place of propaganda to engage the population with the party as it developed. The use of the past for present political circumstances is common, as it was here. Oral histories from citizens in Petrograd and Moscow were taken to identify their roles in the October Revolution and transform the narrative from one of a small group of activists seizing power to one that made the events of October seem to be something that emerged from a mass movement. By early 1923, a series of some thirty-three booklets on the history of the October Revolution, highlighting these local experiences, were distributed across the USSR, and commemorations that also emphasized the local were apparent in further flung places such as Kiev, in the Ukraine, and in the Ural Mountains that divided Europe from Asian Russia.

Commemoration of the October Revolution in the first half of the 1920s thus became one way in which to establish the authority of the Communist Party across the Soviet Union and to bring people into the party as well. It was part and parcel of the building of the Soviet Union as a Communist state. By 1927, the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution, the construction of the Soviet state was celebrated in Moscow and in Leningrad (formerly Petrograd). These celebrations centered on the transformation of a backward Russian Empire into a modern Soviet Union, with the events of October 1917 serving as the catalyst for a complete transformation of society. Monuments to Lenin's arrival in Petrograd from exile and memorials to the Red Army that fought in

the revolution and civil war were unveiled. Cinema also played a part in this anniversary, as the release of Sergei Eisenstein's film *Oktiabr'* was officially commissioned by the government as a follow-up to Eisenstein's *Battleship Potemkin*, which told the story of the failed 1905 revolt in Russia. These works emphasized the role of the Bolshevik Party and Lenin in particular. A cultural memory of the revolution was overtaking any memory of the First World War. Tsarist Russia was only portrayed as backward and imperialistic. The content of these efforts emphasized that the revolution was a mass movement, not one led by a small group, as really had happened, and put Lenin at the center of this story. A certain memory thus developed to become the cultural memory of this period in Russia.

In the emerging Soviet Union, the actors in charge of memory politics were the Communist Party and the new state, and no other political movements or dissenting voices were permitted. The Soviet state had clearly established the official commemoration of the Russian Revolution in time for the tenth anniversary in 1927. The reality was that the First World War had engulfed large parts of Russia, and the events of October 1917 really only involved a few. This was elite construction of memory par excellence as the new state broke completely away from the imperial past. Over time, the events of October were portrayed as mass events, and the experience of the broader European war were neglected. Most Soviet citizens gained knowledge and understanding of the Russian Revolution not from their actual participation but through mediated, transmitted knowledge passed on to them in a top-down manner that represented the creation of a cultural memory of the events of the revolution and civil war.

Of course, there were memories of the First World War that the Soviets did not control or shape. Russian émigrés, who fled the country during the civil war and resettled in France and elsewhere, celebrated Russia's traditional military culture in groups such as Russia Abroad. While these groups were primarily political, seeking to mount an overthrow of the Soviet state, they did not neglect the interests of their members, which included commemorating the old Russian Empire and its role in the First World War. The war and subsequent civil war were linked in that Russians spoke of defending the fatherland from foreign enemies, first the Germans and then the Bolsheviks. Aaron Cohen argued that while no government celebrated such connections, the Russian veterans in exile could still use such stories and commemorative days to rekindle the idea of Russia as it had been.[8]

MEMORY AND STATE IN POLAND

The Second Republic of Poland, which emerged in the aftermath of the First World War, and the subsequent border wars with Russia naturally looked to those conflicts as vital to the creation of a new nation. However, the wars of 1914 through 1920 were only the end of a long period of partition, whereby Poland was consumed and divided between the Prussian/German, Austrian, and Russian Empires. Partitioned since the 1790s, Poland had to grapple in the early 1920s with what it meant to be a nation again. A major decision was made in 1920 to celebrate November 11, the day that ended the First World War and led to the creation of Poland's provisional government, as Poland's day of independence. This also followed the victorious military campaigns against the Russian Bolsheviks, from the battle for Warsaw in mid-August 1920 to the victorious battle of Komarow on August 31 and the Nieman campaign that had pushed Russian troops out of the L'viv region, making it part of Poland, by the end of October 1920. The events of 1918 and the military victories of 1920 established Poland and its leader, General Pilsudski, as legitimate rulers of a new land. The use of military force came about because of Pilsudski's and other nationalists' insistence that the partition of the Russian Empire and Soviet military action after the collapse of Russian were one and the same, making all Poles victims and thus uniting them against a unitary enemy. In this way, a narrative was established even as the fighting went on and even as territory with significant non-Polish populations, such as Lviv, became part of Poland.

Despite the predominance of the Pilsudski narrative about victimhood and nationhood, other rationales for Poland's independence and thus oppositional ideas about how to celebrate independence also existed. Pilsudski's institutional control of memory politics was not complete. Right-wing political movements and press saw November 11 as only a day that the Germans had abandoned Warsaw. The closeness of November 11 with November 7, the day that the Soviets celebrated the Bolshevik Revolution, tarnished the celebrations for these individuals and groups. They also believed that November celebrated Pilsudski too much, and they opposed his government in the early 1920s. Governments that followed Pilsudski after his resignation from political office in 1923, until his return to power in a coup in 1926, thus downplayed November commemorations; outside of Warsaw, which the Germans had withdrawn from, few people recognized the importance of November 11. Many drew upon Poland's earlier history, especially the

era of the Polish-Lithuanian Kingdom in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as a better basis for Poland's independence and for Poland's claims to many of its eastern territory, such as Lviv. Thus, despite the fact that the impact of war created modern-day Poland, there was little consensus about how to commemorate the Polish-Russian war and its role in Polish independence by the mid-1920s. Like in the Soviet Union, the First World War was neglected, for what came after mattered more. However, unlike in the Soviet Union, there was no imposed consensus.

Other issues in Polish political and social life aggravated the cleavages that developed around the celebration of independence in the 1920s. Historian Eva Plach wrote of a sense of "moral crisis" that was apparent in the newly independent Poland over issues such as women's appropriate place in society, with many on the right calling for a re-Catholicization of the state and society; whereas, the Polish Socialist Party emphasized equal working rights and equal wages for women.[9] Pilsudski's return to power through a coup in May 1926 brought the debates over commemoration and contemporary society back to the fore. Pilsudski used the idea of a moral crisis to justify his coup, fearing that Weimar Germany's treaties with France (1925) and the Soviet Union (1926) threatened Polish independence. Although not in the position of leader of the government, Pilsudski dominated the regime until his death in 1935, using somewhat authoritarian means at times to impose his will. Opposed by many on the nationalist and Catholic right, due to his centralization of power, Pilsudski's coup led to the creation of new opposition movements like the Camp of Great Poland, created in December 1926, with the claim that they had the solutions for Poland in the form of re-Catholicization and opposition to Jewish influence. Pilsudski's second period of rule focused on building a new national movement and drawing in the population to the new state. The importance of recent history would be vital to this effort.

Part one of this effort was a reorganization of the military to give positions of power to those veterans and POWs from the wars of 1914 through 1920. This was the beginning of a new "civic patriotism" fostered by the Pilsudski regime, whose most important initiative was the inclusion of minorities like Jews and Ukrainians, in opposition to the nationalist rights' more ethnic interpretation of a national community. One of the groups created from these developments was a group of Jewish former POWs and legionnaires, who commemorated their effort in fighting for Poland's independence from 1914 to 1920. This group, along with the national veterans' organization, became extremely important supporters of the new regime and actually merged into one organization in 1933. Military veterans and former POWs were held up

as exemplars of the new Poland created from the conflict of 1919 and 1920, regardless of ethnic origin.

The second part of the effort to put the wars at the center of the story of the creation of a new Poland was the celebration of Pilsudski himself as leader in all the events that had transpired in war. Pilsudski's coup, similarly, was not seen as brash or irresponsible but as necessary in order to lead with Poland's best interests at heart. Pilsudski's war effort needed to be replicated in peacetime circumstances. Over time, the state that Pilsudski created could not be separated from the man himself. His commitment to Poland, his physical attributes, his war record, all were meant to represent the archetypal Polish man. The representation of this kind of image was more important than democratic rights in the Second Republic, which were definitely trimmed with limits on parliament, a curtailing of freedom of the press and speech, and extensive growth of the state's role in daily life. A certain cultural memory of the war, Poland's creation, and Pilsudski's role came to be seen in official commemorations of the recent past.

This can best be seen most directly in the effort made to put war at the center of Poland's recent history, namely the institutionalization of November 11 as the day of independence. This effort was most conspicuous from 1926 onward. On November 11, 1926, schools and government offices were closed for the first time to celebrate the national holiday, and special religious services were held. A military review in Warsaw took place, overseen by Pilsudski. The review emphasized the connection between war, Pilsudski, and independence. The victory of 1918 was put in the context of the "answer" to a long period in history when Poland lost its independence. Just before this first postcoup celebration of national independence, the government authorized the creation of a national anthem based on a modified version of a marching song used by Pilsudski and his legionnaires in the Austrian Army in 1915. By 1927, November 11 was clearly the main day of celebration across Poland, and by the tenth anniversary of the events of 1918, almost every major town across Poland held events marking the occasion. In 1928, a national committee was created to lead the effort to establish permanent public monuments to Polish independence. The tributes focused on military victories, led by Pilsudski, and Poland's military tradition, which had been seen in the rebellious efforts of 1863 and 1905 against Russian occupation but which were only successful after Pilsudski's war against the Russians in World War I and then against the Germans and Bolsheviks.

Pilsudski's death in 1935 ended the excessive national unity celebrations of November 11. His supporters turned it into a day to commemorate Pilsudski the person, and the first November 11 after his death, in 1935, saw the unveiling of many Pilsudski statutes (fig. 3.2). As the regime that followed Pilsudski became more authoritarian and more nationalist, November 11 became less a celebration of independence and more of Pilsudski's leadership and memory. The institutions of the state rallied around the image of the fallen leader and the significance he gave to the memory of November 11 and the First World War.

The actions of Pilsudski as a memory actor and his use of the government to institutionalize a particular narrative are particularly important for understanding this period of Polish nationhood and the role of memory in its politics and society. The last of the

Figure 3.2. Josef Pilsudski monument in Pilsudski Square in the center of Warsaw, Poland. The monument was designed by Tadeusz Lodziana and unveiled on August 14, 1995. Photo by iStock/Anastasia Petrova.

public November 11 celebrations was in 1938; one year later, Poland was divided between German and Soviet occupation and the Second World War was underway.

NATIONAL MEMORY OF WAR IN OTHER SUCCESSOR STATES

In other new states created by the series of Paris Peace Agreements—Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Hungary—there was a similarly difficult relationship with the memory of the First World War and upheaval that followed. These territories had all been part of the Habsburg Empire for generations, with some exceptions. For example, Serbia gained independence from the Habsburgs and Ottomans by 1867 and after the First World War became part of Yugoslavia (or officially, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes), and since 1867, Hungary, although not having full independence, had had significant political and cultural rights to govern themselves within the Habsburg Empire. For Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, Slovenes, and others, this was their first period of independence in the modern era, and all of these states had experienced a flourishing of nationalist movements over the course of the nineteenth century. Thus, the memory of the First World War was complex. Their citizens had died in war for an empire that no longer existed; they had achieved independence, a longtime goal, but it was not perfect, as in the cases of Serbia, where they were now tied to others in the south Slav state, or Hungarians, whose complete independence came with loss of territory in the Treaty of Trianon.

How did this complex set of political and geographical circumstances impact the memory of war in the first decades following the conflict? When Czechoslovakia started its first national holidays in 1920, there was significant representation of World War I soldiers in public events and in newspapers and other publications. However, institutional actors organizing these ceremonies were very selective, and they limited participation to the soldiers who had been Russian prisoners of war not to everyone who had fought in the Austro-Hungarian army. There was a simple explanation for this; most of the Czechoslovaks who ended up as Russian POWs had fought in the Battle of Soborov/Zborov, which was a battle involving Czech legionnaires who had abandoned the Habsburg army and turned against Austria and ended up in Russian custody as a result.[10] Here, these soldiers could stand in for the absence of an actual military history in the independence of Czechoslovakia, while those who only served the Habsburg Empire could not, regardless of their actual political views on independence.

This demonstrates the difficulty of developing a single institutionalized memory in new states such as Czechoslovakia.

Meanwhile, Czechoslovakia also included the Sudetenland, the part of Czechoslovakia with a majority German-speaking population, which had been part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire before the First World War. Here, public commemoration of the war emphasized the individual and the community, not the nation. When memorial events focused on the sacrifice of the dead, speakers referred to the fatherland, but this term simply meant village or region and thus could include both the German majority and Czech minority who died in battle. However, by the 1930s, this had been changed to sacrifice for the fatherland; fatherland meant German territory and sacrifice was linked to the sacrifice that contemporary Germans made by living under a Czechoslovak government. German nationalist political movements emerged to influence this interpretation. Many of these groups were made up of World War I veterans who opposed traditional party politics because they did not provide a voice for the regional Germans.[11] Over time, the Czechoslovakian government became the main opponent of the Sudeten nationalist movement, and what began as a cultural and social movement became more political. Here, we can see how alternative versions of the past, competing memories, can be politicized. The German community did not have institutions to set cultural memory as the Czechoslovak state did. Eventually, the Sudeten German National Socialist Party, likened to Germany's own Nazi or National Socialist Party, agitated for outright union with Germany, which was achieved in October 1938 through the infamous Munich Conference. The existence of an oppositional and alternative memory of the past in Czechoslovakia underlines the difficulty of creating a common cultural memory in such a diverse country and in such a complex situation as the successor states faced following the end of the First World War and the collapse of the empires that had fought in that war.

In Yugoslavia, there was no official commemoration of the war or the war dead until 1934. There did exist a memorial to an unknown dead Serbian soldier near the site of where Austria attacked Serbia in 1914, although it was never used in public events. So a social memory of this time was there but never made official. However, that changed in 1934, when the soldier was reclassified as an unknown Yugoslav soldier. In many respects, this change and the public commemorations that followed speak more to a nation's need for a military past that sought

to unify rather disparate groups rather than to a specific need for commemoration of the First World War itself. Those who had been conscripts came to see their fight as the beginning of Yugoslavia; those who had been Croatian officers within the Austro-Hungarian army, however, had more difficulty in moving to position themselves alongside the Serbian military that they had fought in the war. Serbian officers saw them as unreconstructed Habsburgs not new Yugoslavs. Many Croatian officers who felt that the Austro-Hungarian Empire had protected Croatia to some extent developed anti-Yugoslav sentiments after the war. The result, as in Czechoslovakia, was that confrontational politics became wrapped in oppositional memories of what the war had created, which meant that the memory of the war itself was open to debate.

CONCLUSION

The Russian Revolution not only had a great impact on the conclusion of the First World War and the creation of the Soviet Union, for it, along with the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, led to a series of military conflicts across eastern Europe in 1919 and 1920. In 1920 and 1921, the new states that emerged from these battles necessarily had war to thank for their existence or to blame for a sense of loss or weakness or for a sense that the postwar political structure was somewhat incomplete, as with the Croatians or Sudeten Germans described above. However, no one could ignore war in commemorating what had occurred. So what wars, which battles, and which virtues could be celebrated in the process of state building that inevitably followed, and what had to be ignored or even suppressed? These were the questions that faced regimes, popular opinion, and those directly touched by and involved in World War I and the subsequent battles. Each regime chose different paths in looking at the conflicts that gave their nations their contemporary forms, demonstrating both the complexity and importance of official public memory in state building and the multipronged legacy of the First World War in twentieth-century Europe.

FOUR

VICTORS' MEMORY, FORGETTING, AND RECOVERY
Civil War Memory in Spain

On July 17, 1936, a revolt was launched by the Spanish military against the Second Republic in Spain. The republic was young, created in 1931 after the abdication of the monarch, and had endured five years of political polarization between the left and right. The most divisive period came when the election of February 1936 put in place a leftist Popular Front coalition government of socialists and leftist republicans, supported by the Communist Party and the anarchist Confederación Nacional del Trabajo even though they were not part of the government itself. The Popular Front government, led by Manuel Azaña, was opposed by the monarchist right wing (including leading members of the military), the political right wing of elected parliamentarians, and the Fascist-inspired Falange movement; to many, this suggested an impending civil war. Physical violence of one side against the other increased through the first half of 1936.

That conflict came on July 17, when the Spanish military in Morocco, led by Gen. Francisco Franco, launched its attack. Franco was joined by other generals around Spain who used their garrisons to take control of various regions. The division of the country in July and August 1936 replicated the voting results of the February election: the center, northwest, and southern parts of the country fell to the army rebels, now called the Nationalists; the republican government held the cities, most especially Barcelona and Madrid, due to the voluntary rallying of citizens in those places against the coup and their actions in taking up arms to assist those soldiers and commanders who stayed loyal to the republic.

At the most basic level, the conflict was a military and political one. At the military level of the conflict, two military forces emerged, the rebellious Nationalists, who had support from most of the Spanish army, and the legitimate republican government, supported by some of the military and especially by various civilian and political militias created in the summer of 1936 to defend the state, assisted, eventually,

by thousands of foreigners in the International Brigades who came to see the republic's cause as their own. On the political side, the Nationalists were supported by various right-wingers who wanted Spain to be a monarchy, a Catholic society, an authoritarian state, or even a Fascist modern empire. While divided over what form a future government might have, they nonetheless agreed that the authority of the Catholic Church, centralized government in opposition to minority rights of Basques and Catalans, and the end of democracy were important goals. Similarly, the republicans seemed quite divided: some wanted liberal democracy, some Communism or Socialism and land reform, some anarchism and social revolution. Yet, all believed in the fight against the Nationalists as a fight that replicated the international situation as a choice between democracy and Fascism. Beyond this, it was also a class war—between landowners and other economic interests who supported Franco and workers, peasants, and other forces of the center left—and a religious war, debating whether Spain should be a Catholic or anticlerical state. Many of these divisions went back generations, and thus, the civil war was not only a result of the politics and social divisions of the 1930s, but one that began in the nineteenth century and especially after the defeat of Spain in the Spanish-American War in 1898 that severely weakened the colonial empire.

This conflict lasted from July 1936 through the end of March 1939. During this time, the civil war also held the attention of the international community for reasons well outside of the domestic causes of the conflict. The Soviet Union assisted the republic with military supplies and advisors while Britain, the United States, and France declared, each for their own reasons, a policy of nonintervention that was mostly, if not always, held to by them as well as twenty-four other countries. Western nonintervention had the result of assisting the Nationalist side, given that most of the Spanish military was fighting for them. Moreover, over one hundred thousand troops from Fascist Italy and a bomber squadron and additional military supplies were sent from Nazi Germany to aid Franco's Nationalists.

While the Nationalists held sway for most of the war, fierce fighting in places like Madrid and Teruel lengthened the conflict. Nonetheless, for most of the conflict this was a war of steady attrition as the Nationalists gradually moved from their initial territory to conquer the rest of the country. In the fighting, over 60 percent of Spain's railway transport was destroyed; half a million buildings were destroyed or severely damaged; in combat, about 125,000 Spaniards and 25,000 foreigners lost their lives.

In January 1939, the Nationalist armed forces entered Catalonia, the last region in Spain still under the control of the republic. The Nationalist crusade to establish a strong central government, linked to Catholicism and opposed to the movements of workers and lower classes, put fear into many there. Catalonia had been a part of the republic under an autonomous statute that gave co-official status to the Catalan language and decentralized civil law and local administration to the Catalans themselves. Moreover, the coalition government that ruled Catalonia during the war brought into power Marxists and Communists, supported by anarchists, making the region one fraught with ideological division, even within the republican camp. Indeed, Communist, Marxist, and anarchist forces had fought each other in Barcelona in May 1937 in an effort to establish whether or not the primary policy of the republic was to use all its resources against Franco (the opinion of the Communists) or to fight Franco and initiate radical and revolutionary reforms in the lands it controlled (the Marxist and anarchist position). Once the city of Tarragona fell on January 15, a mass movement of people from Catalonia over the Pyrenees Mountains to France occurred. The exiles were mostly civilian; many had already been refugees, as some one million non-Catalans had settled in Barcelona from 1936 to 1939 to flee the fighting in other parts of Spain. Others were Catalan. In all, some half million people left Barcelona and other parts of Catalonia in January and February 1939. This massive migration continued until Franco controlled all border crossings on February 13, 1939. This led to his final victory over the democratically elected republic in the Spanish Civil War in April 1939 and the establishment of an authoritarian dictatorship that lasted until Franco's death in 1975.

Due to the many cleavages produced by this conflict, the nature of the conflict meant that each side embraced a desire to completely destroy the enemy. While both sides were engaged in this part of the war, as Franco's forces steadily and slowly moved to conquer most of Spain, a wave of mass killings and horrific violence that targeted civilians thought to be prorepublican played out, leading historian Paul Preston to title it "the Spanish Holocaust."[1] From 1936 to 1939, approximately 350,000 people, soldiers and civilians, died in the war. Forces from one side or the other executed many civilians, an estimated 200,000 according to Preston.[2] Of the 350,000 deaths, nearly 200,000 of those killed came from the republican side, including the majority of those executed as civilians.[3] In addition, somewhere near 400,000 civilians were imprisoned during the conflict and in the immediate aftermath.[4]

The Spanish Civil War was a violent and destructive conflict. Spain was destroyed, and by 1940, the population had been reduced by half a million and the average national income was at 1914 levels. The economy did not reach 1931 levels of production again until 1956. Moreover, the political repression against opponents and perceived opponents of the regime continued to be a dominant feature of the period of "first Francoism," not just in the 1940s but through the 1950s. The aim here was to negate the historic fact of the Second Republic and its universal suffrage, defense of individual and regional rights, and its tradition of secularism, as well as the contributions made by Socialist, Communist, and anarchist movements and political parties. In its place would emerge a centralized and Catholic state governed in the name of the personal power of Francisco Franco and one that sought to build its longevity on nostalgia for Spanish power associated with its past empire. The Law on Political Responsibility, decreed by the regime on February 9, 1939, even before the end of the conflict, ordered the continuation of the removal from society of those who fomented the "red subversion."[5] The law created special political tribunals to try those suspected of being opponents of the new regime. As a result, there was a massive round of political repression in the early years of the Franco regime, with approximately 150,000 executions of political opponents and some half million held in labor and concentration camps following Franco's victory.[6] Martial law, enacted by Franco in July 1936 in zones occupied by Nationalist forces, stayed in place across Spain until 1948. Michael Richards labeled the post–civil war attempt to punish republicans and suspected republican supporters a "programme of terror."[7] These measures were meant not only to imprison regime opponents but also oversee their reeducation and reintegration into the new Spain. Some twelve thousand children were removed from republican families when their parents were arrested and "reeducated" as members of Catholic, regime-supporting families. This was in many respects a purge of the history of left-wing politics in Spanish history. Many regional studies have emerged since the late 1990s to document the nature and size of the repression across Spain at the local level.

In the late 1940s, Spanish Communists based in France attempted, with little success, to attack Spanish border patrols and start another civil war; more successful were strikes against political control and economic independence—some thirty thousand to fifty thousand in May 1947 and over three hundred thousand who shut down Barcelona in February and March 1951. The response to this was severe and built

on policies of terror already enacted since the triumph of Franco. In addition, the regime cast such events as the work of Communists and reds, who were illegitimate in the first place and often supported by foreign powers. Historian Antonio Cazorla-Sánchez concluded that over time Spaniards accepted the regime's argument that democracy meant a return to chaos and civil war, and they supported the regime in mass demonstrations when the United Nations condemned it in December 1946.[8] From this foundation, Spaniards reinterpreted what it meant to be a Spanish citizen, and many did indeed participate in the regime's projection of community and identity.

FRANCOIST MEMORY OF THE CIVIL WAR: HISTORY IN THE SERVICE OF THE REGIME

Thus, accompanying the violent repression of opponents during and after the civil war was a distinct Francoist memory of the conflict. Memory had to be part and parcel of the creation of regime, given its desire to institutionalize the idea that one side defeated another in a battle of "two Spains." As Paloma Aguilar Fernández wrote, official discourse allows us to study how memory is socialized to those who themselves did not participate in events, as well as those who did, using various forms of media.[9] The key use of the war's memory came in Franco's argument that it was a necessary evil required to provide legitimacy to the government that the Second Republic failed to produce. Because the Second Republic did not contain political violence, defend the Church, or protect the unity of national territory and allowed the influence of outsiders, especially the Soviets, it was illegitimate, thus justifying civil war. Even if civil war was necessary, however, and not a choice, it was nonetheless purifying and the total defeat of the enemy renewed Spain. In the years following the civil war, Francoist entities used language that depicted the civil war as a "crusade," a "war of national liberation" or the "glorious uprising." In textbooks used in the education system, such language and imagery were prevalent in Spain throughout the 1940s and 1950s. Some ten thousand political prisoners labored in 1940 to construct the huge, five-hundred-foot cross and crypt at the Valle de los Caídos in the Sierra de Guadarrama outside of Madrid (fig. 4.1). Franco is now buried there. The site symbolized the regime's own politics of memory.

The Valle de los Caídos represented, in physical form, the legitimacy the regime sought, first in victory over the opposing side and secondly in its Catholicism and religiosity. This became combined with an

Figure 4.1. Valley of the Fallen, Valle de los Caídos, El Escorial, Madrid, Spain. Photo by iStock/KarSol.

assertion of nationalism to create a kind of national Catholic iconography. Because of the extent of urban destruction that occurred in the civil war, mainly due to aerial bombardment of cities, Franco had an unparalleled opportunity to physically reconstruct Spain in the image he desired, especially through the creation of the Interior Ministry Office for Reconstruction, the Dirrecíon General de Regiones Devastadas. In Barcelona, the bombing damage in the city center allowed the construction of what is now called Avinguda de la Catedral and fulfills a longer-term vision of a central avenue into old Barcelona. It also gave the regime the chance to reveal Roman ruins in the old quarter and exploit them for the purpose of linking the new regime to the glories of a Roman past. Architecture often celebrated an imperial past that Franco drew parallels to and iconized historical figures like the Catholic kings, Isabel and Ferdinand, and El Cid. The regime also left significant reminders of the civil war and the threat of the other side renewing the conflict. Belchite was left in ruins, and a new town was built five hundred meters away; new modern planning stood alongside ruins and memorials to fallen martyrs, as a constant reminder of both the devastation of war and the renewal of Spain provided by the current dictatorship.

The regime also cultivated memory politics in the celebration of

Franco. The leader, or *caudillo*, was omnipresent as statues of him and streets renamed in his honor proliferated around Spain in the years following the civil war, especially in the 1940s. He was first cast as a military hero. From 1939 to 1945, Franco was often seen alongside images of Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini, demonstrating both the regime's sympathies with the Axis side in the Second World War (although Spain never joined the conflict) as well as tapping into the cult of personality and charismatic imagery that the Nazi and Fascist propaganda was so good at. As Franco emerged from the Second World War, obviously this disappeared. Interestingly enough, a second round of Franco statues proliferated in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The era of "first Francoism," tended to be dominated by the army and elements of the Fascist-inspired Falange, and from 1945 to 1957, the economic policy followed by Spain was one of autarky, or the attempt to create a self-sufficient independent economy. During this period, Spain limited trade, tourism, and general relations with the outside world. It was an attempt, in part, to mirror the policies of Mussolini's Italy. This limited industrialization, however: if Spain wanted to modernize, it required foreign capital that could only be gained by trading on the world market. So by 1957, as the Falange declined in significance, Spain was opened up to foreign investment, tourism, and broader relations with the world. The official policy change came with the 1959 Stabilization Plan. As a result of modernization, foreign investment flourished, tourists from Europe and North America were welcomed, and the nature of Spain's economy changed dramatically. There was significant population movement from rural areas to the cities, and agriculture for the first time was not the primary industry in Spain; certain regions, like the area around Madrid and especially Catalonia and its capital, Barcelona, experienced tremendous economic growth; and the production and purchase of consumer goods flourished in the 1960s. The result was a period of great economic growth from 1960 to 1974, growth that averaged 6.6 percent per year—only Japan did better over the same time period. The second "cult" of Franco, evident by the proliferation of statues and monuments to him, celebrated his leadership in making Spain modern.

Others were celebrated with statues and street names, such as José Antonio Primo de Rivera, founder of the Falange who was executed in 1936, and numerous generals who had served Franco in the war. Primo de Rivera also was celebrated on November 20, the anniversary of his death, known as the Day of National Mourning. Other celebration days

include Franco's Day of Victory, April 1 and July 18, which marked the start of Franco's uprising. Soon July 18 was joined to May 2, the traditional nationalist day that commemorated Spain's fight against Napoleon in 1808. The two days were linked in that they both represented Spain's assertion of its identity in opposition to foreign invaders—the French, in the case of May 2, and "international Communism," represented by Spain's own Second Republic, in Francoist interpretations of July 18. October 12 soon became the Day of Hispanidad, marking Spain's imperial past and continued ties to Latin America, while May 1, traditionally a holiday in Europe for workers, celebrated by left-wing political movements, became the Fiesta of Work. Just as late Francoism saw a proliferation of commemorative spaces celebrating Franco's modernization of Spain, so too did it publicly celebrate the length of his rule, with special days commemorating twenty-five years of peace in 1964, where the annual military march was renamed a Parade for Peace.

Franco's victory left no room for any expression of culture, ethnicity, or heritage that was not Castilian, the primary language of Spain and especially central Spain. Indeed, much was made by Franco of celebrating the Spanish "race." In regions with different languages and cultures, such as the Basque, Galician, and Catalan areas of Spain, bans on public use of non-Castilian languages were strictly enforced. In Catalonia, which had a prewar population of only three million, some sixty thousand to one hundred thousand Catalans fled Spain after the civil war. These included most of the pre–civil war political leaders who survived the conflict as well as many cultural figures like the musician Pau Casals. When Nationalist forces first entered Catalonia on April 5, 1938, Franco abolished the autonomous statute. A cultural genocide—a phrase used to define a series of actions taken by the state to suppress any form of visible Catalan identity in public—followed the end of the war. These acts included the banning of the Catalan flag, the banning of any public use of the Catalan language, and the banning of any published material in Catalan.[10] New teachers from outside the province were brought in to guarantee that there would be no use of the language in public education. Catalan Communist, Socialist, and anarchist leaders existed underground or in exile in France. After 1945, a new generation of Catalan nationalists emerged, many associated with the church. Although the regime supported the church, in Catalonia it had many pro-Nationalist priests and others. Only in the mid-1960s did Francoist repression of Catalan soften, and some publication of Catalan

texts and magazines was allowed, but this was countered by the massive influx of non-Catalans who moved into the province as the economy flourished.

THE TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY AND THE PACT OF OBLIVION

The regime hoped that economic growth and modernization of the 1960s and 1970s would satisfy Spaniards and that a mixture of authoritarianism in politics could be combined with Western consumerism in economics and lifestyle, but this was not to be the case. Economic growth weakened the influence of the traditional conservative classes, especially rural landowners. It also produced, for one of the first times in Spanish history, a huge middle class, and attitudes changed on a number of issues, including women's rights and, above all, on the importance of political freedom and democracy. Added to this was a generational change, similar to that occurring across the rest of western Europe and the United States, that produced intense criticism by the young of their elders and especially of the political, economic, and other structures of power. In Spain, the first political opposition came from university students of the 1960s, then it spread to workers and the middle classes; eventually, even reformist Catholics lessened their support for the regime. Added to this was the antagonism in the regions with different identities and languages, such as the Basque lands and Catalonia. The most visible and violent form of opposition from these regions came from the Basque group ETA (Basque Homeland and Freedom), which began bombing and targeting politicians to be killed in the late 1960s.

As Franco aged, he began to prepare for the transition from Francoist dictatorship to monarchy, in the form of King Alphonso's grandson, Juan Carlos (officially named successor in 1969). Franco intended for the monarch who would replace him to be a Francoist, in other words, to continue to rule Spain as a conservative, Catholic, and authoritarian state. Indeed, Franco had been in charge of Juan Carlos's education since the prince was the age of nine, and for the most part, he had lived in Spain not in Portugal with his father, the heir to the monarchy who was removed from power in 1931. Franco also prepared for succession in the political realm, and in 1969, he appointed his close friend Adm. Luis Carrero Blanco as prime minister. When Carrero Blanco took office, both student and worker protests and ETA attacks against the regime grew; in 1973, the admiral was assassinated by ETA militants. His replacement, Arias Navarro, moved more and more in the

direction of ending authoritarianism, and here, the Portuguese Revolution of 1974 served as a lesson because, while these Spanish officials wanted change, they also wanted to avoid a situation that might allow the Communists to come to power, as they had briefly in Portugal. It is important to note that repression in this era did not end. In December 1970, a major trial of ETA activists resulted in sentences of death, although international pressure did result in the commutation of these sentences to life in prison. Later, in March 1974, the anarchist leader Salvador Puig Antich was executed in Barcelona.

Nonetheless, many of the leaders who would emerge after Franco's death were talking of some kind of opening up—*aperturismo*—instead of what Franco may have wanted, continuity (*continuismo*). Indeed, Prime Minister Arias Navarro used the word *opening* when referring to the regime in one of his first public speeches in office in February 1974.[11] With Franco's death on November 20, 1975, Spanish leaders followed this path, led by King Juan Carlos II.

The transition to democracy in Spain has been characterized not as a sudden break, but rather as a *ruptura pactada*—a negotiated break with the past and a very gradual one, led by the new king, other moderates, and Francoists. On Franco's death, Juan Carlos II took power. In July 1976, Adolfo Suárez replaced Arias Navarro as prime minister. Suárez introduced a law on political reform in November 1976 that laid the groundwork for eventual elections. New political parties were formed, although the Communist Party, which had abandoned its advocacy of violence to overthrow Franco in 1963, was not legalized until 1977. The first elections were held in June 1977 and were won by Suárez's new political party, the Union of the Democratic Center (UCD), which involved many like him from the old regime. The new government then set about writing a constitution, which came into force in December 1978, with autonomous statutes for the regions that allowed use of the Catalan, Basque, and Galician languages again, as well as some decentralization of power from the center to the regional governments.

The transition also was marked by an October 1977 law that created an amnesty for all political crimes committed previously, whether committed in the name of Francoism or otherwise. This piece of legislation was vital to the idea of a so-called *pacto de olvido* (pact of oblivion), described by historian Santos Juliá as not a decision to forget the past but rather as a decision not to let the past shape the future.[12] The amnesty law was a perfect example of that. So too were numerous

efforts to reintegrate the republican losers of the civil war into society, not now seen as victors but on at least equal terms as the Francoists. Pensions were granted to injured republican soldiers at this stage.

Many have interpreted the pact of oblivion as a pact of silence about the past. Simply put, there was no desire on the part of these political elites to revisit the history of the war or the implications of that history. While Julía's idea not to let the past dictate the future and to remove the idea of a context between winner and loser from Spain's history is convincing, there are certainly arguments in favor of seeing the transition as an effort to publicly "erase" the past. Some 73 percent of deputies elected to the first Cortes (parliament) after Franco were forty-nine years old or less, which meant they had not lived through the Spanish Civil War and thus had little interest in revisiting it. Most Spaniards were happy with the return to power of the Bourbon monarchy in the form of Juan Carlos II and did not insist on a return to the republican form of government that had been forced out by Franco. This did not mean that the public had no memories of the conflict—one of the most notable was the arrival in Spain, in 1981, of Pablo Picasso's painting *Guernica*, created in 1937 for the World's Fair to commemorate the April 26, 1937, bombardment of the Basque town and its civilian population in the course of the civil war, a bombing carried out by the Nazi Condor Legion but under the orders of Franco's Nationalist Army. The transition also saw the abolition of important Francoist holidays, such as July 18, or their replacement, so the April 1 Day of Victory became Armed Forces Day. In 1985, there was a rechristening of the May 2, 1808, monument in Madrid that Franco had tried to link to his own uprising, and it became a monument for all victims of the civil war. However, there was not a complete removal of Francoism from the public sphere. A completely different politics of memory was not institutionalized to replace the old; rather, some elements of new memory found a place, but many old ones remained; neither was given a place of prominence in society or politics. The Valle de los Caídos remained open, and annual events, such as the anniversary of Franco's death (which coincided with that of the Falange founder José Antonio Primo de Rivera), continued. When the first Socialist prime minister elected since the Second Republic, Felipe Gonzalez, came into office in 1982, he endorsed the concept of the *pacto de olvido*; especially fresh in his mind and those of many others was the brief but nonetheless significant coup attempt by a small group of army officers in February 1981 that sought to restore an authoritarian regime. This attitude continued

throughout the Gonzalez years. While acknowledging the role of those who fought with the republic in the civil war, and thus in part the groundwork for Spain's contemporary democracy, Gonzalez nonetheless declared on the fiftieth anniversary of the start of the conflict in 1986 that the war was "definitely history."[13]

It was indeed in the field of academic history where a new generation of historians took up research in the 1980s exploring the causes and consequences of the civil war, often using methods of social and political history that were common in the rest of Europe but had not fully developed in Francoist Spain. This group was the first to challenge the political elite's conception of memory as nothing worth exploring. However, these new works did not yet resonate with the public. Francoism continued to provoke positive responses from many in Spain, who saw Franco as being "good and bad for Spain," and many Francoist leaders continued to have a role in politics.[14] The most notable was Manuel Fraga Iribarne, Franco's minister of Information and Tourism from 1962 to 1969, minister of the Interior during the transition, and the founder of the first real conservative political party after Franco, the Alianza Popular and its successor, the Partido Popular, created in 1989. Fraga was also head of the Galician regional government from 1989 to 2005. Yet, the transition also saw the collapse of any sort of extreme right-wing movement, especially after 1982, and the relegation of racist right-wing politics to young skinheads, much like the rest of Europe at the time. Most commentators argued that if Francoism remained, it is not as a political movement, but as "sociological Francoism"—which meant a general detachment from politics, a distrust of politicians, and the public's placing of a high value on order.[15] The transition to democracy, then, was a successful one, one that acknowledged the past and the two sides of the civil conflict but one that still had not directly grappled with the difficult memories of the past violence and repression.

THE RETURN OF MEMORY POLITICS TO SPAIN

Under Francoism, those killed by the Nationalist forces or by the subsequent Franco regime were often not recorded and could not be publicly remembered during the postwar era. The state granted an exclusive right to patriotic sentiments, community, and sacrifice only to the victims. While the transition era changed this, admitting that there had been republican war sacrifices and thus gave republican veterans pensions, there was still no public space to represent what had happened to the republic side in the Spanish Civil War and especially nothing

that commemorated the repression and mass executions that followed the conflict. This slowly began to change in the 1980s, first at the local level. In small towns and villages of Spain, mass graves of Francoist victims began to be identified and publicly marked. This was not comprehensive and did not occur everywhere. Small ceremonies carried out by the families of victims also emerged. For example, in the village of La Barranca de Lardero, near Logroño, the cemetery held a mass grave of some four hundred victims. Family members, after the death of Franco, began to hold a small commemorative ceremony each November 1, All Saints Day, and eventually they created a distinctive monument there. Similarly in Barcelona, the field in the Montjuic cemetery known as Fosser de la Pedrera was first opened to the family members of victims in 1976. Many of the 1,717 people executed in Barcelona from 1939 to 1941 were buried in this field, in an area not accessible to the public. From the late 1970s, Associació Pro-memòria als Immolats per la Llibertat a Catalunya (Association for the Memory of Those Who Sacrificed for the Liberty of Catalonia) speared the effort to open up the field; it negotiated an end to all burials there by 1979 and pushed for the creation of the first public monument on the site in 1985.[16]

What began to emerge very slowly, and very locally, in the 1980s soon became more prominent, as novels and films concerned with the civil war came into the realm of popular culture. By the 1990s, more public commemorations of the civil war emerged, and debates over how best to recover memory, or what to remember, also developed. There was now in Spain a real debate over the politics of memory; both the Francoist memory and the pact of silence negotiated by the transition's political elites were challenged. In January 1996, in advance of the sixtieth anniversary of the start of the civil war, Spain's parliament voted to give Spanish citizenship to any living International Brigade member who had fought on the republican side in the civil war. Soon, the politicization of the memory of the civil war became even more apparent as the Partido Popular (PP), led by José María Aznar, won elections that brought fourteen years of Socialist rule to an end and returned the conservative right to the government for the first time since the beginning of the transition. The new government authorized a reform of the education system and its curriculum. One of the elements of this reform was to bolster and prioritize the teaching of Castilian, which was seen both as a defensive reaction against increased immigration to Spain and an assault on the autonomous communities and their language policies—policies to support Basque, Galician, and Catalan in

order to undo decades of Francoist repression. The vote of the parliament compared to the educational policies of the PP seemed to draw political divisions in a way very similar to those of the civil war itself. Similarly, in 1997, the Aznar government paid to create a memorial and exhume some 1,300 bodies of members of the Division Azul near St. Petersburg, Russia—this was the purportedly volunteer division of the Spanish army that Franco sent to the Soviet Union to fight the Red Army alongside Nazi forces in World War II. By 1999, the left-wing opposition's effort to recognize the Spanish republican exiles was countered by the government's attempt to recognize all victims of violence, and in 2001, the government offered substantial financial support to the Fundacíon Francisco Franco, a group created in 1977 to advance the memory of the former dictator. Then on November 20, 2002, the Spanish parliament unanimously condemned Francoism. The memory of the civil war was becoming a political battle comparable with others played out between the government and opposition.

This political battle over memory—or perhaps better put, the use of memory in political debate—was the first reason for the "rediscovery" of the civil war in Spain in the 1990s. Reluctantly and slowly, the agreements decided upon by a previous generation's political elite were challenged. This challenge came not only from a new generation of politicians but from the judicial bench as well. In this interpretation, Spain, as a country that now is democratic and a member of the United Nations, supporting many UN declarations and documents that support human rights, has a legal obligation to come to terms with its own repressive past. Indeed, Spanish law was quite expansive, at least as interpreted by one of the leading judges in Spain's Audiencia Nacional, Baltasar Garzon. In 1996, Garzon used Spain's human rights legislation to claim Spain had jurisdiction in the case of some fifty Spanish citizens murdered in Chile during the dictatorship of 1973 through 1991, as well as the right to investigate similar crimes committed against Chileans, because of Spain's adherence to international treaties and documents regarding human rights. Thus, Garzon prepared the indictment of the former Chilean dictator, Gen. Augusto Pinochet. This indictment led to Pinochet's brief arrest in the United Kingdom in 1998 and ultimately the loss of his remaining political power in Chile.

The Pinochet case, and Spain's leading role in it, revealed to many the fact that Spain had not pursued its own demons with quite the same principled and determined action. Aznar and the PP's general

position not to reopen the past, and not to dismiss Franco from Spanish history, as described above, only exacerbated this sense.[17] Soon enough, the United Nations declared that Spain was a country that had not dealt with its own past with some type of state-led investigation or truth commission. By 2002, the UN Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances urged Spain to investigate the fate of those killed by Francoist forces and dumped in mass graves, graves that many claimed still held the remains of some thirty thousand unidentified persons.

What was happening nationally and internationally was also happening locally. Just as local efforts in the late 1970s and early 1980s spurred on the first commemorative efforts, so too did they encourage a real national debate over the extent of Franco's crimes, and indeed, they made those crimes front and center in the debate over what to remember. In the late 1990s, there emerged a number of popular movements created to recover and identify the mortal remains of the victims of the repression. Over time, these groups sought not only to operate in a local context but in regional and national contexts as well. The most notable group to emerge was the one led by Emilio Silva, the Asociación para la Recuperación de la Memoria Histórica (ARMH; Association for the Recuperation of Historical Memory) in 2000. The ARMH made its primary goals to be the excavation of mass graves and the identification of victims killed by Francoist forces during and after the civil war. ARMH began in the province of Léon and exhumed its first mass grave of thirteen bodies there in October 2000, completely funded by private sources. By 2006, the ARMH had exhumed graves in some forty locations across Spain, containing 520 bodies. It encouraged local communities to host "memory forums," where there would be discussions of how to proceed, since most communities knew of the existence of mass graves in their midst but did not have the means to exhume them. ARMH offered support services and then employed forensic anthropologists and other professionals, often from other countries, to carry out the work on the ground. Foros por la Memoria, another organization with the same mission, soon joined the ARMH as a national group. ARMH is a group of activists, but their emphasis tends to be on the role of family members in the excavation and identification process; the ARMH gives families the decision on how to commemorate their relatives, by maintaining the mass graves or in separate burial, just as it encouraged local communities to make the initial decision to exhume or not. The more leftist-oriented Foros, associated with the Communist

Party, asserts that the collective identity of victims as political victims is primary, and thus, the goal is not only identification but commemoration of the crimes (fig. 4.2) and the mass graves themselves.

By 2005, some 170 associations that dealt with the recovery of memory were registered in Spain. The ARMH and Foros were national in scope; others were associated with particular types of victims of Francoist repression, such as journalists; others specifically focused on the preservation of certain sites and memorials; others recover documentation and mass graves in more local or regional contexts. The work of these groups was the second reason for the return of memory politics to Spain. If the political debates of the government and the opposition brought out memories of the right and left in the 1930s, the work of mass grave excavations put the attention of the public not on the military aspects of the civil war but on the repression of the Francoist side. The work of activists from the grassroots has greatly influenced the historical profession in Spain, as many historians turned to detailed local studies of those killed by the regime. Conferences, websites, and large team-oriented research have developed at many of Spain's universities. One such example in the province of Galicia is the impressive project

Figure 4.2. El Torno, Cáceres, Spain, January, 12, 2018, three statues of the monument to the forgotten of the Spanish Civil War, Jerte Valley. Photo by iStock/jcm32.

Nomes e Voces (www.nomesevoces.net), based at the University of Santiago de Compostella, which was established in order to create maps and databases of all of the victims of the civil war in the region.

Generational change is an important reason for both the political-legal and the grassroots developments apparent in Spain by the late 1990s and early 2000s. As noted in chapter 1, generational change is often a key factor in marking changes in memory politics. The leaders of movements like the ARMH are the grandchildren of the generation that fought in the Spanish Civil War, taking up its memory in their thirties and forties, after most of their grandparents had passed away. They, unlike the generations of their parents and grandparents, had not created the pacto de olvido, which for their parents meant living in silence when it came to a direct confrontation with the past. From this generation, too, came a new generation of politicians, who reinterpreted the past in very partisan ways—those in the PP who refused to distance themselves completely from the conservative, nationalist history of Spain, which included Francoism, and those in the Socialist Party who, unlike Felipe Gonzalez and his generation, were more assertive in claiming their politics had come from the Second Republic and the leftist tradition in Spain.

SPAIN'S "SECOND TRANSITION": ZAPATERO AND THE LAW ON HISTORICAL MEMORY

The next stage in the development of the movement to recover the memory of the civil war and Francoist repression came in March 2004, with the election of the Socialist government of José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero to power. Zapatero took the lead in what he and others called Spain's "second transition."[18] A variety of policies emerged from this effort, such as restricting some of the rights of the Catholic Church, liberalizing abortion and divorce laws, and legalizing same-sex marriage. The open investigation of the Franco regime was a key component of this effort as well, and a very personal one for Zapatero, whose grandfather had been executed by Francoist forces during the civil war. Indeed, in a 2004 speech, Zapatero read an excerpt from a letter written by his grandfather just prior to his execution. In it, his grandfather asked his family to help clear his name "when the appropriate time comes."[19] Zapatero was not unique in taking this charge—some 67 percent of Spaniards in 2007 supported looking anew at the civil war and the Franco regime.

The first policy to develop from within this framework was an

Interministerial Committee for the Study of the Situation of the Vic-
tims of the Civil War and Francoism, established in October 2004, led
by Zapatero's vice president, Maria Teresa Fernández de la Vega. By
2005, the government had removed one of the last statues of Franco
in the capital city, in the prominent Plaza de San Juan de la Cruz.
By 2006, the commission came up with a draft law that became the
groundbreaking Law on Historical Memory, enacted in October 2007.
This law condemned Franco's military uprising as illegitimate and the
judgments of military tribunals that sentenced Franco's opponents
to death or prison camps as unjust. It created a council to investigate
war crimes of the civil war—committed by both sides—and set aside
money that could be used as reparations for family members of those
found to have been victims of war crimes. Those stripped of Spanish
citizenship by Franco because of their exile were allowed to reclaim it.
Monuments, plaques, and statues that exalt one side over the other or
were directly associated with the Franco regime were to be removed. In
this instance, the role of educating the public was emphasized so as not
to ensure one interpretation over another, although on balance the law
clearly associated the government with the anti-Francoist side. A Docu-
mentation Center of Historical Memory was created. Finally, the most
significant monetary change was the government funding of mass
grave exhumations. In many respects, the law was a symbolic gesture,
for the creation of an archive, money for compensation and mass grave
exhumations, and other things did not require parliamentary approval
and could have easily been done through government decree. It did not
repeal other legislation, most especially the 1977 Amnesty Law. It was
meant to give a prominent position to the recovery of memory within
the scheme of national politics. It was meant to respond to the actions
that civil society, through organizations like the ARMH, had already
taken and to demonstrate the government's response to society. Finally,
it was a symbolic consolidation of Spain's democracy through dealing
head-on with its past.

  The conservative side of the political spectrum in Spain charged
Zapatero with trying to divide Spain again and with breaking previous
understandings of how memory of the civil war should be handled.
When the government removed the last statue of Franco in Madrid,
in 2005, as noted earlier, the leader of the PP, Mariano Rajoy, accused
Zapatero of "breaking the spirit of the transition." Another member of
the PP, in the debate over the Law on Historical Memory, said it sim-
ply represented the assertion of victory by one side over the other but

in reverse of what Franco had done. Just days after the law passed the Cortes, the Roman Catholic Church named 498 Spaniards murdered by the republican side in the Spanish Civil War as saints. Others argued that the 1978 constitution and the 2002 parliamentary condemnation of Francoism were sufficient to prove that Spain had no interest in abandoning democracy and that that was far more important in the end.

As noted, one of the things that the Law on Historical Memory did not do was revoke the 1977 law on amnesty. This important omission was criticized by many international human rights organizations because it meant no sort of truth commission or court case would ever emerge in Spain as a result of a history where war crimes had been committed. Perhaps this was one of the ways in which the pacto de olvido and its emphasis on moving forward remained present in Spain. The section of the law demanding changes to monuments and plaques linked to the Franco regime did not come with any funding to pay for the removal of such prominent markings of the previous regime. The city of Madrid still contains some 350 streets named for Franco or others associated with his regime, and many other towns and villages have similar sites. Moreover, the 2007 law did not change the status of the Valle de los Caídos, which remained open. In 2009, a commission of historical experts examined the status of the site and did indeed close it to the public with the exception of the church, which sits in the mountain under the cross. For many who want this site converted into a museum about the crimes of the regime—much as many Nazi camps and other National Socialist places have been transformed into museums and centers teaching of tolerance—closure does not resolve the issue.

The only direct response to the international community's desire for more than the 2007 law permitted came from Judge Garzon in 2008. In October 2008, Garzon decided to rule on a petition from the families of thirteen of Franco's victims. He opened an investigation into some 114,000 killings under the Franco regime, and he ordered that nineteen mass graves be exhumed as the first stage of this process. One of these included the body of the famed poet Francisco García Lorca. García Lorca was murdered by Francoist forces shortly after the civil war began and buried in a grave with a small number of other victims. Although knowledge of this was commonplace, García Lorca's family did not want exhumation, and as with other cases, the desire of the family to exhume was central, at least until Garzon made his ruling. He had raised the possibility that graves could be dug up despite family wishes. Moreover, he called the killings of citizens crimes against humanity, which

were against the law in Spain, and thus, he raised the possibility that these investigations could lead to charges against groups or individuals, including some thirty-four individuals named by the judge.

In taking this action, Garzon was acting on his own and attempting to move into territory that the Law on Historical Memory did not go, namely on pushing for investigation that could lead to trial. Although a common feature in societies transitioning to democracy since the 1990s, no such trials had ever been considered by the Zapatero government. Indeed, the government filed a brief with Garzon arguing that, under the 1977 Amnesty Law, he did not have the right to open investigations that could lead to trial, not to mention the difficulties of having trials when so many of those involved had passed away. So in November 2008, Garzon closed his investigation. This brought renewed criticism on Spain from groups like Amnesty International, which called for further judicial inquiries, as did the United National Human Rights Committee, which noted in October 2008 that the 1977 Amnesty Law was incompatible with Spain's adherence to a series of human rights documents within the UN system.

CATALONIA AND COMPARABLE POLICIES

The impact of the Law on Historical Memory was felt at the regional level as well, especially in the autonomous region of Catalonia, where Francoist repression of language and culture, as well as an influx of non-Catalan Spaniards in the last part of the twentieth century, marked the region and fundamentally changed it. With the restoration of its own government, the Generalitat, and its own statute of autonomy in 1979, the government of Catalonia instituted a comprehensive cultural and educational policy to restore the language and culture. Catalan citizens, as early as 1975, tore down street signs named for the Francoists and replaced them with their own, hand-made signs. So the removal of Francoism was part and parcel with the promotion of Catalanism. However, for the first two decades after the transition, the focus in Catalonia was on cultural policy. Later, as the rest of Spain grappled with the past, so too did Catalonia, demanding in 2004 a national government apology for the execution of civil war–era Catalan president Lluis Companys in 1940, opposing the removal of civil war documents from the Catalan archive to join a national archive on the civil war in Salamanca, and, as in the rest of Spain, organizing local initiatives to exhume mass graves. In October 2007, just as the Cortes passed the Law on Historical Memory, Catalonia

passed a similar law. This created a regional institution, Memorial Democràtic, to oversee the creation of public memorial spaces in the region and to support local municipal efforts that were already underway or might develop. The preservation and communication of historical memory was seen as vital to the promotion of democracy and the development of democratic culture. Moreover, in Catalonia, the origins of contemporary democratic culture lay in the history of republicanism and opposition to the Francoist regime. This statement was far more assertive than the comparable one in the Spanish Law on Historical Memory for it not only asserted that the Franco regime was unjust but also that opposition of Francoism was the basis of the current political culture.

As elsewhere in Spain, the recovery of mass graves is important in Catalonia. The restoration of the mass grave at Barcelona's Montjuic cemetery, known as Fossar de la Pedrera (Mass Grave of the Quarry) is one example. This was the burial site for some 1,717 people killed in Barcelona after the civil war ended, from 1939 to 1952, and a total of approximately 4,000 bodies lay there unmarked. Its restoration began during the transition, led by a local victims' group, and in 1985, it opened as a public site of memory and the body of former president Companys, executed in 1940, was buried there in the single marked grave. The creation of Memorial Democràtic led to a second restoration, adding more signage and historical explanation.

However, the restoration of sites of memory and support for local and regional museums is only part of what Memorial Democràtic does. It also has been central to the mission of connecting history and memory to the current state of democracy. As stated in Article 2 of the Catalan Law:

> The object of the Democratic Memorial is to implement the Government's public policies geared to civic action for recovering, commemorating and fostering democratic memory and, specifically, knowledge of the period corresponding to the Second Republic, of the Republican Generalitat, of the Civil War, of those who fell victim to the conflict for ideological, conscientious, religious or social reasons, of the repression that occurred during the Franco dictatorship, of the exiles and deportations that took place, of the attempt to eradicate the Catalan language and culture, of the values and actions of those who opposed the Franco regime and of all the traditions of democratic culture, for the purposes of scientifically and objectively increasing awareness of the recent past and nurturing understanding of the present.[20]

A greater focus of Memorial Demogràtic then has been on the victims of the repression and those who fled Spain and went into exile because they would be persecuted if they stayed. In other words, those already politically affiliated with Catalan nationalism or democratic politics. In particular, the Catalan government's use of the history of Catalonia as the last place in Spain held by the republicans during that conflict and their subsequent exile from Spain via Catalonia links exile, political rights, and republicanism as distinctly Catalan. The key physical manifestation of the Catalan effort to connect the past with broader ideas about democratic culture is the Museu Memorial de'Exili (Memorial Museum of Exile) in La Jonquera, on the border of Catalonia and France. There the story of exile is told as one motivated primarily by democratic impulses.

CONCLUSION

Spain has come a long way in dealing with the violent facts of its past and most especially with the history of the Franco regime in executing and imprisoning political opponents from 1936 to 1975. From a general decision of the political elite to move forward toward successful transition in the 1970s through to grassroots efforts to fully document and discuss Francoism and violence, the country has come a long way. The 2007 Law on Historical Memory was a milestone in taking local initiatives, especially around the exhumation of mass graves, and turning them into a more comprehensive national policy. Yet the Garzon incident of 2008 demonstrates that while the Law on Historical Memory was an innovative and important attempt to grapple with Spain's past, there was no interest within the government to completely abandon the ideas behind the pacto de olvido and most especially the Law on Amnesty. In some ways, the efforts initiated by the Law on Historical Memory in 2007 were halted by the worldwide financial crisis of 2008, which impacted Spain greatly through large cuts to programs like those fostered by the law, and the coming to power of the PP in 2011, which resulted not in the removal of the law but in the underfunding of a number of initiatives from the law. Moreover, even under the Socialist government, Spain has dealt with its past without engaging in any judicial measures, which many societies in similar circumstances do. A new phase was initiated with the coming to power of a new Socialist government in Spain in 2018, which has proposed exhuming Franco's body from the Valle de los Caídos site and burying it in a modest cemetery.[21] Perhaps this represents a

continuation of the "second transition." Clearly, the efforts to move beyond the pact of silence, while incomplete, have been significant in shaping the cultural memory of the civil war in contemporary Spain.

FIVE

GERMANY, NAZISM, COLLABORATION, AND THE HOLOCAUST

The History of the Second World War in Europe

So many of the contemporary political and cultural memories in Europe are connected to the Second World War that it is essential to ground a basic history of the Second World War in Europe and mark the impact of Nazism and German policies across the continent before discussing the implications and attempting to measure how memory of the war shaped and continues to shape culture. This chapter outlines in very broad terms some of the major issues associated with the war in Europe before considering the war's memory. Beginning with German foreign policy and the origins of the Second World War, the chapter then moves to outline the history of occupation and the Holocaust before considering the issue of collaboration with Germany broadly and more particularly in the cases of France and Poland. Finally, the end of the war and the impact of the war on Germany and German civilians will be examined. In the next chapters, the importance of these events for a broader, cosmopolitan European memory of the war will be explored.

NAZI GERMANY AND WORLD WAR II ORIGINS

On November 5, 1937, after almost five years in power in Germany, Nazi leader Adolf Hitler held a conference with his leading military generals. Hitler reminded his listeners of what he had written in his 1925 book, *Mein Kampf.* At the meeting, he emphasized his concept of *lebensraum,* or living space, namely that Germany needed to expand its territory to become an autarkic power and the best basis for expansion was in eastern Europe due to its agriculture, its natural resources, and the fact that it was populated by those of "lesser races," specifically Jews and Slavs. Hitler's racial theory was not only motivated by his conclusion that Germany needed to expand but was grounded in a larger worldview. Hitler believed that all of human history was a battle of nations and races; German Aryans were, in his view, the superior race but were

currently held back by the presence of Jews in Germany and the fact that the Treaty of Versailles denied Germany the territory it needed to flourish as a race: thus, Hitler proposed to get rid of the Jews and carry out an expansion of Germany eastward, into territory that would give Germans the living space they needed. This was not only a policy to rectify immediate concerns, but one Hitler believed to be just given the struggle of races over time. Thus, his goal not only would solve, in his mind, Germany's short-term problems but also create the basis for a thousand-year Reich. The idea of expansion and expansion targeting areas populated by those deemed low on the racial hierarchy of Hitler has been called the twin concepts of "race and space" by many historians.[1] This was the basis for Germany's wars between 1939 and 1945.

The first sign of Hitler's aggression came in Austria in 1938. The Treaty of Versailles had forbidden a union of Germany and Austria after the end of the First World War: an *Anschluss*. Yet, the Nazi Party in Austria, which had been partially banned in 1934, was still active and growing and advocated union with Nazi Germany. Thus, when in February 1938, Hitler met the Austrian chancellor Schuschnigg, he insisted that Schuschnigg appoint a member of the Nazi Party to the Austrian cabinet. Schuschnigg agreed; yet, when he returned to Austria, he changed his mind, deciding that Hitler was simply trying to engineer the collapse of Austria. This reversal led to riots throughout the country, as Austrian Nazis protested the decision and Schuschnigg called a plebiscite on whether or not Austria should join Germany. Hitler was furious: he issued an ultimatum and began to move troops to the border. This resulted in Schuschnigg's resignation, and the Nazi government that took over invited German troops in on March 12, 1938. Austria became a province of the German Reich.

Hitler followed this up in the summer of 1938 by exploiting the existence of a Nazi Party in the primarily German-speaking region of the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia; by October 1938, the western powers, at the infamous Munich Conference, agreed to allow the Sudetenland to join Germany in the hopes of avoiding war. Once Hitler invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia in March 1939, however, it was clear that his expansionist dreams went far beyond uniting German speakers under his rule. The origins of the Second World War are at the same time complex and simple: complex in the variety of policies pursued by Britain and France, policies developed as a result of Versailles, the desire to appease Hitler and accept some of his demands as legitimate, and in response to their own national interests in the 1930s; simple in

the fact that, at a certain point, war was unavoidable due to the Nazis' expansionist aims. Following the invasion of Czechoslovakia, Britain and France guaranteed the independence of Poland and promised war if Germany invaded Poland, which it did on September 1, 1939.

Germany would go on to attack Norway, Denmark, Belgium, the Netherlands, and France in the spring of 1940, defeating all of these countries by the end of June. Due to the expansionistic aims of Hitler's ally, Benito Mussolini, leader of Italy, Germany was drawn into the war in Yugoslavia, Greece, and North Africa over the course of 1940 and 1941. Finally, on June 22, 1941, Hitler attacked the Soviet Union with whom he had a nonaggression pact meant to last until 1949 and with whom he had divided Poland in September 1939.

The attack on the Soviet Union was entirely an ideological decision, the highest point of Hitler's race and space strategy in German wartime policy. He committed almost three million troops and thousands upon thousands of tanks and planes. More significantly, he stated, in a planning meeting of March 30, 1941: "The Communist has never been a comrade and will never be a comrade. We have a war of annihilation on our hands."[2]

THE NAZI OCCUPATION OF EUROPE

Such policies had already begun in Poland. The German occupation in Poland was longer in duration than in any other country with the exception of the Bohemia region of Czechoslovakia and was by far the most severe. The Nazis considered Poles as the third-lowest racial group in Europe after Jews and the Roma/Sinti peoples (Gypsies). From 1939 through the beginning of 1945, over six million Polish citizens, roughly three million Christians and three million Jews, were killed during the war. In occupied Poland, privileged status was reserved for the *Reichsdeutsche*, those who had been German citizens before 1919, since much of western Poland had been German before the First World War. Most others were treated with various levels of contempt and hatred. The Nazis considered the Jews and the Roma/Sinti as destined for ultimate extermination and treated them the worst from the start. Just below them were those thought of as the *Untermenschen*, (the "sub-humans"), which included most Slavic peoples such as Poles, and they were considered only in their capacity as potential laborers for the Nazi war effort.

The first targets of German oppression were the Polish elite, politicians, intellectuals, journalists, and community leaders. Most of these

individuals were not Jewish but Polish. For example, in November 1939, 167 professors at Krakow's Jagiellonian University were arrested and sent to Germany, to the concentration camp of Oranienburg-Sachsenhausen. "The Poles," announced Hans Frank, the governor of the General Government of occupied Poland, "do not need universities or secondary schools; the Polish lands are to be changed into an intellectual desert."[3] Following these arrests, the German occupation forces closed most Polish scientific, artistic, and educational institutions with the exception of primary schools. In those parts of western Poland annexed directly to Germany, public use of the Polish language was forbidden, and place names were Germanized. Any history of an intellectual Poland, or the idea of Poland as a place of ideas, was erased, since the Germans, as noted, only saw the Poles as necessary for labor.

Roundups of citizens on the streets of Poland who were perceived as potential resisters to occupation began as early as November 1939, with most similarly sent to concentration camps or for forced labor in Germany. Many were held in local prisons, such as Pawiak in Warsaw (fig. 5.1). Ultimately over three hundred labor, concentration, and extermination camps were established in Poland itself, many holding not just Jews but also non-Jewish Poles as forced laborers. In the winter of 1939 to 1940, about one million Poles were deported from the lands

Figure 5.1. Pawiak Prison, a prison built in 1835 in Warsaw, Poland, and used by the Gestapo during World War II. Since 1990, it has been the Museum of Prison Pawiak. Photo by iStock/piotrbb.

annexed to Germany, in western Poland, to the occupied General Government. These examples, from the beginning of the Polish occupation, set the tone of the violence and harm that was to come.

Occupation regimes in Nazi-controlled Europe were diverse and often not as completely German led as in Poland. In places like the Netherlands, Nazis took over top positions in the government but worked with existing bureaucrats, police officers, and mayors. In other places, even more authority was granted to local governments, to the extent that these regimes were technically independent, although considered collaborationist, such as in France and Croatia. In Poland and the Soviet Union, Germans controlled almost everything, and collaboration largely stayed at local levels only.

Despite the different ways in which German occupation was administered and the variety of local variations at lower levels of the bureaucracy, German policy tended to focus on demographic and economic concerns throughout Europe. Economic policy was pursued in a fashion typical of the Nazi state within Germany: there was great centralization and planning in Berlin, but a multitude of officials and agencies had authority on the ground in various occupied countries, and thus, economic policy was implemented in a somewhat haphazard fashion across the continent. What was common in economic policy was that the purpose of any conquered territory was to serve Germany; if the most important heavy industries and war industries were centered in Germany proper, each conquered territory was a tributary. France and western Europe were to provide consumer goods for the German population; all of Europe was to provide food for Germany. Coordination meant that Denmark had more dairy farms than the Ukraine because Denmark had less arable land and Ukraine was best for massive wheat production and slated to become the breadbasket of the New Order.

The occupation aided in the German effort to arm itself; in particular, factories and businesses in the west had levies imposed upon them, that is, a certain percentage of their output had to go to Germany: this was the cost of occupation. In some mines and steel plants, that levy was often 100 percent; if factories closed, their equipment was shipped to Germany to be added to war industries there; in all occupied zones, the occupying power tightly controlled allocations of fuel and raw materials. Industries tended not to shut down in collaborationist countries like France but only because the collaborationist governments agreed to convert all trade to the German market at extremely low prices: on average, 75 percent of the goods produced in a French factory went to

Germany. For civilians, occupation, no matter where, meant a decline in food supplies as the Germans took over: black markets flourished, nutrition levels declined, sickness and disease spread.

The most significant aspect of German occupation policy in Europe was the expansion of a forced labor policy that impacted millions of non-Germans over the course of the war. Already by 1939, an influx of foreigners had immigrated to Germany for work, as rearmament increased the number of jobs there. Most of these people came voluntarily; after 1941, forced labor was seen as the solution. By 1944, some seven million foreign workers were based in Germany, and in German towns and villages anywhere from 20 to 80 percent of the foreign workforce was not there by choice.[4] There were two methods of forced labor: in the east, Nazi Germany relied on Soviet and Polish prisoners of war. The Germans took as prisoners some 5.5 million Red Army soldiers, 3.5 million of whom died working in labor camps, not just because of conditions but also due to the sheer barbarity on the part of German military and civilian officials. Between 1939 and 1944, the Germans deported about 2 million Polish civilians to Germany to work in agriculture and industry. In occupied France and other parts of the west, forced labor came in the form of labor conscription, mostly beginning in 1943 with the creation of Service de Travail Obligatoire.

THE HOLOCAUST

When Hitler took over power in Germany in January 1933, the persecution of Jews was very gradual, becoming more and more severe as the regime became more and more established; once war came, this pattern repeated itself in Europe with a greater degree of violence; In Germany, it was a gradual process that ultimately would deprive Jews of German citizenship; in Germany and Europe, once war came, it ultimately took away the lives of some six million Jews.

Anti-Semitism had a long history in central Europe and in Germany, going back centuries. In the nineteenth century, however, there was little focus on actually moving Jews out of German territory; Jews had had equal rights in Germany from the time it had become a country in 1871, and in parts of Germany, they had had equal rights going back to the early 1800s. Hitler's anti-Semitism was connected to his belief in lebensraum as well as ideas grounded in the rhetoric of racial superiority: he believed that a racially "purified" Germany should expand eastward into Polish and Soviet territory, colonize the "inferior" Slavs, and dispense with the Jews; he also believed that Bolsheviks and Jews

were synonymous in the USSR, and thus, his anti-Communism was not only on ideological grounds but also on the grounds that he viewed Communism as an aspect of Jewish life and culture. In his books and speeches made before the war, he blamed Jews for Germany's various economic and other problems and vowed to "solve" Germany's Jewish problem. In the summer of 1939, just as war was on the horizon, Hitler stated that if war came it would be the fault of the Jews and that the result would be their "annihilation." Once war began, he would refer back to this speech and to his "prophecy."[5]

In Nazi Germany, persecution of the Jews began with legal actions. In April 1933, the Professional Civil Service Act purged thousands of Jewish bureaucrats, teachers, and professionals from the government payroll. In September 1935, the Nuremberg Laws were created, and these measures deprived Jews of their rights as citizens and forbade marriage and sexual relationships between German and non-Aryans, which included Jews, Romanies, Sintis, and Africans. By 1937 and 1938, various legal pressures were instituted that encouraged Jewish businesses to be sold to Aryans. Violence was first sanctioned across the country with the infamous Kristallnacht, or Night of the Broken Glass, during which Nazi party members across Germany destroyed the remaining Jewish business, houses, synagogues; thousands of Jewish men were arrested and held for weeks and months in concentration camps following this event.

Attacks against Jews began soon after the invasion of Poland in September 1939. As early as September 19, 1939, plans for moving the Jewish population into restricted areas of Polish urban centers—ghettos—was being discussed by the head of the Reich Main Security Office (RSHA), Reinhardt Heydrich. On September 20, these plans were given official status: Jews were to be rounded up and moved into urban ghettos, first in the German-speaking areas attached to the Reich, later in the rest of Poland. Essentially, the ghetto was an area of a city where all the Jews lived; they were not permitted to leave, and all food, clothing, medicine, and other supplies sent into the ghetto area was strictly controlled. Over time, ghettos were fenced in, and armed German police manned the barricades to prevent Jews from leaving and to limit what entered. Within each ghetto, the Nazis appointed a council of Jewish elders—*Judenrat*—to carry out the management of the ghetto and implement German orders within the ghetto; in Warsaw, in 1939, the SS arrested twenty-five leaders of the Jewish community and only released them after they agreed to create a council. The

first ghetto was established at Lodz in April 1940; and then Warsaw, in October 1940; Krakow, in March 1941; Lublin and Radom, in April 1941. The ghetto area was tightly packed: usually it had housing, some shops, and a few parks, empty lots, or open space. In Warsaw, the Germans spent millions rerouting the old streetcar lines so they did not have to pass through the ghetto, which was close to the center of the city. The Warsaw ghetto was 1.3 square miles with a population of close to 400,000, and an average of 7.2 people per room of living space. Over time, malnutrition and disease became rampant, and over the life of the Warsaw ghetto, 83,000 of the 470,000 who lived there died there.[6]

After the June 1941 invasion of the Soviet Union, the move toward extermination as a solution to Europe's "Jewish problem" was unstoppable. The decision to invade Russia was neither pragmatic nor sound; Hitler initiated the war in the east as a war of destruction, not a strategic war as in the west, but as another radicalization of Nazi plans, a decision that prioritized the ideology of lebensraum above rational decision making. As a result, there was a similar change in Nazi policy toward the Jews: entering eastern Poland and the USSR, the European territory with the majority of Jews in Europe, Hitler and the SS abandoned gradual persecution, and policies of outright murder were adopted, which culminated in movement toward the "Final Solution" by the end of 1941. In 1941, Jews numbered approximately 2.1 million in the area of the Soviet Union that Germany eventually occupied. Within the Soviet Union, mass murder did not begin in concentration camps but through the deployment of mobile-killing squads, the Einsatzgruppen. The Einsatzgruppen were part of the SS, connected to the RSHA, run by Heydrich. They were ordered to join the army in the invasion of the USSR with orders to carry out measures against the civilian population, particularly Jews. The Einsatzgruppen followed closely behind the main German army attacks and trapped large populations of Jews in the larger cities and towns before they had an opportunity to escape. They then gathered Jews and shot them en masse. In some areas, like Lithuania, Einsatzgruppen troops remained for weeks, moving back and forth across the territory in an effort to find Jews who they had missed in previous sweeps; in other areas, like Galicia, in eastern Poland, they moved out quickly. The Einsatzgruppen did not act alone, for the German army, the Wehrmacht, cooperated, often turning over captured Jews to the Einsatzgruppen that came behind them and often joining in the shooting, so too did units of the Order Police, meant to provide security and control in occupied areas.

In most of the mobile killing operations, several hundred to several thousand Jews were shot at one time; but other episodes happened that go far beyond those numbers; in retaliation for a bomb against Romanian troops fighting alongside the Nazis, on October 23, 1941, most of the Jews in Odessa were shot; another twenty-five thousand to thirty thousand were killed outside of Odessa two days later; not only SS but police and army units were all involved here.[7] During the first sweep, from June to November 1941, approximately one hundred thousand Jews per month were killed in mobile killing operations. From December 1941 through the summer of 1942, there was a second sweep of mobile killing operations throughout the USSR, this time mainly involving the SS Order Police and the army, with the Einsatzgruppen playing less of a role; in this phase, the creation of hastily constructed concentration camps emerged. Almost one million Jews died in the Soviet Union during these months.

The radicalization of Nazi policy toward the Jews in the USSR led to radical changes across Europe. In July 1941, Heydrich and his deputy responsible for Jewish affairs, Adolf Eichmann, were given the authority to find a solution of the Jewish question. By the fall of 1941, measures were enacted that suggested what form this would take. In German territory, on October 1, 1941, a directive was issued that prevented any further Jewish emigration out of the country. In Poland, special concentration camps began to be created, at Chelmo and Belzec, in November, with gas chambers.

Before moving into a camp system completely, though, Heydrich decided to call together all those involved in Jewish issues for a meeting; he issued an invitation to a number of SS and occupation officials to a conference on the subject of the Final Solution on November 29, 1941. After a delay, the meeting was actually held on January 20, 1942, in an SS villa on Wannsee road, outside of Berlin. At the Wannsee conference, Heydrich outlined the decision that had been made for all the Jews left in German-controlled Europe. The decision, from the führer's office, was to end all emigration of Jews. He proposed the evacuation of all Jews to the east, beginning with those in western Europe. They would work in labor camps, where a large number would die due to the burden of work; others, he said, would be treated accordingly—there was no direct mention of execution, but it was a phrase all at the meeting knew, and they knew what it meant, for this was the same phrase the Einsatzgruppen used in their reports to Berlin about mass murder. The representatives from the General Government in Poland insisted

the Final Solution begin there, since hardly any of the Jews there were capable of working in labor camps. From here, the system of death camps and genocide by gassing was instituted.

By mid-1942, the final stage of the Holocaust, that of the death camps, was well underway. These death camps grew out of the preexisting concentration camps system: largely forced labor camps, which had been in place in Germany since 1933 and had spread across occupied Europe to hold political prisoners and other opponents of the Nazi regime in various countries. Such camps, including affiliated subcamps, numbered over 12,000 at their height and large camps such as Dachau inside Germany itself had many subcamps—123 in that case. In order to create a centralized death camp system, Jews were moved from across Europe to the six death camps, all located in Poland. The first deportees were Polish Jews in ghettos nearby the camps, and the last of the Jews came from Germany. The ghettos were liquidated in stages over the course of 1942 and 1943, as women, children, elderly, and sick Jews were removed in deportations of a couple thousand to tens of thousands, then weak Jews were deported, leaving small numbers of those who could still work in the ghetto until orders for final liquidation came—in most parts of eastern Europe, sometime in 1943, and as late as 1944 in more western parts of Poland. In western Europe, deportation was completely different because although much of western Europe had been under German occupation since before the invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941, there had not been the same unity of war aims and anti-Jewish policy that there was in the east, and Jews had not been isolated from the rest of the population and put into ghettos. Thus, once the decision to round up all Jews was made, moving from identification of Jews, to isolation, to deportation had to be carried out simultaneously. Eichmann initiated the deportation on June 30, 1942, when he visited Paris and emphasized that time was short. After that, Dutch and French police, working with the SS, created holding camps, rounded up their own Jews, sent them to these camps, and from there, they were deported to Polish death camps when the SS could arrange German trains to arrive and load prisoners. The most infamous roundup of Jews in France occurred on July 16, 1942, when four thousand Jews were arrested and sent to the indoor sports stadium the Veledrome d'Hiver, in Paris, and held there for five days without water, food, or sanitation. Many died before being moved on to other camps.

The RSHA of the SS in Berlin, first led by Heydrich and then by

Eichmann, was responsible for organizing transport of Jews from across Europe to the camps. This office had an official architect for the death camps, Dr. Christian Wirth, and also someone who coordinated delivery of the gas to the camps with the Office of the Hygienic Chief of the Waffen-SS and worked with a variety of German companies to acquire hydrogen cyanide and other gasses.

There were six death camps in Poland: Belzec, Sobibor, Chelmo, Treblinka, Majdanak, and Auschwitz-Birkenau. Belzec was a preexisting labor camp created in 1940; construction of the gas chamber in a camp expansion occurred in late 1941, and the first gassing operations began in March 1942 and continued until May 1943, when gassing operations stopped. In that single year, some 600,000 Jews were killed at Belzec, primarily those that came from the first wave of deportations: Jews from the General Government of Poland. At Sobibor, 250,000 Jews were killed from March 1942 to October 1943. The construction of this camp into three sections was the first sign of the Nazi bureaucracy's desire to run the camps in the spirit of bureaucratic efficiency— one of the most repulsive but significant elements in the definition of the Holocaust as a very unique and modern form of genocide. Train tracks entered the camp, and on the platform, the selection was made. Jews deemed suitable for work were directed to Camp A; these Jews worked in the camp doing maintenance work for the camp and taking care of the disposal of bodies of those murdered. Camp B was a series of large halls where the deportees had to undress, have their hair shorn, and hand over valuables; and Camp C was called the shower area but in reality consisted of five gas chambers where four hundred could be killed every half hour. Treblinka was set up in a similar manner to Sobibor, close to Warsaw. In the region of Lublin, Majdanak encapsulated the history of genocide under the Nazis: it began as and remained a labor camp; then gas vans were added and eventually gas chambers were constructed, and then a crematorium to burn the bodies of those killed. Over seventy-five thousand were killed at Majdanak, including some seventeen thousand Jews shot to death during the so-called Harvest Festival of November 3, 1943.[8]

The culmination of the camp system, and of the killing operations of the Nazi Holocaust, came at Auschwitz-Birkenau (fig. 5.2). Auschwitz started as a camp for Polish political prisoners but soon became more for it became a massive labor camp with hundreds of affiliated factories attached to the camp or nearby meant to take advantage of slave labor. By the time that Heydrich began planning

Figure 5.2. Rail entrance to concentration camp at Auschwitz-Birkenau KZ Poland.
Photo by iStock/CL-Medien.

the implementation of genocide, he and SS leader Heinrich Himmler
decided to make Auschwitz the main center for killing operations. The
camp was well situated geographically to access rail lines that came
from across Europe, and the area was swampy, cold, and damp—great
conditions for a camp; it was far away from the battlefields in Russia,
meaning IG Farben and other companies with factories could produce
their goods without fear of being attacked by either Russian, US, or
British bombers. Construction of the expansion, which created a new
camp nearby, in the village of Birkenau, took place over 1941 and into
the spring of 1942, although in reality construction was ongoing right
through 1944. At Auschwitz-Birkenau, one saw all aspects of the indus-
trialization of mass murder: a selection of prisoners overseen by the SS
doctors, including the infamous Dr. Josef Mengele, massive slave labor
brigades being kept in camp and working in hundreds of factories for
hours upon hours without adequate nutrition or clothing, and multiple
gas chambers constructed with crematoriums in the same building to
increase the number of people who could be killed and then burned
per day. The commandant of Auschwitz, Rudolf Hoess, was proud of
his efficiency not only in design but in implementation—as in other
camps, those selected for death entered a room and were told they

would be showered and deloused—they were not just told that; they were given a bar of soap and told to remember the number of the hook where they hung up their clothes. Hoess claimed that this created a sense of calm over those killed that made the operation go smoothly. The Nazi goal of efficient murder continued after death in the plunder operations. The Germans collected and sorted for use all belongings of the Jews killed; the warehouses where this was done was called Canada, for the Jews who worked here were allowed to take a few items from time to time, and thus, they lived better than other prisoners, as though they lived in a more prosperous place, like Canada; others who survived and worked at Auschwitz resented these workers. When the Germans evacuated Birkenau in January 1945, they burned the Canada warehouses, but six remained intact; the Red Army found in these six buildings 370,000 men's suits, 837,000 women's outfits, 44,000 pairs of shoes, and some 14,000 rugs.[9]

GERMANY'S DEFEAT

The German defeat at Stalingrad in February 1943 turned the tide of the war in the east. From that point on, German forces were in retreat, although there were hundreds of miles to cross before they would even be close to German territory. The war was far from over. Meanwhile, in the west, preparations for an Allied landing in France and subsequent push east into Germany were underway. This event came on June 6, 1944, D-Day. On June 5, over 5,000 vessels sailed from England across the English Channel to Normandy, including over 4,000 landing craft filled with soldiers, supported by 7,500 aircraft and 3,500 bombers. The German army anticipated the invasion, and there had been a constant German buildup of troops in the west but not specifically to Normandy. On June 6, three German infantry and one Panzer division faced the five Allied landing divisions. Nonetheless, on the day of the invasion, the Germans were surprised. Their commander, Gen. Ernst Rommel was actually on leave in Germany, and only eighteen of the ninety-two German radar stations were working. Only the American troops who landed at Omaha Beach faced any significant German resistance, and over three thousand deaths occurred there, the majority of all the US casualties on D-Day.[10]

By June 13, the Allies had linked all beaches they had landed on and thus completely controlled the Normandy coast, while the German forces remained outside of Normandy, in Calais, for German commanders feared a second invasion in that region. With control of the

beaches, the Allies brought almost one new division into France every day; by June 25, there were already 25 Allied divisions in France compared with 14 German. By the end of July, the Germans had lost over 100,000 men and only been reinforced by 10,000; 1,700 tanks had been destroyed and only 17 replaced. The end of the war was in sight. Allied forces broke out of Normandy in August and September 1944, and the liberation of Paris soon followed. Nevertheless, it would take another eight months for the war to end, and the last German attack at the Battle of the Bulge in December 1944 resulted in numerous Allies casualties. The material strength of the Allies won out for on the western half of Europe alone they were able to bring in over one hundred divisions from England and increase bombing of targets inside Germany during this final phase of battle.

Indeed, until Allied troops entered German territory in 1945, most German civilians only experienced the Second World War as targets of Allied bombings. The idea of air power, and in particular bombing, as an effective strategy for fighting the war developed in the last part of World War I; Great Britain at the time developed an Independent Air Force that dropped 534 tons of bombs on Germany in 1918. By the Second World War, many military planners adopted the concept of strategic bombing, to bomb strategic sites like munitions factories, which was not bombing in support of ground troops but to use the air force on its own instead of ground troops. The idea was not only to drop significant numbers of bombs but also to do so behind enemy lines in a place where only the air force could reach. The value of such strategic bombing was seen in two ways: material, meaning to target military and economic sites that would weaken the enemy's ability to wage war, and moral, meaning to hurt public morale in the greatest way possible by striking in areas not inhabited by soldiers but by civilians. As early as 1918, Sir Hugh Trenchard, head of the Independent Air Force, which became the Royal Air Force (RAF), underlined the dual impact that such strategic bombing could have.

Trenchard's point, made in 1918, raised an immediate moral dilemma for in order for strategic bombing to really be effective, it had to expand general warfare to the citizenry on a daily basis. By the mid-1930s, air forces throughout Europe, in particular the RAF, adopted this strategy. Great Britain viewed the First World War's massive numbers of land forces committed to France and Belgium for four years as a waste since there was little movement between sides. If air power meant that a war could be won without committing so many troops

to the continent, then that was an effective strategy to build upon. Yet, many saw strategic bombing as morally reprehensible because of the impact it had on civilians. This point was particularly apparent after German and Italian bombing of civilians in cities like Barcelona during the Spanish Civil War of 1936 to 1939, and in particular in the German bombing of the Basque city of Guernica in April 1937, a city without any military targets and one immortalized in the painting of the same name by Pablo Picasso that debuted at the 1937 World's Fair in Paris.

Until midsummer of 1940, both Britain and Germany avoided bombing cities, but on August 24, 1940, a Luftwaffe plane got lost and bombed east London by mistake; the British retaliated and bombed Berlin; Hitler made a statement on September 4 condemning the British attack and launching a wider-scale bombing of British cities and civilians. Strategic bombing began in earnest with the German Blitz on London and southern England in September 1940.

The RAF was in a position to mount their own bomber offensive beginning in the last part of 1940, and they were eager to do so after the Germans bombed Coventry on November 8, 1940, destroying 60,000 buildings and causing nearly 570 civilian deaths. This, then, was the way in which the war came to most German civilians. The first major British raid came against the city of Mannheim on December 20, 1940, but the target was missed, and the bombs landed on the outskirts of town. By 1942, the US Army Eighth Air Force arrived in England, and its first raids began in August 1942. By 1943 and 1944, the two Allied air forces began a combined bomber offensive against German factories, military sites, and cities, with US forces targeting precise targets such as factories and the British using the tactic of area bombing, which tended to impact civilians more. By 1944, the United States had 1,000 bombers in England, and between March and September 1944, they targeted German oil supplies and oil production, which resulted in declines on German oil reserves from 316,000 tons to 17,000 tons. In terms of civilian targets, from July 24 to 30, 1943, repeated attacks on Hamburg by the RAF created a firestorm that destroyed 62,000 acres in and around the city and led to 30,000 civilian deaths. By the end of 1943 and into early 1944, the RAF bombed smaller German cities that also created firestorms and led to civilian deaths in the thousands. From November 1943 on, Berlin became the major target of RAF city raids, including some sixteen major raids from November 18, 1943, through March 2, 1944, that resulted in some 6,000 killed and over 1.5 million left homeless. Mostly infamously, the bombing of Dresden in four

raids from February 13 to 15, 1945, by both US and British air forces destroyed over 1,600 acres of the city center and killed some 22,000 to 25,000 civilians.

The war in the east also came to Germany by 1945. By the middle of 1943, the Soviet Red Army had some 6.5 million soldiers, an increase from 1941 despite Germany's capture of some 3 million soldiers as prisoners of war, and the German army had decreased from its height of 5 million to just fewer than 3 million. The Red Army was also better supplied. The Red Army's victory in the tank battle at Kursk in July 1943 allowed the Soviets to put the Germans on the run backward for good; by the end of the summer of 1943, the German retreat since Stalingrad at the beginning of the year measured nearly 150 miles, a retreat that extended from north to south without any opportunity for the Germans to dig in and prepare their own fortifications or adopt a more defensive position. From here, the Soviet progress west was steady and consistent, and by May 1944, the Red Army was ready to target Germany itself by throwing most of its forces into the German army's center position, leaving fighting in the northern and southern USSR to smaller forces. By August 1944, the Red Army left prewar Soviet territory and entered eastern Europe, and by January 1945, the Red Army was approximately fifty miles from Berlin.

This last part of the war was the most destructive, for with armies moving so slowly, battles were fierce and fought over a small amount of territory, with the result being total disaster for civilians, their homes and villages, and the environment where they lived. Meanwhile, the Allied bombing offensive against Germany also expanded, adding to the devastation. More than 3 million homes were destroyed in Germany, and as a result of Allied bombing, 131 cities and towns in Germany were essentially obliterated; 50 percent of the urban area in Germany was destroyed, and homelessness was rampant. In the end, Germany lost some 4.5 million people, about 1 million of whom were civilians.

Civilian suffering in Germany did not only result from bombing. In the final period of fighting, Soviet soldiers in particular carried out the mass rape of German women as they occupied German territory, with an estimated two million women being victimized. Somewhere close to ten to fourteen million ethnic Germans from countries east of Germany—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and so on—were expelled from 1945 to 1948 as new governments decided to move forward without any German presence; this, despite the fact that many of

these Germans had lived in those areas for generations and certainly a large number of them were not Nazis. In addition, some five hundred thousand Germans were also killed in these countries in 1945, mostly after the military fighting and German occupation had ended. Most of the expellees ended up in German lands, having to compete with those already there that had lost homes, jobs, and resources in the final stages of the war.

CONCLUSION

This chapter outlines, in as clear and direct way as possible, the facts of the Second World War. A somewhat detailed knowledge of these events is necessary in order to understand the variety of memory trends that emerged from this conflict, for it not only was transformational in the social and political history of Europe but also for the importance of historical memory in Europe ever since. How were Germans to deal with the crimes of the Nazis? How were other Europeans to deal with the brutality of Nazi occupation? What was the legacy of the Holocaust in the places where it either took place or where it left an impact in the permanent loss of communities and individuals? How was everyone to deal with the sheer amount of violence and the fact that violence associated with this war overwhelmingly targeted civilians? The next set of chapters takes on the implications for the memory of the Second World War in twentieth-century Europe.

SIX

DEALING WITH NAZISM IN GERMANY

Germany's initial confrontation with the past was imposed upon the country by the victorious powers of the Second World War that occupied Germany in May 1945: Britain, France, the Soviet Union, and the United States. Despite the fact that Germany was divided into four zones, each governed by one of the four powers, certain common ideas or objectives were pursued across the four zones, and the most significant of these was denazification. Denazification was first defined at the Potsdam Conference of July and August 1945 and was meant to destroy the National Socialist German Worker's Party (NSDAP) and its affiliated organizations, dissolve any Nazi institutions, prevent future Nazi activity, repeal Nazi laws, arrest and intern war criminals of the former regime, remove Nazi officials from public and semipublic life, and remove Nazi influence from the German education system. The means to make this happen came through a series of laws for all of Germany that emerged from the Allied Control Commission and from laws that developed within each occupied zone, such as the American Joint Chiefs of Staff Document 1067 (JCS 1067), which defined denazification for the American zone. The American document set out to eliminate Nazism and totalitarianism from German life not just as political movements or ideas but also as a cultural force; similarly, it sought to remake Germany's economy and politics as less militaristic. How to confront the past in order to make these goals achievable in the future was implicit in the directives of the occupiers.

War crimes trials and the International Military Tribunal (IMT) at Nuremberg were the most significant policies that resulted from these attitudes about occupation. Previous considerations about individual and group responsibility inside Nazi Germany informed the writing of the London Charter of August 1945 that established the IMT and the Nuremberg war crimes trials process. Most important here was the decision to try Nazi Party organizations, and not just individuals, at Nuremberg. This was carried over into Allied Control Council Law No. 10, which stated that membership in any organization tried at the

IMT could lead to an individual's trial within an occupying zone. In the short term, this reinforced the military's earlier plan to intern members of suspect organizations in a series of civilian internment camps. Inside occupied Germany, the Allied Control Council Directive 24, issued in January 1946, outlined ninety-nine categories of Germans subject to automatic arrest and detention. In the long-term, this led to a series of subsequent trials, both at Nuremberg and within the American zone, with a total of 1,885 prosecutions in the American zone from 1945 to 1949.[1]

Moving away from war crimes trials and considering those subject to automatic arrest and investigation, the victorious Allies came to view the occupation using the thesis of collective guilt; applied to Germany on a broad scale, this meant that the natural policy to be implemented was one of collective punishment. The final year of the war, with its brutal fight to the finish across Europe and a really unprecedented level of violence in the east and west only reinforced this line of thinking and created a sense of anxiety and fear across the continent. One result was that soldiers, American, British, and especially Soviet, entered Germany with the intent of destroying, not liberating, the population. The message emanating from the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force and other offices of the US government in the fall of 1944 was no different—Germany was nazified and this had to end with the implementation of Allied force, first, and then Allied law. As William I. Hitchcock wrote, soldiers entered German territory with the sense that "the occupation aimed to educate Germans about their moral and political failings and this required a distant, cold and firm demeanor."[2] One obvious manifestation of such sentiments was the compulsory visits to concentration camps in Germany imposed on the population by occupying forces. In November 1945, for example, American authorities arranged a small exhibit on SS crimes at the Dachau concentration camp near Munich.

Historians have a consensus that whatever the intent of denazification as broadly conceptualized, the reality was it fell far short of its ambitions in its implementation. Nonetheless, denazification in the US zone of occupation resulted in some two million individuals suffering some form of punishment such as loss of employment and the internment of four hundred thousand for some time. These are not insignificant statistics, and the experience of friends, family members, and neighbors who faced these moments, days, or weeks of suspicion and punishment greatly influenced the context through which Germans

initially remembered Nazism and the Holocaust. Wulf Kansteiner wrote that Germany's confrontation with the Nazi past is different with each generation, and the wartime generation viewed the past through the lens of occupation and the imposition of collective guilt by the Allied forces.[3]

It was thus only over time that Germans themselves had to confront concepts of guilt, identity, and victimization related to the breakdown of civilization that was the Second World War and the Holocaust. Obviously, given the length of the Nazi dictatorship, the mobilization of the entire German populace for war, and the many individual experiences of war and Holocaust, individual memory and individual reconciling with participation in the war and the Holocaust occurred throughout the country. However, the emphasis in this chapter as with the rest of the book is on national memory, in its institutional forms, or, as Caroline Pearce wrote, "a public or official version of the past anchoring what Jan Assmann refers to as the 'connective structure' of a society."[4]

The concept of national memory is often guided from above, usually by government but also can emerge from the bottom up. In occupied Germany, as the Allies sought to impose a narrative of collective guilt from above, there simultaneously emerged among Germans a different direction for memory. In the late 1940s and into the 1950s, it was clear that many Germans saw themselves also as victims of the Second World War. Jeffrey Olick convincingly demonstrated that many Germans in the late 1940s equated themselves with European Jews, in that both suffered at the hands of the Nazis.[5] When Germans did debate whether or not they were collectively guilty and whether or not they had overtly supported Nazism, the impetus for this often came from those who had left Hitler's Germany and sought exile, such as Thomas Mann who had spent much of the 1930s and 1940s in the United States. Others, like Friedrich Meinecke in his 1946 book, *The German Catastrophe*, claimed that Nazism was an aberration from traditional German conservatism, an aberration that most German conservatives did not realize until it was too late.[6] Then, Germans themselves did not embrace the collective guilt thesis. Within German churches, some like theologian Karl Barth embraced collective guilt but still criticized the harshness of Allied reeducation plans while the Catholic Church across the board rejected the concept. Others, such as the politician Kurt Schumacher, accepted some degree of common guilt but rejected collective guilt especially when thinking of himself and other political opponents of Nazism who had suffered persecution and imprisonment during

the dictatorship. The Christian Democratic Union (CDU) under Konrad Adenauer, whom the Nazis also had persecuted, argued that while many Germans had indeed embraced Nazism, punishment should be limited to active Nazis, not fellow travelers. In these arguments, Germans under the occupation, from many walks of life, rejected the collective guilt thesis inherent to many of the Allied denazification policies. The reality, then, was that two cultural memories of Nazism emerged, one that did admit to crimes and one, much more openly discussed, that criticized the Allies for thinking of all Germans as Nazis.

Many Germans considered themselves doubly victimized: first by Hitler and his policies that ruined Germany and then by the Allied bombings, ground campaigns, and occupation. There was a great focus on reconstruction, but in the matter of bombed churches, some were left in their destroyed state as a reminder of German victimhood, a reconstruction plan first carried out in England, at the St. Michael's Cathedral in Coventry, which had been hit by German bombers. At West Berlin's Kaiser Wilhelm Protestant Memory Church, the steeple of the wrecked church sat for most of the 1950s and was incorporated into the redesign at the end of the decade. In Hamburg, Hanover, Cologne, and Mainz, similar ruins were integrated into reconstructed churches and reminded visitors of Germany's suffering at the hands of the Allies just as the Allies sought to remind Germans of their responsibility for Hitler.

On top of all this, the ultimate division of Germany into two states as the Cold War emerged was made real in 1949 with the creation of the western, capitalist, and democratic Federal Republic of Germany and the eastern Communist German Democratic Republic and further complicated the immediate German memory of the war. The first West German government of Konrad Adenauer, himself a political opponent of the Nazis from the 1930s through the war, advocated for the release of some 1.5 to 2 million German prisoners of war, whose whereabouts were unknown but were mostly deemed captured and held within the Soviet Union. Also central to Adenauer's government was the fate of German expellees, some 11 to 14 million ethnic Germans forcibly removed by new governments that came to power in eastern Europe with the end of the war in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, and elsewhere. A series of resettlement and integration policies and a promise from Adenauer's Christian Democratic Party that "your fate is ours" again put the emphasis on German victimhood in the war. The West German government created the Ministry for Expellees, Refugees and

the War-Damaged to foster integration of the expelled eastern Germans into West German society. Active groups such as the League of Returning Veterans, which dealt with POWs coming back from the Soviet Union, and the League of Expellees and Deprived of Rights, created in 1950, and the subsequent Federation of Expellees, created in 1957, kept this issue in the public eye. From 1950 to 1957, some twenty-seven billion Deutsche Mark (DM) were distributed to German citizens for reconstruction and resettlement purposes, 64 percent to expellees. In September 1955, Adenauer successfully negotiated for the release of some ten thousand German POWs from the Soviet Union, and the many homecomings that occurred over the fall of 1955 secured Adenauer's image as a protector of war veterans.

Adenauer, to his credit, did not abandon the concern the Allies had had with German guilt. In 1951, Adenauer publicly acknowledged the suffering of Jews in the war, suffering caused by the previous German regime due to "unspeakable crimes [that] have been committed in the name of the German people."[7] This led to a policy of negotiating with representatives of world Jewry and the government of Israel on a compensation program, passed by the Bundestag in 1952. Over 3.5 billion DM went to Israel for Holocaust victims who lived in Israel and some 450 million DM to the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany, which represented Jewish victims outside Israel. In addition, a restitution program for Jews who lost property and assets was carried out and made official with a 1957 law passed by the West German Bundestag, paying out 50 percent of the value of property lost, of 1.5 billion DM not only in Germany but also in France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Belgium and to some citizens of Eastern European states.

These policies of apology and restitution came at a critical time for West Germany, trying to get the support of its Allies to rearm, create a new military, and join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to support western Europe against the Soviet Union and the threat of expanding Communism. Adenauer saw pushing for a military and negotiating with Israel as related measures meant to make Germany a "normal" state in the world and in the emerging geopolitical atmosphere of the Cold War confrontation between the United States and the west, on the one hand, and the Communist Soviet Union and the east on the other.

A similar dynamic, but with different results, was occurring in East Germany. There, the crimes of National Socialism were more overtly acknowledged and became part of the new Communist regime's efforts

to justify its rule. Merging the Social Democratic and Communist Parties that had existed in Germany before Hitler came to power formed the Socialist Unity Party (SED) and led to the creation of the German Democratic Republic state in 1949. For the first part of the GDR, as before under Soviet occupation, many Nazi concentration camps were repurposed by Soviet police to hold political opponents. These special camps at Sachsenhausen and Buchenwald were the sites of the deaths of thousands of Germans due to malnutrition and disease in this era. However, later, by the late 1950s and early 1960s, these camps were made into memorial sites called National Sites of Warning and Memory, the most prominent being Buchenwald (1958), Ravensbrück (1959), and Sachsenhausen (1961). These sites commemorated the political prisoners, identified by a red badge on their prison uniforms because most were Communists, held by the Nazis. East Germans learned that these anti-Fascists were fighters against Nazism, whereas Jews were mere victims. East Germany's compensation program for former Nazi prisoners rewarded former Communist prisoners with more money than Jews held by the Nazis received. Thus, they were not victims of the Nazi regime but rather good Germans whose time to lead had come, replacing the bad. Memoirs of the war followed a set narrative outlined by the Communist SED party, which even developed an office to manage the writing of wartime memoirs. This master narrative had writers highlight their development as a Communist after the First World War, their activism in the Weimar Republic, their persecution under Nazism—and then their struggle redeemed in the new GDR.[8] This narrative put the memory of anti-Fascism at the front and center of the Communist's history. There was little or no emphasis on anti-Semitism as part of this past, except when arguments were made that West Germany maintained the anti-Semitic traditions of the Nazis. Alongside the former Communist prisoners were Soviet liberators, without any reference to mass rape or of the destruction that the Red Army brought to Germany in the first months of 1945 but more clearly with references to the Cold War alliance formed in the east, again as an anti-Fascist alliance. The East German regime made sure to emphasize that commemoration was not enough, but that the events held at camp sites, as the Central Committee of the party wrote in 1958, "must make reference to the current tasks facing democratic and socialist Germany."[9] Mobilizing memory to legitimize Communist rule was consistent, and as a result East German narratives of the war and Holocaust remained the same from the 1950s through the early 1980s.

During the 1950s, while the general public in West Germany was aware of Adenauer's policies of restitution, the focus on Germans as victims of the war and its aftermath continued. Given the growing atmosphere of the Cold War and the divide between eastern and western Europe, a great emphasis was placed upon the Soviet Union as the primary antagonist that created German suffering at the end of the Second World War. A flood of historical studies, memoirs, and newspaper and magazine articles in the 1950s recounted the history of Germans expelled by Soviet forces and eastern European governments as the war ended. Memories of rape and other physical and psychological abuses, property expropriation, and family separation were prominent features in such writing. The stores of expellees and those who continued to be held as prisoners of war in the Soviet Union were intertwined in popular cinema of the day. Moreover, a movement to repeal prison and death sentences handed down at Nuremberg and subsequent trials by the occupying authorities gained prominence. Similar trends were apparent in East Germany, where prominent leaders emerged telling their conversion stories, whereby they explained away their Nazi pasts in telling of their embrace of Communism and hence return to society and positions of prominence within the state.

What changed in the 1960s in West Germany was the advent of a new generation, leading Wulf Kansteiner to conclude that changes in collective and cultural memory are, more often than not, driven by generational changes, which in turn creates "generations of memory."[10] Generations often define themselves by what they were not, and the generation that came of age in West Germany in the 1960s was most definitely not Nazi.[11] Such changes were typified by the emergence in West Germany, for the first time, of a vibrant civil society with the birth of new social and political movements like feminism, pacifism, and other voluntary association groups. How did such movements come to question the broader memory of the war and change Germany's memory emphasis from a focus on victimization and German suffering to one centered on German perpetration and guilt? Beginning in the late 1950s, a number of groups, including the German Socialist Student Union (SDS), drew attention to the continued influence of judges who had been trained and received their first judgeships under the Nazi regime. That led to the creation of a new prosecution office in Ludwigsburg in 1957 meant to spearhead investigations into the Nazi past. By the early 1960s, beginning in Ulm, a series of court cases brought by individuals against former SS members began. The international impact of the Israel-based trial of the

former head of the SS office responsible for Jewish affairs, Adolf Eich-
mann, also drew attention to the scale of the crimes of the Holocaust
and thus implied that hundreds of thousands had been involved in mass
murder. Soon novels and plays, especially the 1963 play by Rolf Hoch-
huth condemning Pope Pius XII for inaction during the Holocaust,
brought memories of perpetration and weak claims of ignorance into the
public sphere. In 1963, in Frankfurt, the first German trial of Auschwitz
guards occurred, and the public focused not only on Nazi leaders as per-
petrators but also ordinary Germans.

By the mid-1960s, the student movement in West Germany took
these various strands of changing memory dynamics and made them
central to their own politics. Critical of American involvement in the
Vietnam War and West Germany's implicit support of its most import-
ant ally, West German students came to conclude that many in political
leadership had come of age during Nazism and thus should not lead, and
moreover, supporting the United States in Vietnam, was an attempt to
bring elements of Fascism back into politics. While many countries and
societies experienced a mobilization of political youth and a generational
divide in politics at this time, in West Germany the Nazi past was seen as
one of the primary factors in explaining generational rupture. How did
these ideas show up in public life? At many universities, emerging stu-
dent groups demanded that their institutions account for the role of edu-
cation under Nazism and demonstrate that the contemporary university
system did not contain any vestiges of Fascism. From 1964 to 1966, the
pressure from various student groups prompted German academics to
critically evaluate their scholarly ties to Nazism, often in public forums.
The SDS movement made a point of finding professors with direct ties
to Nazism in terms of training or former party membership and pub-
licly exposed their past; from 1967 on, beginning in Munich, SDS mem-
bers would enter lecture halls of these professors and publicly confront
them. By 1968, the line of Fascist influence articulated by these students
had been drawn from individual professors to the government and from
there to the US government and its actions in Vietnam.

In this way of thinking, every political event or decision could be
analyzed to see how far or not West Germany had moved away from Fas-
cism. The SDS saw the shooting by police of student protester Benno
Ohnesorg on June 2, 1967, and subsequent emergency laws enacted by
the government as directly Fascist. By the end of the 1960s and into the
1970s, what had begun as the student movement developed into the
broader concept of the New Left in West Germany. Some groups moved

toward communal living, some created new antiauthoritarian schools, others moved more directly into civil society organizations for women's rights, environmentalism, or Marxist publishing. What remained, however, was the linkage all these groups made to Fascism and Nazism and the need for West Germany, as a society, to engage with the past in a very different way from how it had in the immediate aftermath of the war.

The changing nature of West Germany's engagement with the past was most obvious in Chancellor Wily Brandt's 1970 visit to Poland. Brandt's visit was part of a new policy of Ostpolitik, an engagement between the federal republic and Eastern European Communist states that represented a formal end to Adenauer's policy of embracing expellees and their claims that parts of Eastern Europe where Germans had settled were home. Brandt went to Poland to sign the Treaty of Warsaw and formally accept Poland's post-1945 borders. While there, on December 7, 1970, he visited a monument to the 1943 Warsaw Ghetto uprising where the Nazis viciously fought some fifty-eight thousand Jews in an ultimately successful attempt to ship them all to death camps. After laying a wreath, Brandt—seemingly spontaneously—knelt down at the memorial in silence, an act that was taken by many as a sign of German penance for the events of the Holocaust (fig. 6.1).

Figure 6.1. Memorial in Warsaw, Poland, marking the visit of West German chancellor Willy Brandt in 1970. Brandt famously fell to his knees in a gesture of contrition for Nazi crimes committed against Polish Jews. Photo by iStock/Alizada Studios.

Internationally, the response to Brandt's step was positive, and even some 41 percent of West Germans polled believed it was an appropriate act, although 48 percent found it excessive. Nonetheless, such an act by the chancellor made it clear that Germany's dealing with the past was changing.

Thus, by the end of the 1970s, German society was able to place German perpetration at the center of its understanding of the war and the Holocaust. One of the most profound ways in which this was done was in the public discussion and reaction that followed the television airing of the American miniseries *Holocaust* on West German TV in 1979. Some fifteen million West German households viewed the series, nearly 50 percent of the population. Popular opinion followed the lead of the student movement and demanded more space in schools, on television, and in the public sphere for a discussion of German actions during the war. In a way, this ushered in a new era of memory, displacing the overly political focus of the 1960s and 1970s student and New Left movement with a broader engagement with war and genocide, making memory and the questions it raised about German identity more mainstream, more central.

Increasing public and academic interest in detailing the history of the Holocaust and Nazi crimes came to the fore in 1986 in what Germans call the Historikersteit, when a debate broke out between historian Ernst Nolte and philosopher Jürgen Habermas that drew many other historians and commentators into writing about the role of the Nazi past in contemporary Germany. Nolte's article "The Past Will Not Pass" in the newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* in June 1986 raised questions about whether it was worthwhile to compare Nazi murder statistics with those of Stalin; Habermas responded a month later in *Die Zeit* not necessarily objecting to historical comparison but to Nolte's use of comparison, which had the effect of diminishing the significance and horror of Nazi crimes and the Holocaust.[12] This renewed a debate about how to see the Nazi period in the larger framework of German history and what Germany's continuing debt to the world was, in the form of reflective remembrance. Habermas wrote a second article, "On the Public Use of History," where he rejected any effort to relativize the Nazi period and demanded that the German public still had work to do to come to terms with the past. Coming as it did in the aftermath of renewed public interest in war, the Holocaust, and Nazi crimes, the Historikerstreit brought to life a line of thinking that claimed Germany could not have a typical national identity because of

the events and crimes of the war, and therefore, German identity must embrace apology in a more central way than other societies had. Intellectuals had defined identity through shame not pride.[13]

The trends evident in this debate only intensified after the collapse of Communism in eastern Europe from 1989 to 1991 and especially due to the end of the German Democratic Republic and the reunification of Germany in October 1990. Habermas's argument about the need for a different kind of German identity was renewed and expanded upon as the world watched a single Germany emerge for the first time since Hitler had ruled. Habermas himself underlined that the last period of German unity had been based on Hitler's concept of a racial *Volk* against the "other"—the Jew—and that this time it would have to very explicitly reject such notions. Habermas was not demanding a renewal of collective guilt but something more in line with the idea of collective liability. How united Germany responded to these calls—which came not only from Habermas but also from others, including many outside Germany—would be crucial as the 1990s emerged. Although the real chance of a Fourth Reich was nonexistent, leaders like François Mitterrand of France did fear the power of a stronger Germany, if only economically and politically. German chancellor Helmut Kohl addressed such concerns by insisting that a reunited Germany play a key role in further integrating into the European Union. In a speech before the Bundestag in December 1991, Kohl argued that such a decision by Germany was not only motivated by contemporary politics but that the nationalism of the past would be "impossible" if European integration was the path Germany chose.[14]

Another way of expressing this opinion came in the countermemory or countermonument (*Gegendenkmal*) movement. This movement argued that the traumatic events of the Holocaust could not be represented in memorial form. Founded in the mid-1980s, this diverse and dispersed movement advocated for the use of black sculptures in places such as the Platz der Republik in Hamburg or the use of lighting in former Jewish neighborhoods rather than traditional and permanent monuments. They were distrustful of traditional monumental forms, given that the Nazis themselves filled Germany with such public art and celebrations meant to glorify the emerging Third Reich. The connection this book has made about institutionalized memory and specific sites, so commonly found across Europe and elsewhere, was directly challenged by this movement. In 1995, during the competition to create a memorial to Jewish victims in Berlin, the artist Horst

Hoheisel proposed blowing up the Brandenburg Gate. Hoheisel was involved in many memory projects, including burying a memorial in Kassel, that typified the countermonument movement. The group rejected that such difficult history as that of Nazism and the Holocaust in Germany could be adequately represented in concrete form; therefore, their proposals sought to underline that point by suggesting either impossible options, like blowing up the Brandenburg Gate or antire-presentational or antiauthoritarian options—such as the proposal by the artists Renata Stih and Frieder Schnock called *Bus Stop*, a transportation plan running buses from central Berlin to the death camps of Poland and Germany, placing the burden of memory and its guilt on those taking the trip—disassociated with any formal institutions. The rejection of the word *monument* itself and its historical connection to official memory and collective memory was strong.[15] As James Young wrote, the countermemory movement reminds us of the limits of traditional memorials when faced with such guilt and shame and the peculiar place of Germany to be engaged in a debate "never to be resolved."[16]

In the mainstream, however, Kohl's commitment to historical memory after reunification was made real through a series of initiatives at home. These efforts represent a very overt and institutionalized political layer to the memory of the Holocaust, linked to contemporary concerns about reunification. But there was also a shift in the role memory played in German society, driven by generational change, but in a very different way from generational change in the 1960s. In Germany in the 1990s, a new reconstruction of the past was meant for a society more removed from the crimes of the Holocaust than the generation of the 1960s that first began memorialization efforts in West Germany had been. In this era, other themes besides that of German guilt were important. This change was not only occurring in Germany, however, for the 1990s saw a new global narrative that linked the history of the Holocaust to larger human rights, spurred on by the awareness that wars in Bosnia (1992–95), Rwanda (1994), and Kosovo (1999–2000) came with genocide and assaults on civilians. More and more, the world saw the Holocaust as a historical event that could be used to talk about genocide, human rights, and other related concepts; the Holocaust was a vehicle for making universal claims about rights and the need to fight against the violation of rights. The end of the Cold War conflict between two superpowers with nuclear capability to a world driven more by smaller, ethic-based conflicts drove this rediscovery of the Holocaust. The creation of new public spaces, such as the

US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC, in 1996 and the success of films like Steven Speilberg's Holocaust drama *Schindler's List* in 1993, made visible this trend. Such a global narrative was bound to impact events in Germany just as German reunification and Kohl's commitment to historical memory was.

Within Germany, the use of the phrase *Vergangenheitsbewaltigung* (overcoming and mastering the past) grew increasingly common. The first step in this process was the uniting of western and eastern German narratives about the past, largely done through major revisions to the East German exhibits at concentration camp sites like Buchenwald, Sachsenhausen, and Ravensbrück. For example, a new exhibit opened at Buchenwald in 1995, following the creation of a new historical advisory group in 1991 and 1992. Similar initiatives took place at Sachsenhausen and Ravensbrück camp sites. East Germany's strong emphasis on anti-Fascism as the theme of the war and Holocaust was removed from these camp museums and exhibitions to be replaced by exhibits emphasizing the racial aspects of Hitler's war.[17] The second step was to take advantage of the fall of the Berlin Wall and the availability of space in what was now the center of reunified Berlin to build memorials and museums of national significance that would demonstrate Germany's continued liability to the past, to use Habermas's idea. Two sites in particular emerged as prominent representations of putting the Holocaust at the center of the new German capital: the revitalized Jewish Museum of Berlin and the Holocaust memorial, which eventually came to be called Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe.

In 1988, the increasing trends in West German society to place the Holocaust more at the center of German history led to the proposal of new initiatives and the emergence of new sites beyond concentration camps like Dachau, outside Munich, which was made into a memorial and museum in 1965. The first was the idea of a centralized Holocaust memorial, initiated by the West German television journalist Lea Rosh and the historian Eberhard Jäckel; the second was the official launch of a competition to build a Jewish museum as an extension of the City of Berlin Museum. Both were delayed by the events of 1989–90 and German reunification before moving forward under a united Germany in the 1990s and taking advantage of the spaces created in the city by the fall of the Berlin Wall. The Jewish Museum, opened in 1997, was designed by Polish-Israeli architect Daniel Liebskind. Although the museum focuses on the long history of Jews in Germany and Europe more generally, the Holocaust is but one exhibit; the architecture of the building is designed

around various "voids," which Liebskind described as "the embodiment of absence." Given the importance this book has assigned to the physical representation of history in collective memory, from the first chapter on, Liebskind's use of space as a void, to represent absence, is important. Jewish history, thus, should not focus only on the Holocaust, but the Holocaust is unavoidable in thinking about Jewish contributions to Germany—and the lack of such contributions since 1945.

The Holocaust Memorial was a more controversial project, but one driven by the 1990s fear of a revival of totalitarianism with the reunification of Germany. The project began by Germans who themselves understood the horrors of the Holocaust and wanted a central place of commemoration and mourning. It was decided to place the memorial in a central location, less than one block from the newly renovated German Bundestag, the former Reichstag that now could be the central place of government for a properly united Germany, and the Brandenburg Gate that marks the city's center. Thus, the triumph of reunification and a warning from the past would sit side by side. Debate soon focused on what kind of memorial to construct; how could one possibly represent the genocide of six million European Jews in a single city block? Many prominent Germans, like the novelist Günter Grass, supported and then came to oppose the concept. Eventually, a design by the American architect Peter Eisenmann was selected in 1999 and opened to the public in May 2005. The memorial consists of a field of 2,711 stelae, which start very low at the edge and grow in height, and the ground similarly moves from smooth to undulating (fig. 6.2). The stelae are not decorated or inscribed, indicative of the fact that most of the Jews who were murdered in the Holocaust do not have marked graves. Each stone has its own shape. The stelae are grey in color, representing ashes. It is a very striking and different kind of monument, without explanation, which led to an information center of the history of the Holocaust and the voices of victims in their testimonies being added in a space underneath the site. Eisenmann opposed the creation of the museum space, wanting the memorial to stand on its own without history. Yet, many others felt that history needs explanation, so the museum was added.

The controversial nature of the monument's design and the very concept of a single monument meant to represent the murder of all Jews have not disappeared. Indeed, as our understanding of the Holocaust has expanded to include other groups targeted for murder by the Nazis for perceived racial or biological flaws, new memorials within walking distance of this one have been added, namely to the persecution of

Figure 6.2. View of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in Berlin, Germany.
Photo by iStock/Evgeny Shmulev.

homosexuals (2008) and to the murder of the Roma and Sinti peoples
of Europe (2012). Although the Jewish Museum and the Memorial to
the Murdered Jews of Europe represent the most prominent examples
of new public space being designated as Holocaust space in Germany
in the 1990s, they were part of a much larger trend. The Topography of
Terror is a museum and commemorative space located on the grounds
of the State Secret Police and SS offices that existed from 1933 to 1945.
It was opened in 1987 as an outdoor exhibition space; a design for a
large museum was planned for in 1993 but financial and other consid-
erations delayed and ultimately canceled the project. In 2004, Berlin
and the federal government relaunched the process and a new docu-
mentary center was opened in 2010 exploring the history of the SS, the
Gestapo, and the RSHA, the branch of the SS responsible for Jewish
affairs and for the implementation of the Holocaust. Another example
of this trend includes the creation of a museum on the history of the
Nazi Party at the former party ground in Nuremberg.

The seemingly massive expansion of public space from the 1990s
through the 2000s commemorating the Holocaust, however, should
not be taken to mean that the entire nation embraced concepts of
collective guilt or collective liability. Certainly, these forces were at
work, and these public spaces can be interpreted in that light. But the

debate about Germany's obligations for past events continued during this period. In 1997, American political scientist Daniel Jonah Goldhagen published *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, where he argued that the Holocaust was not only the result of Hitler's intention to commit genocide but was the product of a very specific form of "eliminationist" anti-Semitism that existed in Germany during the 1930s and earlier.[18] Historians and others, in Germany and outside, objected to Goldhagen's argument that this specific genocide could only have occurred in Germany and in the 1930s and 1940s and that anti-Semitism prior to the Nazis in Germany had always been eliminationist, focused on murder. His book became popular in Germany, however, because many members of the public accept his implicit contention that that generation of Germans—and only that generation—were anti-Semitic and that there was nothing to carry forward to the contemporary German. Most historians, by contrast, believe anti-Semitism was only a part of the answer as to why the Holocaust occurred, and other reasons existed that have been replicated in other genocidal situations in history. In other words, the debate was whether or not one specific people at one time could commit genocide or whether any group of humans could do so.

The popularity of the book in Germany has been seen as one way in which contemporary Germans rejected any sense of guilt or obligation for previous generations. Another was the controversy over the exhibit on crimes committed by ordinary German soldiers in the Wehrmacht in eastern Europe, including direct participation in the Holocaust alongside the SS. An exhibit launched in 1995 by the Hamburg Institute of Social Research traveled to a number of German and Austrian cities from 1995 to 1999, drawing impressive crowds that numbered almost nine hundred thousand by the end of this period. The controversial exhibition went against Goldhagen's thesis in many respects, arguing that ordinary soldiers, who had not signed up for genocidal activities, nonetheless worked with the SS and committed such crimes as part of their regular duties fighting the war. It went against the ethic of the wartime generation not to talk about such things, and arguments between that generation and younger ones were prominent as the exhibit traveled the countries. It also contradicted the general assumptions of the postwar German army, the Bundeswehr, to not discuss the Holocaust or the German military's role in it. The core of the exhibit was an impressive amount of photographs from three locales of the war, demonstrating military involvement in the massacre of Jews

and other civilians. Soon enough, the debates prompted by the exhibit became politicized, with left-wing parties encouraging all Germans to see it and the conservative Christian Democrats and military veterans discouraging such tainting of the military and soldiers of World War II as a whole.[19] They argued that the military's involvement in the plot to kill Hitler in July 1944 was also an important way to think about the military and the Third Reich. Many extreme right-wing and neo-Nazi groups fought in street battles outside the exhibition's venues, during a time in the late 1990s that saw a rise in such activity across Germany, especially in parts of the former East Germany. The exhibition was withdrawn in 1999 before going overseas because of these debates and also because there were claims made that one of the photographs showed Soviet, not German, crimes against civilians. In the end, the incorrect photographs were minimal, but the damage was done.

One way to interpret the debate over German memory, guilt, and obligation in the 1990s is to look at the monuments, museums, and memorial sites that were created at the time and conclude that Germany really was coming to terms with the past. Yet, the debates over the Wehrmacht exhibit and Goldhagen's book showed that many Germans thought differently about the war, and while they accepted the history, they were not content to embrace guilt and obligation as the only way to think of the war. On top of this, the concept of postmemory, developed by Marianne Hirsch, argued that we must also pay attention to generational change and seek to understand how subsequent generations continue to interpret and develop memories of the traumatic past in different ways, through mediated images, objects, stories, and affects.[20] The amount of activity in Germany around memory in the years after reunification confirm the importance of this theory to memory studies at large.

These trends escalated in the first decade of the 2000s, as the public increasingly was exposed to films, writings, and commemorations that portrayed Germans as victims of the Second World War: victims first of Hitler's terror, victims second of the air raids conducted by the Allied forces against German civilians in cities and towns from 1943 to 1945, and thirdly, victims of the Soviet Union's invasion of Germany and mass rape and pillaging that the Red Army soldiers engaged in upon entering Germany in 1945. These were all themes present in Germany right after the war in the late 1940s and 1950s but ones that had been replaced by a focus on German crimes and the Holocaust since the generational change of the 1960s. The republication of a diary from a woman in Berlin who endured mass rape led the way, and the diary

was made into a popular film, *A Woman in Berlin by Anonymous*, in 2008. Jorg Friederich's book on the air raids against Dresden, titled *The Fire*, became a best seller and was controversial among historians because the language Friedrich uses in describing Allied bombings paralleled that used by historians who wrote about the Holocaust and German crimes of the Second World War.[21] Finally, in the literary works of Günter Grass, among others, the Allied bombings and the experience of German civilians living under the conditions of bombing and participating in the war rose to acclaim.[22] Also, a museum recounting the experience of ethnic Germans expelled from eastern Europe in 1945 was proposed and then canceled. The return to themes of German victimhood was never cast as a replacement for the sense of guilt or the acknowledgment of the crimes of the Holocaust. However, by the 2000s, their prominence suggested that Germans were willing to remember the past in multiple ways and that there were strong indications that a singular focus on the Holocaust that appeared predominant in the late 1980s and early 1990s was not satisfactory. This was not a question of ignoring the suffering of Jews and others but rather a question about whether or not the emphasis on the Holocaust and German guilt had created an uneven hierarchy of suffering. At one time, raising questions of German wartime experience was seen, and many still see it, as potentially offensive. But the public's interest in German victimhood in the first part of the twenty-first century suggests that there is a demand now for a more comprehensive historical memory of the Second World War.

Cultural history and memory studies promote open narratives of history as opposed to fixed ones by emphasizing ideas like the one that the past is constructed by contemporary societies. The post-1990s portrayal of Germany in the Second World War did not abandon Germans as guilty but added to the narrative by insisting that seeing Germans as victims of war was also an appropriate way to remember the past. In many cases, as was emphasized in chapter 1, collective memory involves a number of memories not a single one. Institutions and political elites often also can embrace multiple memories. The question remains one of balance and to find the right balance in public spaces and in national sites that fully encapsulates the experience of Germany and Germans in the Second World War. This struggle will inevitably be a permanent one, but one that again reinforces the importance of memory as part of identity at the national, local, and even neighborhood levels.

SEVEN

WAR MEMORY IN FRANCE AND POLAND

France and Poland experienced the brunt of Nazi occupation during the Second World War. Germany defeated both in a matter of weeks, Poland in September 1939 and France in May and June 1940. As a consequence, most civilians spent the war living under occupation and Nazism's brutal policies that targeted civilians. In Poland, the eastern part of the country was actually under Soviet occupation from September 1939 through June 1941, when Germany broke the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact as it launched its invasion of the USSR. Moreover, the death camps of the Holocaust that killed millions of European Jews and others were located in Poland, making it the center of the Holocaust. The nature by which these two countries then remember this period is significant because it raises issues of how civilians did or did not resist Germany when most people lived far from the battlefield. And when the war did come to these people, in France through the D-Day invasion led by the United States and Great Britain in the summer of 1944 and in Poland with the entrance of the Soviet Union's Red Army, also in the summer of 1944, how did people react and how did the course of liberation from Nazi oppression play out? Moreover, how did these places remember that afterward? In many respects, the issue of the memory of the Second World War has been as complicated for the Poles and the French as it has been for the Germans. Moreover, in tracing the memory of war, occupation, and genocide in France and Poland, we can uncover many of the significant factors that shape collective memory as outlined in chapter 1—the role of political elites, generational change, and even conflict over which memories matter most.

FRANCE: VICHY, COLLABORATION, AND OTHER DEBATES

Following the invasion of Belgium, the Netherlands, and France that began on May 10, 1940, and the evacuation of French and British forces from Dunkirk in early June, Marshall Philippe Pétain, a war hero in World War I and a member of the government, demanded that the

French government sign an armistice and end the fight against Germany; by June 12, the French army's chief, General Weygand, agreed. British prime minister Winston Churchill visited France on June 13 in an effort to dissuade the French from capitulating, but it was all for naught. By June 16, the prime minister of France, Pierre Reynaud, was replaced by Pétain, and on June 22, 1940, France signed a separate armistice with Germany. The French government was reorganized, giving the northern half of the country and the Atlantic coast to Germany to occupy, and a new French government was located in the spa town of Vichy, under Pétain, to govern the southern part of France. In a nod to memory, Adolf Hitler insisted on signing the document of capitulation in the same railway carriage used when Germany had surrendered to France in 1918 in Compiégne.

What emerged in France after the military defeat was a somewhat strange situation: in the northern half of France and all along the Atlantic coast, the German army occupied the cities and towns and ruled by military decree; in the southern part, however, a French government, known as the Vichy regime, continued to rule, without any German troops, until November 1942; and after November 1942, while German troops occupied the country to prepare for a possible Allied invasion, the Vichy government still ruled. On July 10, 1940, in Vichy, the parliament of France voted itself out of existence, giving dictatorial powers to Pétain, and thus, the military defeat of France turned into the end of parliamentary democracy.

Many historians consider the Vichy regime to be the model for collaborationist regimes in Hitler's Europe and thus has been the subject of many studies to determine how politicians and the population at large interpreted collaboration and resistance. The Vichy regime, from day one, was not simply a regime based upon Nazi Germany; it had its own task, to rebuild France within the new Europe dominated by Nazism, and had some freedom to do so within the confines of southern France. Having said that, it was also subject to the economic and other policies that Nazism imposed everywhere it conquered, as outlined in chapter 5. Nonetheless, Pétain also espoused the point of view that became crucial to Vichy: he connected the military defeat with the problems of democracy. France was weak in 1940, he argued, because the democratic (and often left-leaning) governments of the Third Republic had made it so; thus, Vichy was seen not simply as a transitional regime, or a temporary measure, but rather as a solution to France's problems, a cure to the decadence of the 1930s, and a change

to make France strong by eliminating the divisions brought about by democracy and unifying the country under authoritarian leadership. So even if the basis for the creation of Vichy was France's defeat by Germany, the sentiment expressed by Pétain and others was that collaboration with the Germans and the construction of an authoritarian France was good for the country.[1]

Vichy leaders called the attempt to rebuild France within the framework of a new Europe the national revolution. Instead of the French republican values of liberty, equality, fraternity, Vichy proposed work, family, fatherland. This was not so much a Fascist ideology as a very traditional conservative one: it based French renovation upon the strength of the Catholic Church, a strong, authoritarian state, and the idealization and celebration of the peasant and the traditional French village. In many respects, these ideas were not only based upon German National Socialism but they appeared closer to the authoritarian regimes of Franco's Spain or Salazar's Portugal.

Vichy came closest to Nazi Germany in its embrace of eugenics policies. Nobel Prize–winner Alexis Carrel was a strong supporter of euthanasia of the physically and mentally disabled; in 1941, he promoted the founding of the Fondation Française pour l'Étude des Problèmes Humains (French Foundation for the Study of Human Problems) with the support of the Vichy government.[2] By December 16, 1942, the government passed legislation that created a prenuptial certificate, which had to precede any marriage and was intended to guarantee the good health of the spouses, and much of the legislation was in fact formed by the foundation.

Similarly, Pétain's government quickly sought to legislate against the so-called undesirables: Jews, *métèques* (immigrants from North Africa), Freemasons, Communists, Gypsies, and homosexuals, as well as any former left-wing political activist. In this regard, too, Vichy imitated the racial policies of the Third Reich, and from 1940 through 1944, denaturalized some fifteen thousand people, mostly Jews, who had previously earned French citizenship. In August 1940, Vichy repealed prior legislation that banned anti-Semitism in the media and initiated a statute on Jews that excluded all Jews from the civil administration and set up a series of subsequent legal discrimination policies. Concentration camps soon followed, continuing a trend that began in France with the influx of Spanish refugees fleeing civil war in the winter of 1939.

Beyond its own racial and authoritarian policies, Vichy collaborated

closely with Nazi Germany, first in the northern zone occupied by the German army and then throughout France. Indeed, Pétain introduced the word *collaboration* to define the Vichy-Nazi relationship in 1940. His prime minister in 1940 and again from 1942 to 1944, Pierre Laval, embraced the concept of collaboration more than others. Outside of the camps opened by Vichy, Germany too operated its own concentration camps on French soil and in Alsace, which the Reich had annexed, where they ran the Natzweiler concentration camp. In the summer of 1942, Laval ordered the roundup of all foreign Jews living in France, including any Jews who had received French citizenship after 1926; Vichy police carried out these measures, and Jews were placed on trains that were then handed over to the SS so they could be moved east to the Nazi camps in Poland. The first major roundup of Jews began in northern France, the German-occupied area, on July 16, 1942: four thousand Jews, mostly citizens and mostly children, were taken to the indoor sports stadium Veledrome d'Hiver in Paris and held there for five days without water, food, or sanitation; this is the infamous Vel d'Hiv roundup where many died due to the conditions. Eventually some seventy-six thousand French Jews were deported to the death camps.[3] Both in the north and the south, the SS and Gestapo operated alongside Vichy police. Most Jews arrested in France were first deported to a massive camp outside Paris, at Drancy; from there, they were moved east to the death camps of Poland. This was collaboration in its most extreme.

Collaboration also impacted non-Jewish French citizens. In April 1942, the Nazi minister of Labor, Saukel, demanded that France send more workers to Germany, and so in February 1943, Laval created the STO, Service de Travail Obligatoire, a forced labor program. All military-aged men were subject to conscription for work in German factories. Abstention and flight from service were high, some 150,000 were on the run from the STO in the summer of 1943. In order to carry out the roundup of Jews and fight the STO deserters as well as fight the armed resistance, the Vichy regime created a new police force, the Milice, in January 1943. The Milice was given auxiliary status to the Gestapo. In late 1943, Laval received German permission to expand the internal police force of Vichy and approximately twenty-five thousand to thirty thousand French citizens joined the Milice in 1944, during which time it worked alongside the Gestapo and the German army to continue to arrest Jews and attack the resistance.[4] Collaboration in its extreme meant direct attacks against civilians.

Of course, in opposition to collaboration, there was the French

Resistance. This opposition, from early on, was identified with Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who refused to accept the armistice and creation of Vichy and fled to London, supported by the British, with approximately one hundred thousand French troops rescued from the Nazis. He claimed to be the legitimate continuation of a democratic and republican France, although many historians consider his movement more patriotic than republican. From 1941 through 1942, he focused his attention on getting control of French colonial outposts to give his movement more legitimacy.

Within France, there were a number of small resistance movements unaffiliated with de Gaulle. These were, early on, most often those who already had organized themselves in democratic France as political movements, especially the Communists, who were the most organized group of resisters after the Nazis attacked the Soviet Union in June 1941. Movements had more freedom to organize in the south, in Vichy, before the creation of the Milice because the police and military presence was so much less than in the Nazi-occupied north. Various groups emerged such as Libération-Sud, Combat, and Francs-Tireurs. Many produced newspapers and pamphlets as well as arming small groups meant to disrupt Vichy and Nazi activity. Over time, Catholic Christian Democrats, Socialists, and Communists emerged as the most organized groups. By May 1942, the Communist Party called for the unification of all resistance groups, and in 1943, de Gaulle dispatched Jean Moulin to link his movement outside of France with those internal networks, creating the National Committee of Resistance.

Eventually, US and British special forces and intelligence operations supplied and supported the armed resistance groups. Most attacks focused on German supply lines, especially rail and truck routes. Numbers of men and women involved in armed resistance grew dramatically in 1943 and 1944, as Laval imposed forced labor. Total involvement went from thirty thousand to forty thousand in early 1943 to some one hundred to two hundred thousand by mid-1944, although most were unarmed.[5] By the end of 1943, some 130 attacks against rail lines occurred every month in France. In June 1944, Allied links to the resistance in northern France were important in the operations related to the D-Day invasion, ranging from the gathering of intelligence before the invasion, carrying out attacks on rail lines in the days before and during the assault, and targeting German supplies of armaments meant for the front lines. Meanwhile, in the south, the resistance emerged following German army movements north and Allied

invasions of southern France in mid-August. In many towns and villages, local resistance groups, or *maquis*, emerged from the woods and mountains and liberated their own communities.

What then followed set up memory politics in the years to come. Writers like philosopher Tzvetan Todorov declared that France in the summer of 1944 was on the brink of civil war between collaborationists and resisters.[6] Many of the resistance took up arms against those in their communities deemed to be collaborators with Nazi occupation. Some nine thousand to ten thousand people were summarily executed from June through September 1944 before de Gaulle's government, set up in Paris following its liberation near the end of August, could restore a sense of authority and law. Popular violence was channeled into reconstruction with an important element of justice included, as will be shown later in the chapter. However, the issues of who resisted and who collaborated were not entirely resolved, either in the grand scheme of things or at the local level.

POLAND'S REPEATED VICTIMIZATION

All in all, the Second World War was a "demographic catastrophe without precedent" for Poland, as Jan Gross wrote.[7] The war began when, in September 1939, Poland became the only country attacked at the same time by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. And things afterward only got worse.

After the September campaign, Poland was partitioned and lost its independence, as had occurred from the late eighteenth century until after the First World War. The German occupation in Poland lasted longer than in any other country during the war years and was the most severe. Nazis ranked the Poles as the third-lowest racial group in Europe, just after the Jews and the Gypsies. As a result, over six million Polish citizens—three million Christians and three million Jews—were killed during the war, the highest casualty rate among the European states. Millions were deported to Germany and Russia or left in the territories taken by the Soviet Union after the war.

Poland's citizens were killed not only by the Germans. The Soviet occupation resembled German rule in many respects; indeed, most scholars have concluded things were only marginally better in the Soviet zone of occupation. In any event, the Soviets occupied eastern Poland from September 1939 until June 1941, when Germany invaded the Soviet Union, beginning with the Polish lands the USSR occupied. From 1939 to 1941, both invaders followed the old rule: *divide et impera*

(divide and rule). Timothy Snyder called the lands in between Germany and the Soviet Union—especially Poland—as "bloodlands," where both occupiers pursued visions of systemic, governmental, and ethnic transformation.[8] Western Poland was annexed to Germany, and in many parts had been German territory before the First World War. Eastern Poland was annexed to the Soviet Union. In the middle, the Germans set up a colonial-style government known as the General Government, with headquarters in Krakow and an entire German bureaucracy sent in to administer it.

In the German zone, a complete reclassification of the population on the basis of race and ethnicity occurred. At the top of the social structure in German-occupied Poland were the *Reichsdeutsche*, the prewar citizens of Germany, the Reich. Then, there were four categories of the so-called *Volksdeutsche*—ethnic Germans—followed by the Slavic minorities in Poland, the Belarusians, and the Ukrainians. Lower down were the Poles. On the very bottom of the German-constructed racial ladder were the groups considered by the Nazis to be nonhuman and destined for immediate extermination: the Jews and the Gypsies. The Poles, as other Slavs, were considered to be *Untermenschen*, (the "subhumans") largely destined to be laborers for the Reich. In the winter of 1939 and 1940, about one million Poles were deported to the General Government from other German-controlled parts of Poland. Those expelled were allowed to take with them only a little cash and a few possessions, and Germans confiscated their property. Thousands of the deportees died during the transportation in unheated freight trucks. Most of those that survived were then put into forced labor situations. More than two hundred thousand Polish children were kidnapped and taken to the Reich for Germanization. Between 1939 and 1944, the Germans deported at least 1.5 million Poles to the Reich to work in agriculture and industry.[9]

The Soviets also built a similar social ladder that sought to divide society and remove potential opposition. On its top were Soviet people sent to the newly incorporated areas from the prewar Soviet territories. Next were native Communists and others, mostly non-Polish people like Belarusians, who, at least initially, were happy that the Polish state had disappeared. On the bottom of the Soviet-constructed hierarchy were the so-called enemies of the people, the Soviet equivalent of subhumans, mostly Poles and the non-Polish staff members of the destroyed state apparatus as well as owners of local businesses, larger farms, and estates.

In both parts of occupied Poland, the most savage and devastating attack organized by the invaders was against the elite of Polish society. German efforts to eliminate the potential opposition of a Polish elite are described in chapter 5. The Soviet occupiers had similar ideas. In March 1940, Stalin decided to execute about twenty-two thousand Polish war prisoners, including over fifteen thousand officers from the three POW camps in Kozielsk, Starobielsk, and Ostaszkow. The Poles were executed in April and May 1940 in Katyn, near Kharkov.[10] Most of the victims were reserve officers, prominent in their communities in and outside of the military. In Katyn alone, hundreds of doctors, lawyers, teachers, and engineers were killed. Mass deportations of other potential opponents also occurred on an immense scale. The deportations started immediately after September 1939 and lasted until the very day of the German attack on the Soviet Union in June 1941. In 1940 and 1941 alone, the Soviets deported nearly a half million people to Siberia, to the Arctic regions of European Russia, and to Central Asia.[11] The Soviet deportations constituted a successful case of ethnic cleansing.

Both the Germans and the Soviets terrorized Polish society. By 1940, just months into the war, German occupiers had executed over fifty-two thousand Poles.[12] Soviet militias, established by the new authorities from among their local supporters, initiated random retribution against Polish officers, policemen, local officials, judges, and any other staff members of the Polish state apparatus. Eventually, as described in chapter 5, Poland became the center of the continent-wide camp system developed by the Nazis, with over three hundred labor, concentration, and extermination camps. Ghettos were also established and eventually the six major death camps, and this made Poland the focal point of the Holocaust, as described in chapter 5. Of the more than 6 million Polish citizens (both Jews and Christians) killed during the war, almost 5.4 million died as a direct result of German and Soviet mass terror. In June 1941, the Germans invaded the Soviet Union and occupied all the territories of the prewar Polish state. After their initial victory in Russia, the Germans assumed even more cruel policies toward the population of Poland, beginning with the genocide of Polish Jews. In 1942 and 1943, most Polish Jews were killed.

Despite these extreme conditions, Poland, like France, had a strong history of resistance against the two occupying powers. In two cases, the armed resistance offered by Poles against Nazi Germany represented the largest uprisings of the war. The first of these came from Polish Jews in the Warsaw ghetto. Two small armed resistance groups

emerged over the course of 1942 into 1943: the Zydowska Organizacja Bojowa (ZOB, Jewish Combat Organization) and the Zydowski Zwiazek Wojskowy (ZZW, Jewish Military Union). The ZOB established contact with the non-Jewish resistance movement, the Home Army, in October 1942, and obtained a small number of weapons, mostly pistols and explosives.

From July through autumn 1942, the population of the Warsaw ghetto slowly diminished as weekly and daily deportations to Treblinka occurred. Those left behind were the most suitable to continue working, which tended to mean younger people, who were also more likely than others to consider armed resistance as an option. When German SS and police units tried to resume mass deportations of Jews from Warsaw on January 18, 1943, they were disrupted by a small group of Jews with pistols. Although most of these individuals were killed, the attack allowed some Jews awaiting transport to their deaths to escape. After seizing 5,000 to 6,500 ghetto residents to be deported, the Germans suspended further deportations on January 21. Encouraged by the apparent success of these actions, members of the ghetto population began to construct subterranean bunkers and shelters in preparation for a larger uprising when the Germans would inevitably attempt a final deportation. This came on April 19, 1943, with German orders to liquidate the ghetto.

Jewish fighters stunned the SS on the first day of fighting, forcing the Germans to retreat. On the third day of the uprising, SS and police forces began a targeted campaign, moving building to building and razing the ghetto to the ground as they moved through the ghetto. The fighting continued, block by block, until May 8, 1943. This was the largest armed Jewish uprising of the war, although the ghetto was shut down and the fifty-five thousand that remained were either executed on site or sent to camps, where the majority died later on.[13]

Similarly, in August 1944, Warsaw was the scene of one of the largest non-Jewish armed uprisings of the Second World War. On August 1, 1944, Warsaw's units of the Home Army—a resistance organization created from the remnants of the defeated Polish army in 1939—attacked the Germans and gained control of most of the city within three days as the Germans faced the incoming Red Army from the Soviet Union. Only about 10 percent of the Polish fighters were armed. However, at this point, the Red Army deliberately stopped its offensive and remained idle on the other side of the river from the city. For their part, the Germans sent fresh strong units to Warsaw, and in three

weeks, the Nazi forces consisted of nearly forty thousand well-armed men with artillery, tanks, and planes. On October 2, after sixty-three days of desperate fighting, the uprising surrendered to the Germans, and the Soviet Red Army moved into Warsaw to fight the Germans themselves. The Soviet rationale for its action, or lack of action, was that the Home Army was as anti-Soviet as it was anti-German and thus needed to be destroyed.[14]

The Home Army command and about twelve thousand insurgents were taken as prisoners of war. The Germans deported most of the city's remaining population to various camps. Over two hundred thousand civilians died, about eighteen thousand Home Army soldiers were killed, and about seven thousand were wounded. The main body of the Home Army was eliminated. When the Red Army finally took the Polish capital in January 1945, the city was in complete ruins. The defeat of the uprising weakened the organized resistance in Poland, enabling the Soviets to establish their political domination over the country and establish an alternative, pro-Soviet Communist regime in the country even before World War II ended.[15]

FRANCE'S "RESISTANCE MYTH" AND "VICHY SYNDROME"

Given the experience of occupation, collaboration, terror, and resistance in both France and Poland, how would these societies come to remember their war? In France, Charles de Gaulle and his successors as leaders in the second half of the 1940s moved quickly to end the indiscriminate killings that took place in the summer of 1944. Using pre-1939 legislation concerning treason and military law, a series of trials of those deemed to have been top collaborators occurred. However, domestic legislation did not deal with the concept of crimes against humanity and participation in the Holocaust—treason was the only charge possible. In that light, one of the most significant trials was that of journalist Robert Brasillach, whose anti-Semitic newspaper *Je Suis Partout*, based in Paris, had been virulently pro-Nazi during the occupation. For these thoughts, Brasillach was tried, found guilty, and executed in early 1945.[16] The crime was treason, for being a Germanophile, not for any specific wartime actions or murder. When Pétain himself was tried later in 1945, he was also found guilty of treason, but his death sentence was commuted due to his age and his contributions to France during the First World War.

However, such sentences were more symbolic than realistic for most of the collaborators in France were not put on trial. Fourteen

Alsatians, who had been part of the Waffen-SS once Germany incorporated Alsace into its own territory in 1940, were tried in 1953 for their participation in the massacre of 642 French civilians in the village of Oradour-sur-Glane on June 10, 1944. The trial was controversial for it was argued that many Alsatians were more French than German and most of the 140,000 Alsatians who had served the German military were forcibly conscripted. Indeed, six of the fourteen soldiers on trial had surrendered to the Allies and joined the French Resistance later in the summer of 1944; two had been French soldiers before the French defeat in 1940. The concept of collective responsibility was debated in the course of the trial, and it was argued that the soldiers did not choose to kill French civilians but instead were the *malgre-nous*, or those chosen against their will. In the end, they were found guilty and sentenced to prison terms; the French parliament followed this decision with a ranting of amnesty for most and reduced prison terms for those sentenced to death. Within five years, all the men were free.[17] This trial had been preceded by the first amnesty for collaborators, some forty thousand of whom had been arrested in the year following France's liberation.

Charles de Gaulle and other French politicians, as well as French society, wanted to move beyond the memory of collaboration. An emphasis on the resistance and its role in France's war was the primary means to do so by celebrating France's moral standing, heroism in the face of occupation, and inherent democratic system, as opposed to Fascist collaborationist values. Most historians assert that no more than 5 percent of the French population in the Second World War was actually ever part of an armed, underground movement.[18] De Gaulle and his conservative political movement that emerged to lead France from 1944 to 1946 and again from 1958 to 1969 embraced this concept. Institutionally, De Gaulle created the Commission d'Histoire de l'Occupation et de la Libération in 1946, succeeded by the Comité français de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale in 1950; their work, which brought France's wartime history to the public, deemphasized the role of the Allies and D-Day in liberating France and stressed the grassroots liberation by the resistance. Subsequently, in 1960, de Gaulle opened a memorial site for resistance figures tortured and executed by the Nazis at Mont Valérien west of Paris. To this day, the French president participates in a ceremony at the site on June 18, the anniversary of de Gaulle's 1940 speech calling on the French to resist German occupation. The combination of institutional resources and a national site confirm the message

that France was a resister nation in the war, and the continuation of an important political ceremony demonstrates the importance of this way of thinking to French identity. Moreover, from the creation of the Fifth Republic in 1958, this line of analysis was not at all challenged by de Gaulle's political opponents, most especially not by the Communist Party, which claimed itself to have been the main impetus behind the resistance and subsequently branded itself as the natural successor to the resistance; indeed, the French Communist Party in campaigns labeled itself the party of "70,000 martyrs," harkening back to the experience of Communists arrested and executed or killed in battle by the Nazis during the war.[19]

This common memory and the celebration of it in schools, in national holidays such as Victory Day that commemorates the end of the war in Europe (May 8, a holiday since 1982), and at sites like Mont Valérien in June cast the French as victims and as victors in the war and the resistance as true representatives of France. They also ignore the vast majority of French citizens who spent the war as collaborators or as at the very least bystanders to Nazi occupation. Placing de Gaulle and his own resistance experience at the center of such commemoration was vital. De Gaulle had, of course, resisted from day one. The reality, however, was that few French citizens heard his June 18, 1940, radio broadcast from England where he called on France to reject Pétain's move toward capitulation to the Germans and resist. His movement was small and only gained prominence thanks to the support of the Allied powers and his own efforts to take over French colonial territory prior to D-Day.

After de Gaulle's death in 1970, and in relation to generational change, among other factors, this memory of France's wartime experience as one of resistance was increasingly challenged. One significant factor in this was the release of Marcel Ophüls's film *Le Chagrin et la pitié* in 1971. The film was based on thirty-six interviews of people from the city of Clermont-Ferrand and presented a town—and, by extension, a country—that had very much been divided and not at all resistant. It took ten years for the film to have a wide audience, as the government pressured television networks not to show it, and only in 1981 did the first television screening occur. However, it was joined in 1972 by the book *Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order* by American historian Robert Paxton, who offered similar arguments about the variety and extent of collaboration in wartime France from governmental levels down to daily life. Slowly, over time, more historical and popular works began to present this version of French history to the public.

In the 1980s and 1990s, however, a new fascination with Vichy and the collaborationist history of France took over and surpassed the previous emphasis on the resistance. In this new period, many focused on France's specific role in assisting and collaborating with the Holocaust, making collaboration not just a concept of governmental policy but one linked to genocide. The trial of Gestapo commander Klaus Barbie in Lyon in 1987 was important. The German Barbie—in his defense for crimes against Jews and resistance figures, such as de Gaulle's ally Jean Moulin, whose execution Barbie ordered in 1943—accused the French too. The accusation was made that Moulin had been betrayed by his colleagues within the resistance, setting up his arrest and execution at the hands of the Gestapo.[20] In addition, he hinted at other crimes committed by the resistance during the war. The implication was that collaboration and other crimes had occurred on the French side as well as the German, and it was inherently unfair to exempt French citizens from accounting for their crimes.

This set up a series of trials of French figures for their roles in the Holocaust by the 1990s. Chief among these was Paul Touvier, René Bosquet, and Maurice Papon. Touvier was a former Vichy police official accused of crimes against humanity. He had been granted amnesty once before, in 1970, by the French government. In 1992, he was again deemed not suitable for trial because Vichy was not a legitimate government. Public outcry forced the overturning of this decision, and Touvier went on trial in 1994 for crimes against humanity and was convicted. Bosquet had formerly headed the Vichy police and negotiated agreements with the Nazis on police collaboration in the roundup and deportation of foreign Jews from France in 1942. Bosquet was murdered in 1993 before his trial could begin. Papon was a regional political leader in Bordeaux from 1942 until the end of the war and personally oversaw the deportation of Jews from that region. After the war, however, he was celebrated for assistance he had given the resistance in his position and went on to a successful and long political career, as prefect of Paris in de Gaulle's government from 1958 to 1966 and later a budget minister in Pres. Valéry Giscard d'Estaing's government from 1978 to 1981. He was first accused of crimes against humanity in 1981 and went through a series of legal proceedings before being put on trial in 1997 and convicted in 1998 of crimes against humanity for the deportation of some 1,600 Jews from Bordeaux during the war.[21]

These trials were representative of a changing memory culture in France in the late 1980s and 1990s. Turning from a focus on German

criminals to French criminals in the Holocaust was an important distinction; where Touvier could get exempted from trial and investigation in 1970, this was deemed illegitimate by 1994. That change was also demonstrated by the opening of the Museum and Memorial to the Shoah in Paris, where visitors are greeted with a list of the some 76,000 Jews deported from France during the Second World War, of whom only about 2,500 survived. Generational change drove these changes for the most part. By 1994, the French president François Mitterrand, at the end of his career, admitted he had worked for Vichy in 1942. This fact, never entirely a secret, had played no role in a very long and successful political career in the Socialist Party but was deemed to be a necessary admission by the 1990s.

In the 1980s and 1990s, newer sites focusing on France's complicated past complemented the older ones created in earlier years. The Shoah Museum in Paris added the Memorial to the Martyrs of Deportation, created under de Gaulle in 1962. This memorial in the center of the city was a memorial to the more than two hundred thousand moved from France to concentration camps in Germany and elsewhere during the war. On the memorial are quotes from famous figures involved in the French resistance, including Jean-Paul Sartre and Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. However, there is no specific reference to Jewish victims of deportation as opposed to others, despite the fact that once deportations began, non-Jews were sent to work camps, usually in Germany, and Jews to death camps, most to Auschwitz, where they were killed. The Shoah Memorial and Museum, in contrast, includes a number of memorial spaces meant to commemorate the murder of Jews in France, such as the crypt, which contains a Star of David made from black marble holding ashes taken from the Nazi death camps and the Warsaw ghetto (fig. 7.1). Most significantly, there is a section of the museum that features an exhibit of French police files created and organized by the Vichy government on Jews in France, directly implicating France in the deportations. Many of these materials had been gathered and archived by groups such as the Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation (CDJC) created by the Jewish community during the war and active afterward, but their presence in what is now a national museum raises these collections to a new level of prominence in French society, which is indicative of the changes in memory that took place in the last part of the twentieth century in France.

Other Holocaust memorials and museums have also been created in France, notably at Drancy, the camp outside of Paris that served as

Figure 7.1. Paris, France, cityscape with a fragment of the courtyard of the Shoah Memorial, a museum of the Holocaust that opened to the public in 2005. Photo by iStock/Irena Iris Szewczyk.

a collection point for Jews rounded up in France before they were sent to Auschwitz. Connected to the Shoah Museum in Paris, the Drancy memorial was inaugurated in 2012. Approximately sixty-three thousand of the seventy-six thousand Jews deported from France went through Drancy. The camp, designed in the 1930s as a housing project, was a housing project again from 1948 through the early 2000s, and the first memorial was constructed there only in 2001. Other camp sites have also opened, at Les Milles, near Marseilles, in 2012, and at Rivesaltes, near Perpignan, in 2015. Important temporary exhibits on daily life in Paris under the Nazi occupation, which included aspects of both resistance Jewish persecution, was held at the city hall in 2011, and a special exhibit on the deportation of Jewish children was held there in 2012.

The change in memory discourse and in memory spaces does not mean that the resistance experience has been forgotten. What has changed is the tone, from de Gaulle's refusal to acknowledge French complicity to Mitterrand's blaming of Vichy and its leadership when he was president in the 1980s to Jacques Chirac's apology for France's role in the Holocaust when he was president in 1995. We might see, in hindsight, that de Gaulle's privileging of the resistance experience was crucial to national recovery but less necessary over time as generations

changed and France flourished as a democracy. The so-called second purge of trials in the 1980s and 1990s opened up a new space for critical reflection on the complexity of the occupation and Vichy period, allowing both for a consideration of the resistance's smaller, but nonetheless significant, role and a larger space for debating France's complicity in the Holocaust and other crimes of the Second World War.

POLAND'S WAR, POLAND'S MEMORY, AND POLAND'S VICTIMHOOD

As noted above, the war ended in Poland with the destruction of the Home Army uprising in Warsaw and the removal of German troops by the Soviet Red Army. The Red Army established a provisional Polish government in Lublin in July 1944, even before the Warsaw uprising of August, consisting of various Polish Communist and leftist leaders. In January 1945, this government, joined by a small number of members of the prewar Polish government, which had spent the war in exile in London, entered Warsaw and began the process of establishing the new regime in Poland. At Yalta in February 1945, the United States and Great Britain, despite being supporters of the government-in-exile in London, accepted this regime as the legitimate government of Poland. A Communist state supported by the Soviet Union was then established.

This Communist state did not allow official or public recognition of the brutality of the Soviet occupation in the Second World War between 1939 and 1941. The massacre of Polish military officers and others that had occurred at Katyn in April and May 1940 was, in the official Soviet propaganda, a crime committed by the Germans after their invasion of eastern Poland in June 1941. Public focus then only was about German crimes, of which, as detailed above, there were many. Here, the crimes of World War II represented the complete destruction of a social, cultural, and political community, for not only did Poland lose its Jewish population but also its elites in politics and education, its military, and all the major institutions that had been building a new state from its renewed independence granted in 1918 to 1919. A new national identity, then, was to be built around the ideas of Communism but also around the concept of victimhood that was, for most Poles, far more real than ideological. What this meant was a somewhat strange mix of ideology and memory.

As a result, there would be a distinct shape to the ideas of victimhood that would be articulated in public spaces and within the education system. First, as noted, there was no space for discussion of the Soviet occupation and Soviet crimes, since Communist Poland existed

in alliance with and under the wing of the Soviet Union. Second, there would be only a small role for the commemoration of the mass murder of Jews, and especially the loss of Poland's Jewish community, that had led to the Holocaust taking place largely on Polish soil. This was for many reasons. For one reason, there was not much of a Jewish community left to highlight their specific memories of the war. Secondly, Polish attitudes toward Jews remained, after the war, affected by a long history of anti-Semitism in that country. Of the two hundred thousand or so surviving Polish Jews (from a population of over three million in 1939), those who returned to towns and villages they had been removed from found their properties had been taken over by neighbors unwilling to give them back. Synagogues had been taken down so other Poles could use the materials in rebuilding their own homes and businesses. In 1946 in Kielce, some eighty Jews were murdered by a crowd, and Jews were attacked in the streets of Krakow.[22] Even the Communist Party that ruled Poland integrated anti-Semitism into its policies, most notably with purges of Jews from the party and other positions of authority within the state in 1956 and 1957 and again in 1968 and 1969. The survivors of the Holocaust that remained in Poland were largely gone by 1970, further limiting the focus on Jews that any commemoration or memory of the war would have in Poland.

Deemphasizing the history of the Holocaust as it had occurred in Poland was not universal. In the years from 1946 to 1950, there were numerous trials of German war criminals in Poland including that of Rudolf Hoess, the commandant of Auschwitz, who was found guilty and hung next to the gas chamber at the camp he had run. The new Polish state immediately made the two death camps at Majdanak and Auschwitz into museum sites in order to make the public aware of the extent of Nazi criminality. In 1948, a memorial to the Warsaw ghetto uprising was opened on a site that would have been in the center of the ghetto. However, these institutional and site-specific elements of historical memory, while important, were never central to the Polish Communist memory of the Second World War.

As in East Germany, the new Communist authorities in Poland found that they could use the Nazi occupation and the events of the Holocaust to help legitimize their rule. By emphasizing that Poles generally were anti-Fascist, they could argue that Communists, also anti-Fascists, were natural successors to the Nazi occupation in Poland, despite the fact that Communism before the war was a relatively small movement there. And in a state that had endured Soviet occupation

and then the Soviet imposition of a government, these arguments were even more important because most Poles did not see anything inherently Polish in Communism. Thus, very quickly, the Jewish nature of millions of victims in Poland was diminished, and the act that the Nazis had targeted Poles as Poles and Poles as anti-Fascists became more important. Of course, this was also historically accurate for the Nazi period had targeted Poles as well as Jews, as noted in chapter 5.

AUSCHWITZ

What did this mean? At the Auschwitz site, some one million Jews from around Europe were murdered, seventy thousand non-Jewish Poles, twenty-one thousand Roma and Sinti peoples, and over fourteen thousand Soviet prisoners of war were also killed by the Nazis.[23] Yet, when created as a museum of the Polish state in 1947, the initial emphasis of the exhibit was to represent the site primarily as a site of Polish national martyrdom, focused on the plight and struggle of the non-Jewish, Polish political prisoner (often seen as a Socialist hero or resistance fighter). While the exhibits were most definitively historically accurate, they downplayed the role of the non-Polish Jewish prisoners who had been killed there. As part of the general effort to rally the Polish people to the new Communist state, Auschwitz was used to instrumentalize propaganda for the state by making the argument that Poles and Communists, as the target of Nazi crimes, deserved to replace Nazism in Poland. As Jonathan Huener noted, "Memory work at Auschwitz became a blunt instrument of Polish domestic and foreign policy."[24] It is worth noting that these sentiments were not only inspired by Communism and the need to justify the new state; they fit nicely into broader ideas of martyrdom and sacrifice that had long traditions within Polish nationalism, given Poland's history of occupation by the German, Austria, and Russian Empires in the nineteenth century. What this meant was that although martyrdom was a major theme, it was accompanied by exhibits that focused on Polish—and Polish Communist—strength, a victory of the Polish spirit. As a result, alongside the exhibits of suffering, there were, increasingly, exhibits about resistance to the Germans—Block 21 hosted an exhibit developed in 1949 titled "Struggle and Victory," which emphasized Polish and international Communist activism at the camp in the era of the Holocaust.[25] In another development, *Hitlerite* or *Nazi* was replaced by the phrase *Fascist*, which, not coincidentally, was a phrase used by Communist Europe in the Cold War to refer to the Western democracies.

The creation of a national museum at Auschwitz in 1947 was led by the organization of former prisoners, where hardly any Jews were represented. In Poland's Stalinist period, up to 1953, the initial role of former prisoners was diminished, and the state took more of a direct role in managing the site, but by 1954—after Stalin's death—prisoners were once again in charge. By the tenth anniversary of the camp's liberation, in 1955, the exhibits had changed to better represent the fact that the population of the camp had been very multinational, and a new prisoners' association with representation from other countries besides Poland was inaugurated. Naturally, most survivors from other countries were Jewish. So beginning in the 1950s, a greater representation of the Jewish experience at Auschwitz entered into the exhibits; memory activists drove a change in the presentation of the past. A new permanent exhibit, much of it still in use today, debuted in April 1955. The first exhibit, in Block 15, made clear the racial policies of Hitler's Germany and that Jews were the primary victims of the Holocaust.[26] The earlier, state-created emphasis on Polish martyrdom and Polish Communism did not disappear but was rather modified and added to. There was an exhibit, for example, comparing West German imperialism to that of Nazism. The international committee of ex-prisoners was very careful not to push the Communist regime to reject its influences. However, a new tone was clear. By 1968, a specific exhibit on "Martyrology and Struggle of the Jews" opened in Block 27.[27] The permanent exhibit was more and more about the international dimension of the Holocaust and the victims who died at the camp.

In the late 1960s, the Polish state engaged in a series of policies on anti-Zionism that criticized Jews, purged them from the Communist Party, and forced many to flee the country. Some began to question just how many Jews had died in the Holocaust, and many members of the international Auschwitz committee from Austria, Belgium, France, and the Netherlands resigned from the museum.[28] Many saw the opening of Block 27 on Jewish suffering cynically. The internationalization of the site, however, meant that criticism of the lack of Jewish experience at the museum grew over time. An international committee of historians was appointed in 1973 in order to recommend renovations to the exhibit that had largely stayed the same since 1955. Their advice, while not rejecting the focus on Polish martyrdom, was meant to make the site more appealing to an international audience and their conceptions of Holocaust history, particularly on the basis of seeing the Holocaust as the genocide of European Jews. The Catholic Church in Poland

emerged as a force that advocated for the continuation of the emphasis on Polish martyrdom, particularly on Catholic martyrdom, and used the site to commemorate the deaths there of Father Maxmillian Kolbe, a priest who offered himself for execution when a prisoner escaped from the camp in August 1941 and the Nazis planned reprisal killings in response, and Edith Stein, a German Jew who converted to Catholicism and became a Carmelite nun. By the 1970s, a Carmelite nunnery in the vicinity of the camp was very active in keeping these stories at the forefront of the camp's narrative.

The visit to Auschwitz in 1979 of Pope John Paul II, the first Polish pope, brought both narratives of Polish martyrdom and of Jewish suffering together. The site, over the course of the 1980s, became more universal, especially as visitors from the Federal Republic of Germany increased dramatically. There was some opposition to this, particularly from the Carmelite nuns, who felt the story of Catholic suffering at the Nazis' hands was being forgotten in the rush to make the site more representative of the Jewish experience of the Holocaust. Events such as the mass raising of crosses at the site by the nuns in 1989 emphasized the dual narratives and set up the concept of different and conflicting memories of the site's role in the history of the Holocaust and the Nazi occupation of Poland. The end of Communism in Poland in 1989 and 1990 has only increased the emphasis on the site as a universal, more so than Polish, place, although the narrative of Polish suffering has not disappeared. Language on the plaques placed around the camp changed in 1992, indicating that the primary victims of the camp were "Jews, from different countries of Europe."[29] New groups such as the International Council of the Museum and the Victims Memorial Foundation were created in the 1990s to give direction and advice to the camp's administration. Training for the museum's guides was coordinated with the Yad Vashem Memorial Institute in Israel and the US Holocaust Memorial Museum.

KATYN

During the Communist era, Poland was covered with memorials and plaques about the Second World War, all of them narrating a history of German crimes and the German occupation. There was no space for consideration of the Soviet occupation of 1939 to 1941 or the Warsaw uprising of August 1944, which was both anti-German and anti-Soviet. The political elites of the Communist Party and the strong ties to the Soviet Union forbid it. However, unofficial memories and

unofficial discourse about those events remained prominent within families and occasionally got into the public sphere, and members of the opposition to Communism that emerged by the 1970s within the church and within movements like the non-Communist trade union Solidarity discussed and published texts, pamphlets, and newspaper articles about taboo subjects from the past. Solidarity activists created their own Katyn memorial, illegally, in 1981, in Warsaw's main cemetery. Invoking Katyn became a way to demonstrate general opposition to the Communist regime. To counter this, the regime itself created its own memorial to the victims of Katyn, blaming the Nazis for the crimes, in Warsaw's cemetery in 1985.[30] When, in 1979 to 1981, Solidarity was at its highest popularity and the Solidarity strike against the government that began at Gdansk led to a massive increase in membership, to about ten million people, thus representing the majority of the Polish workforce, broader discussion of the events of the past occurred. Martial law imposed by the government in December 1981 shut Solidarity down, led to the arrest of its leaders, and returned discourse and debate about the past back to the pattern that had been in place beforehand.

However, a clear change in Polish attitudes toward the past emerged. Emboldened by the wave of opposition that had swept Poland with the rise of Solidarity, Poles became more public with their heretofore forbidden memories, although not overtly so. On September 1, the anniversary of the end of the 1944 Warsaw uprising, massive church services became the norm in the 1980s. Thus, when Solidarity was again legalized and the Communist government transitioned itself out of office in 1989, to be replaced by Solidarity, new opportunities for debate about the past opened up. The change of regimes and political elites had a clear impact on collective memory. One of the first signs of change was the renaming of streets in many communities for leaders of the Home Army, which had been forbidden in the Communist period since the Home Army symbolized anti-Soviet sentiment as well as anti-Nazi activities. Polish Army Day, a traditional holiday under Communism, was moved to August 15, to place it in the center of the Warsaw uprising commemoration and the anniversary of the Polish Army's defeat of Soviet forces in the war of 1920. Finally, in 1989, the leader of the then-collapsing Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, allowed Polish academics to visit the Katyn site, and in April 1990, he formally admitted that the Red Army was responsible for the massacre of Polish officers at Katyn and apologized. Documents relating to the event were

passed from the Soviet Union to the Polish government. Court cases emerged in Russia, after the end of the Soviet Union, to press for more document releases.

Memorialization of the Katyn events occurred not only at the site, now in Ukrainian territory, but also in towns and villages across Poland, such as Wroclaw, which opened its own memorial in 2000. At the site itself, this new monument replaced memorials erected by the Soviet government that told of the massacre as having been committed by the Nazis. The memorial depicts the Angle of Death towering over the matron of the Polish homeland, alongside a stone listing the names of Soviet-run POW camps where Poles were killed. There is also a figure of a military officer, shot in the back of the head. In 2007, esteemed Polish film director Andrzej Wajda produced the film *Katyn*, depicting not only the event but also the Soviet effort to repress public discussion and memory of the event in the years following the Second World War, especially among the relatives of those killed. The film was awarded the 2008 Academy Award as Best Foreign Film. In April 2010, the president of Poland Lech Kaczynski and other members of the Polish government were killed in a plane crash on the way to visit the Katyn site, where they were planning to meet Russian president Vladimir Putin and commemorate the seventieth anniversary of the event. This incident led to a number of conspiracy theories throughout Poland that suggested a planned Russian assassination of the president and a return to the Soviet attitude of 1940. While there is nothing to such claims, they nonetheless are a sign of the power of the Katyn event in Polish memory of the Second World War and the recovery of memory of Soviet crimes in wartime Poland.

THE UPRISING

Opening up a discussion on Katyn also allowed the Warsaw uprising of 1944 to have a prominent place in Poland's memory of the war. Although the uprising was not completely off limits to discussion under Communism as Katyn was, it was seen in the Soviet Union as much anti-Soviet as anti-German, and it held the Home Army at its center, which Soviet authorities had worked hard to eliminate in the early period of Communist rule. Thus, the uprising was not a topic that was encouraged when reflecting on the Second World War. Once Communism ended, however, it was studied, discussed, and debated with renewed enthusiasm. In terms of public space, the creation of the Uprising Monument in Warsaw in 1989 demonstrated a new openness

that was already beginning before the Communist era officially ended (fig. 7.2). The Communist government gave permission for its construction in April 1988, and it was unveiled in August 1989, just after the Communist era ended. It depicts the Home Army descending into the sewers of Warsaw, something that actually happened near the end of the uprising in September 1944. The new memoryscape of Poland, then, not only involved discussion and commemoration of events previously forbidden to be discussed but also the presentation of that history as heroic and patriotic, emphasizing the extent to which resistance actors went to defend Poland against both Nazi and Soviet occupation. In 2004, this memorial was joined by the Warsaw Uprising Museum, which not only depicts the events of 1944 but tells the story of Poland's entire World War II experience. The museum again emphasizes that only Poland experienced the true nature of the war as a war not of two but rather of three sides—two totalitarian dictatorships and the Western democracies. Thus, the Polish narrative of dual occupation remains clear and central to the history of the war and Polish opposition and independence, despite the odds, as the heroic story at the center of the conflict.

Figure 7.2. Warsaw Uprising Monument, dedicated to the uprising in 1944 against the Nazi occupiers, Warsaw, Poland. Photo by iStock/R. Nagy.

JEDWABNE

In 1998, in the aftermath of changes to Auschwitz and other Holocaust sites in Poland and in response to the opening up of discussion about Katyn, the Polish parliament created a new institution, the Institute of National Remembrance—Commission for the Prosecution of Crimes against the Polish Nation. The commission was meant, for the most part, to investigate the crimes of the Communist era, particularly as they related to the secret police. However, in the early 2000s, they got pulled into a Holocaust controversy that shook Poland. In 2000, Jan Gross, a Polish historian based in the United States, published a book entitled *Neighbors*. In this book, Gross documented the July 10, 1941, massacre of the Jewish community in the small community of Jedwabne, in eastern Poland, a territory acquired by the Germans as they began their invasion of eastern Poland and the Soviet Union on June 22. In his book, Gross argued that the non-Jewish members of the community, not the Nazi occupiers, carried out the massacre of some 1,600 Jews.[31] This revelation was extremely controversial in Poland and directly challenged the narrative, still consistent since the end of the war, that all Poles, whether Jewish or not, were victims of Nazi occupation. As in France, but decades later, the issue of collaboration entered into the Polish context.

Debates occurred in the Polish press and among researchers and historians in Poland, largely through presenting evidence that the Germans were the instigators and most active participants in the massacre and incited Polish participation. At the sixtieth anniversary commemoration of the event in July 2001, Polish president Aleksander Kwasniewski presented this interpretation. The result of the controversy was an official investigation by the Institute of National Remembrance from 2000 to 2003. Although Gross's book was the impetus for the investigation, previous commissions on Nazi crimes in Poland had investigated the case and trials had been held in 1949 and 1950 of twenty-two members of the community; a subsequent West German investigation in the 1960s occurred of the SS officers involved and a trial found one guilty of war crimes in 1976. The Polish institute's investigation involved over one hundred witness interviews and extensive study of documents. It concluded that the perpetrators were indeed Polish citizens but that the massacre had been "inspired" by the German occupiers; it also concluded that the number of victims that Gross cited, 1,600, was "highly unlikely" and put the toll closer to 300 Jews.[32] In short, Gross's argument was accepted but in a much more limited way than he had made

it. The memorial at Jedwabne was changed and a new inscription was revealed in July 2001, after a period of extensive and divisive debate in the community and in Poland generally. The inscription did not explicitly blame either Poles or Germans for the murders, and as a result, both those who argued Poles were involved and those who felt the Germans were responsible were unhappy.[33]

If the end of Communism allowed memorialization of previously hidden stories like that of Katyn or the uprising of 1944, it also revealed more complex and less comforting historical issues, such as Jedwabne. Now the question of Polish collaboration with the Nazis was on the table. Memorialization of such "bad news" in contrast to the celebration of Polish victimhood and martyrdom in the other post-Communist stories that emerged was not easy, and it continues to be fraught. Indeed, legislation passed in early 2018 makes it a crime to state that Poles were collaborators in the murder of Jews, although this was later weakened (criminal punishment was removed but the law still stands) once many countries criticized the government for this action.[34] The idea of legislating what history was allowed to be remembered about the past is generally seen as a sign of an active discouragement of democracy, although it too is a tactic that those engaged in a memory war can use. The question of whether or not Poles collaborated with the Nazis goes to the heart of what a society, a nation, wants to or seeks to memorialize, and in this case a direct counterargument to the focus on heroism, resistance, and martyrdom that the memory of the Warsaw uprising evokes. It cannot all be "good history," and the Poles are grappling with this perhaps more than other societies. These episodes demonstrate how complex not only history is, but also the collective memory of the past.

CONCLUSION

Complicating memory has been a lengthy and difficult process in both France and Poland. Both societies embraced a narrative of resistance and victimhood after the war that overlooked collaboration and complicity. This changed due to a number of factors, particularly since the 1970s, factors we first considered in chapter 1. The change in political elites, from the end of de Gaulle's reign in France to the end of Communist dictatorship and its imposed memory in Poland, was significant. Generational change was important, especially in the French case. The work of historians such as Robert Paxton and Jan Gross uncovered previously unexplored history and brought new evidence to the attention of the public, political elites, and others. Institutions, sites, and memory

activists all followed the established patterns until new generations, new spaces, and new politics made it possible for different versions of history to emerge. The state was most active in setting the tone in both countries initially and only in the 1980s and 1990s did others move in to make the standard accounts of the past more complicated. In museums, public sites, and historical places such as Auschwitz, we can delineate how the process of complicating memory of the past occurred. In public debates and investigations, such as occurred in Poland around the Jedwabne incident, we can document how broader society became aware of the truths and complexities that many participants always knew about, and we can also see the backlash in debates over Jedwabne and in the Polish law of 2018 that suggested Poles could not be considered as collaborators with the Nazis. Indeed, the case of Jedwabne meets the criteria of a memory war discussed in chapter 1. The historical facts are complex, but memory wants to be simpler. Making memory as complicated as history takes time and involves difficult discussion, as these two countries demonstrate. Despite the very different postwar social, political, and economic situations in these two countries, an examination of both together reveals important similarities in how memory changes over time in complex societies.

EIGHT

FINDING THE HOLOCAUST AND JEWISH HISTORY IN CONTEMPORARY EUROPE

As the previous chapters have demonstrated, the memory of the Second World War, the Holocaust and the German occupation, and Allied response cross many national borders in contemporary Europe. Because the war was on a continental scale, so too is the memory of the conflict. To this point, however, the analysis has focused on how memory appears within the national context through a focus on institutional history, sites, and memory actors, especially state actors. However, Jie-Hyun Lim and Peter Lambert, and increasingly other writers on memory, argued that a social framework for memory can be global and that "a growing sense of global connectivity and global human rights politics has brought a profound change to the memory landscape."[1] Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider argued that references to the Holocaust and, by extension, World War II, have become so widespread in Europe that in addition to national and ethnic memories of these events, we also now have a "cosmopolitan" memory of the war whereby national and ethnic memories share a "common patterning."[2] Sharon MacDonald argued that many use the Holocaust for educational purposes with reference to the present and the future.[3] In assessing how Holocaust sites today convey the memory of that terrible time, this chapter assesses the cosmopolitan or at least continental similarities across national boundaries, particularly in the way in which the Holocaust is memorialized and in the ways in which European Jewish history more broadly is linked to the events of the Second World War and genocide.

MUSEUMS, MEMORIALS, AND MEMORIAL MUSEUMS IN EUROPE: EARLY YEARS

Trauma and depictions of trauma are often central to the concepts of specific memorial museums. They connect survivors and their families to the moments lived; for those without a direct connection to the past, they underline the moral nature of the depicted event; they draw in, through connections with human rights violations and other ideas

about rights, the contemporary visitor, who is the subject of the ped-agogic mission of the museum. Images of the events that generate psychological and other trauma, then, are commonplace in memorial museums. In order to educate through history, the museums often use photographic representations to confront atrocity that can make one uncomfortable; as Paul Williams wrote, "there is a close connec-tion between the theory of trauma and the visual aesthetic of shock," which are closely related.[4] The use of such images and photographs in museums associated with the Holocaust has been well described, most especially by Marianne Hirsch and Barbie Zelizer.[5] Memorial museums often focus less on material objects and more on evoking the experience of the event. This emphasis challenges artists and curators to "remember" an event they never experienced, with the requirement that memory must be passed on to generations who similarly never experienced the event. As James Young wrote, memory and history become intertwined with neither being exclusive of the other; there is no "zero-sum game" here.[6] The result is a blending of historical fact, representative art, and concepts about culture that come together in what Young called a kind of "memorial code" for how to properly repre-sent that past. While this might be most prominent in Germany, where the code must include apologies, as the previous chapter demonstrates the division between representing apology and representing victimiza-tion is not always entirely clear. So memory, history, and Jewish culture get put together in spaces that represent the history of the Jews and the Holocaust in contemporary Europe, and in many cases parallel con-cepts can be seen across national borders.

Paul Williams focused on one manifestation of the sort of place where history, memory, and culture come together: the memorial museum. James Young studied more public art and memorial spaces with the same focus, arguing that public art creates shared spaces that have implications for fostering shared memories of historical and other events. In both cases, the creation of common commemorative prac-tices designates these spaces as markers of collective memory. Wil-liams argued that memorial museums are designed to commemorate tragedy, memorializing the past in terms of evoking remembrance of an event and also serving as a museum, with a more preservationist and educational focus.[7] The proliferation of Holocaust museums and memorials, especially in capital cities of Europe, has been a signifi-cant part of the changing landscape since the 1980s. There, humans have created places not to celebrate national identity as in the past but

to recall absences, violence, and so on with the aim of helping society work through the past. In terms of Holocaust education, the first public space was Yad Vashem, created in Israel in 1953 as a center for research and documentation on the Holocaust. Gradually, monuments commemorating individuals and moments in the history of the Holocaust were built on the Jerusalem site, and a museum of Holocaust history was initiated. Similarly in France, the Centre de documentation juive contemparaine was created in Grenoble during the Second World War, in 1943, to document the deportation and murder of French Jews in the Holocaust. The group assisted with providing documentation to French prosecutors during the postwar International Military Tribunal in Nuremberg, Germany. By 1962, the research center was prominent enough to push for a memorial to the deportation of French Jews, built by the French government and inaugurated by French president Charles de Gaulle in Paris in 1962. In Amsterdam, the Anne Frank House was created in 1957 to protect the space that the teenager and her family hid in during the war, until captured in 1944. Her diary, published in 1947 for the first time, was very successful in personalizing the Holocaust to many generations of readers, especially in schools, where it was prominent by the 1970s. The museum there was opened in 1960 and over nine thousand visited in the first year; now over one million people visit in a given year.

These spaces were important early markers of Holocaust commemoration in a transnational manner, in the sense that many of the same themes and approaches were used in different national contexts and in the sense that the Holocaust was represented as an event that occurred across national boundaries. Many of these spaces would fit well within Williams's definition of a memorial museum. Since the 1980s and 1990s, this trend has only increased. In Hungary, the new democratic government created a Holocaust museum in 1999, which was built in 2002 under the design of famed architect Frank Gehry. As with other memorial museums, it includes a distinct space for commemoration—a glass enclosure called the Tower of Lost Communities opened in 2007 and records the names of 1,441 communities in Hungary that lost Jews in the Holocaust. Soon enough, such national memorial museums were joined by other sites, some national, many of a local or regional nature, that similarly combined commemoration and memorial aspects with focuses on education and preservation. Many of these were in the renovated exhibits and spaces of former concentration and death camp sites that proliferated across central and eastern Europe as Communism fell

in 1989 and 1990. In this view, telling the story of the Holocaust and rep-
licating commemorative practices at sites in different countries directly
related to the Holocaust can be seen in many spaces.

A second important change in the period from the 1990s on was
the merger of Jewish culture, Jewish heritage, and Holocaust history
as portrayed in a number of sites across Europe with again an empha-
sis on eastern European space. Stories of a nation's history have been
adapted to demonstrate to visitors that the loss of Jewish culture as a
result of the Holocaust destroyed something that previously had been a
contributor to the national heritage (and hence pride) of countries like
Hungary and Poland. While these concepts are not without contesta-
tion, given the histories of anti-Semitism in these same places, they
nonetheless are striking in the public spaces that link Jewish culture,
its rich contribution to nations before the Second World War, and the
subsequent loss to countries because of the Holocaust. What is the
impetus for making such connections and thinking about Jewish cul-
ture and the Holocaust together, instead of separately, across Europe as
a whole?

NEW TRENDS: COSMOPOLITAN MEMORY ON THE GROUND

In the last ten years of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first,
the creation of many other memorials and memorial spaces that doc-
ument how open the Holocaust was, how bystanders knew full well
what was going on, and how common it would have been for Europe-
ans to experience the Holocaust in some way have proliferated. This is
especially true in Berlin, which went through its own massive urban
renewal after German reunification in 1990, a process still ongoing.
Almost all new construction in Berlin after 1990 occurred in the for-
mer East Berlin, and many prominent Holocaust spaces were included.
One example is Bebelplatz, the site that commemorates the Nazi orga-
nized book burning of writings deemed to be a threat to Nazi ideology
by Communists, Jews, those who glorified the Weimar Republic, and
others. Some twenty thousand books were burned at the site, across
from Humboldt University, by a Nazi student organization on May 10,
1933. Plans to commemorate the site were underway under the former
East German regime, were then delayed by the reunification of Ger-
many, and finally realized in 1995 when a sculpture of a library with
empty shelves opened under the square, visible to visitors through a
small window in the ground. At the site, Heinrich Heine's 1820 phrase
is there: "Where they burn books, they burn in the end people."

A similar smaller memorial in Berlin that emerged at the end of the German Democratic Republic was the memorial at Koppenplatz, planned in 1988 and erected in 1996. Meant to commemorate the night of November 9 and 10, 1938, when Nazi activists across Germany attacked Jewish synagogues and businesses in what is known as the night of the pogrom (*Pogromnacht*), it consists simply of a sculpture of a table and two chairs, one knocked over, designed by artist Karl Biedermann. A nearby house commemorates the former Jewish owners, with a family tree that depicts those killed in the Holocaust from the family.

Even in local memorials like Koppenplatz, we find traces of cosmopolitan memory. In Krakow, Poland, the image of the abandoned chair is used again by artists Piotr Leewicki and Kazimierz Latak at the square where deportees from the Krakow ghetto were gathered before being deported to the Belzec death camp in 1942 and to Auschwitz-Birkenau in 1943. Thirty-three steel and cast-iron chairs of one height and thirty-seven smaller ones sit around the square and into the nearby tram and bus stops still used today, provoking citizens to at least acknowledge the memorial. The idea that the empty chairs represent the disruption that accompanied the Holocaust can be seen here as a sign of similar commemorative practices across national borders. We can see how local contexts, commemorating local events, get cast in the light of the larger history of the Holocaust, a history that all sites acknowledge occurred on a continental-wide scale. Visitors can observe and reflect or sit in the chairs and reflect the meaning behind the site, encouraging interaction with the past.

Other memorials across Europe, at the local level as opposed to national, similarly try to evoke both the disruption to regular Jewish lives and emphasize to visitors how open and apparent the process of the Holocaust was to non-Jews. The Bavarian Quarter of Berlin's Schöneberg district, as home to more than sixteen thousand Jews, was a center of Jewish life in the city before the rise of the Nazis to power. The artists Renata Stih and Friederich Schnock created the Bavarian Quarter memorial entitled Places of Remembrance in June 1993, at the bequest of the neighborhood Rathaus and the Berlin senate. The memorial is not actually a memorial but rather an outdoor installation of eighty permanent signs spread over a number of city blocks. Each sign contains a colorful picture on one side and an excerpt of a Nazi law limiting Jewish rights and Jewish participation in daily life on the other, based on legislation decreed between 1933 and 1943. For example, one sign depicts a picture of a chessboard, and the other side outlines the

1933 decree that banned Jews from membership in the German Chess
Federation. The artists made a deliberate decision to write the text in
the present tense. Three maps in the neighborhood display the loca-
tions of all eighty signs and collect all of them in one place where they
can be viewed together. Many scholars have contrasted this memorial
with the national Memorial to the Murdered Jews in Europe, empha-
sizing the difference between a colossal city block memorial with one
integrated into a neighborhood, a centralized one with a decentralized
one, a national one with a local one.

A similar analysis has been applied to probably the most promi-
nent of Germany's smaller, localized memorials, the *stolpersteine*, or
stumbling stones, small squares embedded in the sidewalk that doc-
ument the former residences of deported Jews. Artist Gunter Demnig
initiated the stolpersteine project in 1993—actually to commemorate
the deportation of Sinta and Roma residents from Cologne—but it soon
came to represent the deportation of Jews across Germany (fig. 8.1).
The first stone appeared in Berlin, in the Kreuzberg neighborhood in
1997. Now over 610 towns and cities in Germany, Austria, Belgium, the
Czech Republic, Hungary, the Netherlands, Norway, and the Ukraine
have stolpersteines. Each four-by-four-inch stone contains the individ-
ual's name, birthdate, date of deportation, and date of death, if known.
Some indicate if a victim survived. Individuals pay for the stones and

Figure 8.1. "Stumbling blocks" (stolpersteine) at Konstanz, Germany. Plates inscribed
with the names and birthdates of victims of Nazi extermination or persecution. Photo
by iStock/Lerner Vadim.

secure municipal approval for their placement. In this case, both the scale and the initiative needed to make a memorial are locally and personally driven, bringing commemoration to a level that any citizen can interact with. This is in many ways in opposition to the idea of a centralized, national memorial, and it indicates that in addition to the common patterns apparent in memorial museums and central memorials across Europe, one can also find cosmopolitan patterns at the local level. Instead of turning a visit to a Holocaust memorial or concentration camp site into some kind of pilgrimage, the local monument, and especially the stolpersteine, is literally meant to be stumbled upon as one goes about their daily life. Naturally, these are not without controversy. In the town of Villingen, Germany, the city council opposed placing the stones in memory of the nineteen Jews who died in the Holocaust because of the fear that those residents who now live in the homes would be seen as "profiteers" of the Nazi era while others argued simply that the towns should not dwell too much on the past.

Outside of Germany, many similar projects also exist to localize the history of the Holocaust. This trend is directed in part by our broadening views of both the Holocaust and our increasing belief in the complicity and collaboration of Europeans at all levels, in all places, with the Nazis in order to carry out genocide. Bystanders were not neutral in the way we might first read the word, and if not direct collaborators, they were nonetheless a part of the process that allowed the Holocaust to happen. Within three hundred yards of the Hungarian parliament is the memorial Shoes on the Danube Bank, which commemorates the work of the Arrow Cross, Hungary's Fascist Party that ruled from March 1944 to March 1945, the party that came to power in a Nazi-assisted coup and then welcomed the SS in to deport over 440,000 Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz in a matter of months. In December 1944 and January 1945, many Jews rounded up by the Arrow Cross in Budapest were not sent to Auschwitz but simply shot into the Danube River. The bronzed shoes that now stand on the riverbank commemorate their murders and the sheer violence of the Holocaust there and serve as a reminder that the Nazis relied on local participation to make the Holocaust happen.

In Vienna, once a center of Jewish life in Europe, British artist Rachel Whiteread created the memorial in Judenplatz that is often referred to as the nameless library; it is a solid block that looks like a library, with the spines of books facing out into the square. However, the books are unreadable for the spines are nameless and they cannot

be removed, and the door to the building does not open. The memorial is an excellent example of a space meant to portray loss for it expresses the sentiment of the knowledge and contribution of Jews to Austrian life that is now forever gone. At the edge of this centrally located square, there is the Judenplatz Museum, which opened in 2000, shortly after the memorial was built, that features holograms and other virtual means to tell the history of the Jews in the region, from the fourteenth century on. Whitehead's closed library expresses a real sense of loss, a loss unable to be recovered, a loss that is cultural because of the cultural contributions of Jews to Austrian life. It leads the viewer to ask, how would Vienna's and Austria's history be different if the nearly sixty-five thousand Jews killed had been there after the war. This sense is added to by the presence of the museum, which tells the story of the Jewish influence over Viennese and Austrian life from the Middle Ages until the *Anschluss* that merged Germany and Austria under Hitler's rule in March 1938. What is behind the implications made in the Judenplatz space, behind the idea of refocusing the memory of the Holocaust to thinking about the loss of what could have been? The same questions arise in Budapest, where the restored great synagogue serves mostly as a museum to tell the history of Jews in Hungary and in the city itself. Yet, as one walks from the building back into the courtyard, one passes remnant gravestones from the Jewish cemetery attacked by Nazis and the Arrow Cross in 1944, and one emerges into a courtyard that holds the moving sculpture known as the Weeping Tree, a metal depiction of a tree on which all the branches have the family names of Hungarian Jews murdered in the Holocaust.

JEWISH CULTURE AND HERITAGE, LOSS, AND RETHINKING NATIONAL PASTS

The juxtaposition in Vienna and Budapest of a Holocaust memorial and a museum commemorating broader Jewish life and culture raises interesting questions. Should the history of Jews in Europe always be linked to the horrors of the Holocaust? Can we consider Jewish history and culture and its significance to the national histories of so many European countries on its own? Or is this now impossible?

Ruth Gruber asked these same questions with regard to broader themes of heritage, history, and memory. She noted that with the growing emphasis on Holocaust sites across Europe from the 1970s and 1980s, there also was growing interest in the longer history of Jews in Europe and a common interest in heritage tourism.[8] Examples of this include

tourist guidebooks for Jewish sites, "roots" tours for family heritage, and the activism of Jewish communities in places like France looking for new tourist niches and therefore reaching out to local and national tourist boards and similar groups. This process was even more intense in post-Communist eastern Europe in the 1990s; there, just as Holocaust sites were being revived, rediscovered, or uncovered for the first time, there was a similar interest in broader sites of Jewish culture and heritage, embraced by local tourist agencies and government officials in part to appeal to the outside world as societies that overcame not only Communism but traditions of ant-Semitism and to show that they embraced their Jewish past. This was especially the case in Poland, for example.

However, and especially in eastern Europe, such a rediscovery of Jewish culture often came without the input of Jews themselves. Given the absence of contemporary Jewish culture or Jews in these regions, Gruber asked can or should a Jewish heritage site or Jewish museum be treated the same way as any other tourist attraction, or does it require a link to the Holocaust and the memory of that tragedy?[9] This was apparent in Berlin, where Daniel Liebskind's Museum of Jewish History is housed in a space full of voids and ruptures architecturally that are meant to represent the impossibility of avoiding the Holocaust even while celebrating the long history of Jews in central Europe. Yet also in Berlin, amid all the Holocaust memorials and sites, only seven of the some one hundred synagogues that existed before 1938 have been restored as of 2012. In Poland, Polin: The Museum of the History of Polish Jews, opened in 2013 in Warsaw (fig. 8.2) and sits right next to the Warsaw Uprising Monument, which itself was created in 1948. Thus, the juxtaposition of educating Poles and others about one thousand years of Jewish history cannot avoid the Holocaust; indeed, the museum's website links the two by stating: "Our focus is on life, therefore at each stage of the journey we strive to remain close to life by letting people speak—Jewish merchants, scholars or artists from a given era, rabbis, housewives, politicians, chroniclers and revolutionaries. We give the floor to those who perished and to those who survived."[10] The impossibility of discussing life without mentioning those who perished raises questions about how one can foster an understanding and appreciation of Jewish heritage in a country that, more or less, has no Jews. We often associate the development of cultural and collective memory with memory actors who have a stake in the past that they want to develop, such as minority groups who advocate for commemorations and museums depicting their group's role in the nation. Here, we have

Figure 8.2. Polin: Museum of the History of Polish Jews, Warsaw, Poland. Designed by Rainer Mahlamäki. Photo by iStock/Piotrbb.

something somewhat different, for the past being remembered and evoked is not representative of the present. However, there is a value being given to this lost past by society or at least by the elites who create museums and other spaces such as the Polin museum. This is not without difficulty. Some have argued that the celebration of Jewish culture in Polin and other spaces evokes a cultural memory of solidarity between Polish citizens and the Jewish population in the time of the Holocaust, when in fact history shows that such episodes of solidarity were few.[11] Here the minority's history is constructed by the majority.

This has been the case since the end of the Second World War in 1945. As Michael Meng wrote, specifically about Jewish sites in Poland and Germany, "the postwar history of Jewish sites is, at its core, about non-Jewish Germans and Poles encountering the material traces of Jewish life in the wake of genocide and ethnic hatred."[12] The result is that Jewish heritage and Holocaust history have become intertwined in a transnational and diverse way across Europe, linked to national histories in collective memory, linked to specific Jewish history in some spaces, and linked to non-Jewish history as well. Jewish cemeteries were maintained in West Germany as a result of the policy of Konrad Adenauer's government in the 1950s to compensate victims of Nazi

crimes. Yet, in Poland and most of the rest of Eastern Europe, these sites were neglected under Communism. So just what memory was preserved and celebrated is not as clear as one might like to think.

In terms of the rediscovery of Jewish history in contemporary non-Jewish spaces, the 1970s was an important turning point. From this era, a variety of local activists worked to preserve, protect, and restore Jewish sites in central Europe. Generational change was important, for as chapter 6 shows, the generation of West Germans that emerged after 1968 was more interested in the Holocaust and, by extension, the Jewish heritage and history. Similar movements were apparent in Eastern Europe. Moreover, in the aftermath of Communist Party purges of Jews in the 1950s in Poland, an interest in Jewish history became one way of expressing distance from the regime. The Polish Communist Party forced some thirteen thousand Jews to flee Poland in 1967 and 1968 but this was part of a broader anti-Zionism campaign initiated by the Soviet Union that swept Eastern Europe Communism in the late 1960s. However, the reaction within Eastern Europe following the purge was to debate the "Jewish question" and, gradually, to discuss more openly the history of Judaism in places like Poland. Many people who wanted to distance themselves from the party could do so by expressing an interest in Poland's Jewish past. In this case, however, the memory of the Jewish past was appropriated for a specific, contemporary political purpose—celebrating Judaism and its past was seen as a way to mark one's self as an opponent of the Communist regime that had just purged Jews from its ranks. Cultural and collective memory is very often driven by contemporary concerns rather than a pure desire to remember the past.

What did these movements result in? In both East and West Germany, a local monument "boom" occurred that not only included Holocaust specific sites like the Bavarian Quarter signs but also sites that commemorated Jewish heritage that were not directly associated with the Holocaust. In Potsdam, for instance, the Nazis had destroyed the synagogue in the Pogromnacht of November 1938, but its ruins remained until 1958, when the building was finally torn down. Yet in 1979, a plaque was placed on the apartment building that replaced the synagogue noting its existence on the site. Similarly, in the mid-1970s, volunteers began to attempt the cleanup of Warsaw's very large Jewish cemetery, which had been neglected since the war. This work is still ongoing into the twenty-first century. Practical results have emerged from these initiatives, even if the motivation was not straightforward.

By the 1980s, these very decentralized and local efforts coalesced into more significant movements that garnered national attention. A number of reasons account for this. One was the general growth of interest in the Holocaust and Jewish history that brought more western tourists to eastern European countries like Poland and East Germany. In the Federal Republic of Germany, more general interest in the history of the Holocaust led to more awareness of Jewish heritage and a demand on politicians and local and national officials to work to preserve such sites. Thus, in 1991 in Hamburg, a controversy broke out when plans to build a shopping mall on part of the old Jewish cemetery were announced, resulting ultimately in changes to the construction plan. Similarly in Berlin, officials decided to finally respond to those who had asked for a Jewish museum since the 1960s, and by the mid-1980s, plans for a Jewish museum within the context of the Museum of the City of Berlin was underway.

Nowhere is the transformation of a space to commemorate Jewish culture as apparent and overt as in the Kazimierz district of Krakow, Poland. In medieval times this was a traditional area where Jews settled, although they became more dispersed throughout the city by the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Jews were forcibly removed from the area to the Krakow ghetto, across the Vistula River from the main part of town. From the end of the war through the 1980s, the district was rather dilapidated and ignored by citizens and governments alike. In the 1980s, universities in Krakow became real centers of the study of the Jewish past and its role in Poland; in 1986, a Chair of the History and the Culture of Jews was founded at Jagiellonian University there and publishing about Jewish history took off. By 1996, Jagiellonian became the host for the Polish Society of Jewish Studies. An independent nongovernmental agency that emerged after Communism fell in 1989, the Centre for Jewish Culture, built on the academic precedent established and began to program activities focused on Jewish heritage for the broader public. Simultaneously, the Jewish Cultural Festival in Krakow was created in 1988 to put on an intensive event showcasing a variety of aspects of Jewish culture, traditional and contemporary, to large audiences. All of these forces eventually led to a regeneration of the Kazimierz neighborhood, where the Jewish Cultural Festival is based. The city of Krakow has operated a museum in the district since the 1950s in an old synagogue that served as a museum of Jewish religion and culture, but its programming has been far more active and engaged since the end of Communism, and it is now seen as part of

the revival of the district. Other entities like the Centre for Jewish Culture set up offices there, and now, the Jewish Cultural Festival owns and operates a year-round café. Numerous other Jewish restaurants featuring klezmer musical entertainment and traditional Jewish cuisine exist. Bookstores and other art and cultural galleries focus on the Jewish heritage of Poland and Krakow.

On any given day, tourists flock to Kazimierz, where the Jewish past of Poland is on display. However, much of this revitalization and interest has come without the direct involvement of Jews themselves. There is an organized Jewish community in the city that operates the Tempel synagogue and maintains the old Jewish cemetery in Kazimierz, where in 2008 it also opened a new Jewish Community Center. However, before the Holocaust, some seventy thousand Jews lived in the neighborhood; today, it is below five hundred. So what inspires Jewish cultural tourism given the real absence of Jews? And what is the relationship of this tourism to the memory of the Holocaust and the Second World War? Ruth Gruber asked a number of challenging questions about this in her 2002 book, *Virtually Jewish*. Given the absence of contemporary Jewish culture or Jews in these regions, "can or should a Jewish heritage site or Jewish museum be treated the same way as any other tourist attraction"; when American Jews and others with ties to Poland in their family histories visit Kazimierz, are they different from other tourists, if they are there to "remember" not to "sightsee," does it matter?[13] And is remembering the connection that the rich cultural history that Jews have with Polish history permissible while not thinking about the Holocaust? What do you want to remember when you attend a Jewish cultural festival in a country essentially without Jews? These are important questions that go to the motives we all have when engaged in heritage tourism in the aftermath of war and genocide. As a visitor to many of these spaces in Krakow and Poland myself, I have come to learn and appreciate that Jewish history is necessary to understand Polish history. Yet, I cannot escape the fact that the history presented to me as a visitor does not involve Jews today. One cannot, in my view, appreciate the contribution of Jews to Poland without understanding what came of this contribution in the Holocaust.

One interpretation of the revival of interest in Jewish heritage in Poland has been to ask if such activities are meant more for Poles to demonstrate, as Germans have had to do before them, that they are in fact over anti-Semitism and their complicity in the Holocaust raised by books like Jan Gross's *Neighbors* that was discussed in chapter 7.

Studies of Polish attendees at klezmer concerts of the Jewish Cultural Festival see their embrace of klezmer music and Jewish heritage as proof that Poland has moved beyond the anti-Semitism of the wartime era. Easy to do, perhaps, when Jews are not around. In the broadest interpretation, Jewish Cultural Festival creator Janusz Makuch argued that by reintegrating Jews into Poland's national heritage was part of a reformation of Polish national identity. This is a most optimistic view.

There are naturally limits to such interpretations. Jennifer Jordan in her study of the urban transformation of Berlin emphasized that what is not commemorated or remembered is often just as important as what is. Although the renovation of the largest synagogue in Berlin, the Neue Synagogue, was part of the reconstruction of Berlin in the 1990s, Jordan emphasized that the sites of former synagogues in Berlin, which had been the center of Jewish life in Germany before the war, are mostly "un-places"; of the more than one hundred in use before 1938, only six remain from pre-1938, four are currently used as synagogues. While some former sites are marked, most marking efforts came from the efforts of the small Jewish community. Most of the sites of former synagogues therefore remain unmarked with plaques or any sign of commemoration. As Jordan wrote, "a city cannot in any case be made entirely into a museum or memorial. Some people have even expressed concern that the existing memorial landscape threatens to overwhelm residents (and visitors) with a kind of inflation of memory of the Nazi past, provoking indifference or even active resentment. Others express surprise that more marking has not been done."[14]

CONCLUSION

Places of memory, as discussed in the field of memory studies and in this volume, are usually thought of as sites that are meant to recall horrible crime, genocide, and violence; their intent is to help society work through the past. This chapter attempts to demonstrate that when it comes to the commemoration of Jewish heritage and the history of the Holocaust and the Nazi occupations of countries like Hungary and Poland, as well as in Germany, the process is complex. Nonetheless, many common themes appear. This is especially apparent in local sites, where concepts of complicity, popular knowledge, and local activity underline that the Holocaust happened with the involvement of hundreds of thousands of people besides Hitler and the Nazi leadership.

Another theme that is apparent across Europe is the idea that European societies are less than they were because of the loss of Jewish

heritage. This is implicit in museums like the Jewish Museum of Berlin or Polin museum. However, just as Liebskind's architecture of the Berlin museum tells the story of the great contributions of Jews to central Europe, he designed it as a space filled with voids and with an exterior that creates the impression of a scarred building. So can Jewish heritage be separated from the history of the war and the Holocaust?

Nowhere is this question more relevant than in the Kazimierz district of Krakow. Does celebrating Poland's Jewish heritage allow us to move past thinking about the Holocaust? Or does it focus on that more, forcing us to emphasize absence, Polish guilt, and the desire to move beyond the past? These questions, along with analysis that simply stresses tourism as a commercial and economic force, not a historical or memorial one, allow us to see just how intricate and complex thinking about the memory of war in twentieth-century Europe can be and how the representation of the past, whether as absence, as violent trauma, or as positive heritage, can lead us into debating which pasts are most important to pass onto future generations and which ones might indeed fade away.

Various elites and other groups direct efforts to construct memorial and museum spaces and create a memory of the past to pass on to new generations. Many of the local memory actors, the museum directors, and government officials seek to create this collective memory through such spaces. In many ways, however, they cannot control what to pass on to future generations. Yet, they do shape the themes, issues, and representations of the past and raise certain pasts above others in the choices they make in these spaces. Thus, thinking about what role Jewish culture and heritage played in different national and community histories is important but so too is remembering how those Jewish contributions were wiped out. It is better to remember both parts of this past, and necessary. But it is not easy or clear.

NINE

THE MEMORY OF COMMUNISM AND CONFLICT IN EASTERN EUROPE

When the Soviet Union under Josef Stalin emerged from the Second World War, it had one major goal in thinking about the future of the lands between it and its most recent enemy Germany: these countries were to provide the USSR with territorial security against future attacks, especially from Germany, and the best means to do so was to create, foster, and/or impose a series of pro-Soviet buffer states in Eastern Europe to accompany a weakened Germany. In many ways, such a policy represented a direct response to the deaths of well over twenty-five million Soviet citizens in the war. Having said that, ideology was not irrelevant to this policy for Stalin was a Communist, and his belief in Communist-capitalist confrontation made him suspicious of the West and of democracy, despite the fact that he had just spent four years fighting Nazi Germany alongside the United Kingdom and the United States—making up the "Big Three" of the United Nations alliance against Germany. Ideology and suspicion meant going it alone in Eastern Europe; the circumstances of the end of the war meant that the Red Army was in the capitals of almost all the Eastern European nations; and so, the creation of pro-Soviet states began even before the war ended.

In Poland, two Polish governments-in-exile had emerged over the course of the war: the London Poles supported by the British and Americans, both of whom wanted this government to work with Stalin; and the Lublin Poles, a government-in-exile dominated by Communists that Stalin had helped create in 1944 as the Red Army entered the country. When the leaders of the Big Three—Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin—met at Yalta in the Soviet Union in February 1945, Stalin argued that in Poland, and within Eastern Europe more generally, he needed governments that would be friendly to the USSR; the West countered with the argument that the war was about democracy, and free elections in these new governments must be held. However, the Allies also conceded that the USSR deserved some of the territory of what had been eastern

Poland before the war, and they also agreed that the Lublin government had a role to play in a new Poland. Thus, while Yalta was most famous for the Declaration on Liberated Europe, which advocated freedom after war in Europe, its main achievement was the understanding that the USSR would have a larger role to play in Eastern Europe than the other powers, which, ultimately, meant less democracy in these lands.

Thus in Poland, by the summer of 1945, the United States agreed that if four London Poles entered the Lublin Government, then the US government would officially recognize the majority Communist government; in Hungary, the Communist Party was legalized for the first time since the early 1920s, and they joined a coalition government, but by 1946, the Communists started antagonizing their partners in government and completely took over by 1947. In both of these cases, Eastern European countries that had previously been anti-Soviet with fairly weak Communist movements became Communist allies of the Soviet Union. Similar patterns of transformation occurred after the Second World War across Eastern Europe with the exception of Yugoslavia, where a large Communist movement under Josip Broz Tito had emerged to fight the Nazis during the war and succeeded in largely liberating Yugoslavia without the Red Army's presence. Therefore, the Communist state established there did not rely on the Soviet Union or involve Soviet armed forces.

Soon enough, the Cold War emerged as Roosevelt's successor, Harry S. Truman, came to view Soviet actions in Eastern Europe as confrontational, and Stalin gradually came to see that the greater threat to Soviet security was not Germany but rather the United States and its policies in western Europe, where economic and military assistance was given to the new democratic states there. While the Cold War was not a traditional military war as seen in the other cases examined in this book, we can see it as a war from the memory perspective of East Europeans. First, there was a clear division of alliances that were militarized by the end of the 1940s, with western European states allied with the United States in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Eastern European states with the Soviet Union in the Warsaw Pact; similarly, Germany was divided into the communist German Democratic Republic (GDR) and the liberal democratic Federal Republic of Germany (FRG). Second, and perhaps more importantly, the creation of Communist governments throughout Eastern Europe was seen as the imposition of the Soviet Union, and many Eastern Europeans would compare the experience to an occupation. In this way, then, we

can make comparisons with the occupation of the same lands by the Nazis in World War II. That such an occupation occurred amid the chaos and violence that marked the end of one war and the beginning of a new occupation reinforced the point that this can be seen as war-like, if not a formal war. Third, that imposition came in many places with a strong presence of secret police, a presence that, although per-haps never as severe as during the Stalin period, nonetheless remained in these states through the end of Communism in the 1980s. Thus, memories of the period would be centered on violence and oppression, even if these aspects of the Communist period were not as common-place as they would have been in what we might think of as a "regular" war zone. For the purposes of this chapter, memories of the imme-diate period of violence, and the subsequent creation and dominance of the secret police, are emphasized. A brief survey of those historical moments is presented, and then the memories of this period that were evoked with the end of collapse are assessed. When violence and actual war returned with the collapse of Communism in the former Yugosla-via in the 1990s, new memories linked to Communism and its after-math were made, as is discussed in chapter 10.

IMPOSING STALINISM AND THE SECRET POLICE

In Poland, the imposition of a new state and its security structures began even before the war ended. In 1944 to 1945, the Red Army not only fostered the creation of the Lublin government that would even-tually become Poland's Communist rulers but also welcomed in the NKVD, the Soviet secret police. In 1944 and 1945 alone, some 120,000 Poles, many of them of Ukrainian descent, were rounded up and deported east to Gulag camps. Tens of thousands were murdered as the Red Army's occupation replaced Nazi Germany's. Almost immediately following the Warsaw uprising in August 1944, the NKVD assisted in the creation of a Polish security ministry and secret police to eliminate all non-Communist resistance organizations, and military commissars took over towns and cities.

Following the peace, Poland lost some 20 percent of its pre-1939 territory to the Soviet Union, bringing much of its Ukrainian popula-tion directly under Soviet control. Mass deportations of all ethnic Ger-mans in Poland proceeded, as they did across Eastern Europe; nearly 1.2 million Germans were forced out of Poland initially, while others were placed in holding camps. By the end of 1946, nearly 7.6 million Germans had left Poland since the end of the war, including from the

lands of eastern Germany that now formed western Poland. Timothy Snyder, in his work *Bloodlands*, claimed that the ethnic cleansing of Germans, as well as the takeover of new territory in the west, was popular and thus bound Poles to the Communist regime that had, in conjunction with the Red Army, carried out such work.[1] The evidence that Communism took over Poland following the deportations of 1945 and 1946 is clear. Membership in the Polish Worker's Party (PPR) increased as Communists took over the government, although opposition parties and movements still legally existed. By 1946, only the Socialist and Labor Parties remained legal alongside the PPR, and the PPR was declared victors in a fairly fraudulent election in June of that year. Soon enough, the party was renamed the Polish United Workers Party (PZPR) and consumed the other two political movements.

However, the sense that Poland was itself under another occupation cannot be dismissed. As Red Army troops entered western Poland in 1945, an area with a significant German population, soldiers raped German and Polish women en masse. The wholesale removal of industrial plants and machinery as reparations followed the immediate end of the war. Ethnic Ukrainians under Polish rule were forcibly resettled to other parts of Poland in 1947, with some 140,000 sent to the west and north to replace the deported German population, and an effort to "polonize" them began. Communist Poland and the USSR changed the makeup of the entire population of Poland's border regions through force and terror.

Simultaneously, prosecutions of those affiliated with the Home Army in World War II increased as the Communists sought to eliminate all opposition or potential opposition. In July 1944, the Soviet Union sent some twelve thousand secret police affiliated with the NKVD to Poland in order to pursue elements of the Home Army, and in their first two weeks, they arrested some six thousand members. While the Soviets were busy moving Germans and Ukrainians, some thirty-eight thousand Poles were also arrested from January to April 1945, and all were sent to prison camps inside the USSR.[2] In 1945, a so-called Trial of the Sixteen was held in Moscow in June, where sixteen leaders of the Home Army and Poland's wartime government-in-exile were put on trial for treason. They had been invited to Moscow to participate in discussions about the future of Poland, but upon arrival, they were arrested. During the trial, their defense that they should stand trial in a Polish court was ignored, and it might be argued that it would not have helped since the Lublin Communist government in Poland began remodeling the Polish

judicial system along Soviet lines as early as August 1944. In 1946, the government created the Supreme People's Tribunal to try all war crimes, treason, and crimes against humanity. These laws and this court would be used to try those accused of failing to defend Poland in 1939, a common charge for former leaders of the Home Army resistance, which had its origins in the prewar Polish military.

The new Soviet zone of influence was imposed with violence by the Red Army and the NKVD and also through the Eastern European Communist Parties and their entities. In East Germany, some 150,000 were arrested and held in special camps, which often were former Nazi concentration camps renovated by the Soviets, such as at Sachsenhausen and Buchenwald. Approximately one-third of these people died in custody between 1945 and 1953. While certainly former Nazis were the focus of the Soviet roundup, as part of denazification of East Germany, many who were viewed with suspicion were not Nazi leaders.

Similarly in Hungary, under the pretext of looking for Germans, some 140,000 to 200,000 Hungarians with Fascist pasts, German ethnicity, or German-sounding names were arrested by the NKVD in Hungary and deported to prison camps in the Soviet Union after 1945. Sixteen internment camps holding 23,000 were built in the vicinity of Budapest, and they held both German Fascist collaborators and anti-Fascist, anti-Soviet activists.[3] Czechoslovakia, the last major Eastern European state to turn Communist, with a coup in February 1948, soon witnessed trials such as that of Gen. Helidor Píka, deputy chief of the general staff of the Czechoslovak army after the war. He was arrested in May 1948 and put on trial for treason; he was found guilty and executed in 1949. His interrogators from the Army Security Intelligence Office (OBZ) were all trained in Moscow by the NKVD and adopted their techniques; it is unclear if Soviet interrogators actually participated in Píka's case. However, by 1952, when Rudolf Slánský was tried by the Czechoslovak government as part of a general trend to purge Jews from Communist Parties across Eastern Europe, Soviet police worked directly with their Czechoslovak counterparts.

Meanwhile in the German Democratic Republic, the creation of police was a radical process for over 90 percent of new police came from outside the profession to break any ties to Nazism. However, their training was guided by Soviet officials, and they were treated suspiciously by the population, which only increased their reliance on Soviet advisors and the Red Army, which remained in place. Thus, the East German

police were quickly Sovietized. One of the jobs of this new police force was to safeguard industrial equipment and material that the Soviets planned to ship back to the USSR. The secret police were completely in the hands of the Soviets, who arrested some one hundred thousand from May to October 1945. When the East Germans got their own Ministry for State Security, better known as the Stasi, in 1950, it was populated by hundreds of former Soviet agents and almost all instructors of new agents were Soviet, creating, in essence, a kind of dual loyalty to both the East German Communist Party, the SED, and to the USSR and its secret police.[4]

In the creation of new Communist governments throughout Eastern Europe, the Red Army and Communist activity was joined with political manipulation, the imposition of a new legal system, and the creation of secret police modeled on the Soviet experience. Violence and arrests of suspected opponents, with or without ties to previous Fascist and collaborationist regimes, was widespread. Ethnic cleansing and forced population movements, mostly against Germans but also against Ukrainians and others, accompanied the creation of new Communist regimes. The presence of Soviet officials was very apparent across the region. In many ways, then, the idea that Communism was not locally generated but rather was imposed in the form of an occupation was a logical conclusion for many in the general population. This sense of imposition would have implications for the memory of Communism to come, even when these places were not engaged in what the rest of this book has examined, direct warfare.

REBELLIONS AND REIMPOSITION OF SOVIET POWER

When local challenges to the Soviet model arose, even after the death of Stalin and the loosening of Soviet control that came with that, and especially under Nikita Khruschev's rule from 1953 to 1964, reminders of just how and where the Soviets were willing to impose their presence emerged, thus never completely eliminating the sense of an occupation. Most significant here were the popular uprisings in East Berlin in June 1953, Hungary in October and November 1956, and Prague in the summer of 1968, as well as throughout Poland in 1980 and 1981 during the Solidarity era.

The key event that changed everything was the death of Joseph Stalin in March 1953. Eastern Europe welcomed the death of Stalin for many saw it as a sign that there would be less control from Moscow in terms of how Communism would rule. Thus throughout 1953 to 1954, workers

across Eastern Europe went on small-scale strikes as a sign of pent-up frustration with Stalinism and to demonstrate hope for the future.

By May 1953, worker protests had begun in Czechoslovakia. From January 1952 through April 1953, some 280,000 East Germans crossed the border and immigrated to West Germany, protesting with their feet. Economic reasons were primary in this movement, but a reluctance to adapt to new state-sanctioned trade unions and agricultural cooperatives imposed by Stalinist planners also motivated this movement. By June 1953, protests in the GDR went from silent movement to open defiance. A major strike broke out in East Berlin on June 16; the next day marchers took to the streets en masse. Similar movements broke out across the country, and offices of both the police and the SED were attacked. In total, some 500,000 people in 373 towns and cities went on strike in East Germany on June 16 and 17; another 500,000 to 1 million participated in demonstration marches. Soviet officials in the GDR were prepared for the events of June 17, and that morning, Red Army tanks stationed in Berlin were called in to confront the crowd, and they began to shoot at protesters on major thoroughfares such as the Unter den Linden. Once again, the Soviets were not shy about using force in continuing their occupation in Eastern Europe.

Some things did change as a result of the East German uprising. Strict Stalinist policies were loosened, and national Communist Parties were allowed to diverge from one another and from the Stalinist model. The official abandonment of policies like the collectivization of agriculture was apparent in places like Poland. However, in many respects, little had changed. This became clear in the summer and fall of 1956. In Poland that year, strikes over wages and production quotas spread across the country in June, and workers' councils set up in towns and villages; student protests soon followed at universities throughout the country. Over one hundred thousand people were on strike in Poznań by mid-June, prompting the Polish army to move in and kill a number of protesters. The Polish military at the time was led by a Soviet citizen of Polish origin, and more than fifty of the army's senior officers were Soviets; the public thus saw the oppression as another sign of Soviet occupation. By autumn, the Communist Party responded to public pressure and reelected their leader Wladyslaw Gomulka, a reformer who Stalin had removed from office in 1948. Gomulka initiated a series of reforms that further lessened centralized control of the economy. Khruschev was concerned that Gomulka might make too many concessions to the Catholic Church and seek too much independence; by the

end of 1956, however, the two had reached an agreement: Poland had greater independence in economic and religious matters but in return increased its trade with the USSR.

In Hungary, things would not work out as well. Also in 1956, reformer Imre Nagy came to power there. He had previously held leadership positions, was removed in 1955, but returned in October 1956 as the head of a mass movement demanding change within the Communist Party. That movement included some five thousand students in Budapest creating a new, non-Communist League of Working Youth meant to challenge the dominance of the party in organizing the population. As Nagy was named premier on October 24, 1956, he said he had no objection to Soviet troops in Budapest, and this forced the protesters in the street to turn against him, joined by large segments of the Hungarian army and thousands upon thousands of members of the general population. Some eight thousand political prisoners were released. By October 30, Nagy formally asked the Red Army to leave and proposed a coalition government and the end of a one-party state. Then on November 1, he raised the possibility of Hungary leaving the Warsaw Pact and declaring neutrality in the Cold War. Not only Khruschev but many of the Communist leaders in other Eastern European countries believed this went too far, including the Polish reformer Gomulka. On November 4, 1956, some six thousand Soviet tanks entered Hungary. Confrontation with the crowds in Budapest and elsewhere was direct, and battles ensued. In the end, the Soviet forces killed three thousand people and injured another thirteen thousand; some two hundred thousand Hungarians went into exile by fleeing to Austria and beyond. Nagy was removed from office, arrested, and removed from the country. He later was returned to Hungary, tried, and executed by the secret police in June 1958; he and others killed at the time were eventually buried in a Budapest cemetery in plots closed to the public. Three hundred forty-one people were hanged between December 1956 and 1961; another twenty-six thousand were tried and twenty-two thousand of these served five years or more in prison camps.[5] Violence and oppression remained at the heart of the Communist enterprise.

There would be one more incident of a similar nature in 1968 in Czechoslovakia. There, another reformer, Alexander Dubcek, cognizant of Nagy's errors in 1956, tried to reform the Communist Party from within. Rejecting ending the alliance with the USSR or leaving the Warsaw Pact, he nonetheless attempted to build "socialism with a human face" by removing the more totalitarian elements of the

Communist regime. Thus, elections of delegates to Communist Party meetings became more open, censorship declined, and a flourishing of creative culture and political debate—but not democracy—occurred in the summer of 1968. Trade unions and farmers were given more freedom to determine their own cooperative strategies. However, Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev was concerned about the direction of Czechoslovakia, and in August, he ordered troops from the USSR and other Warsaw Pact nations to invade Czechoslovakia. Despite the defiance of crowds who came into the streets to defend Dubcek, the troops prevailed. Dubcek was arrested and replaced, and Brezhnev initiated what became known as the Brezhnev Doctrine, a policy that stated that the USSR had the right to intervene in the domestic affairs of its Eastern European allies, including through the use of force.

Most governments did not experience what Prague had. They themselves developed repressive regimes that sought to limit or even deny change just as Brezhnev did in the USSR from the 1960s through the early 1980s. In 1961, even before Brezhnev, the East German regime, with the support of the Soviet Union, decided to build a wall to keep its own citizens in. Just as they had in the 1950s, hundreds of thousands of East German citizens protested the regime by fleeing to West Germany, where they were welcomed as citizens; nearly 3.5 million left from 1949 to 1961. Thus, in August 1961, the East Berlin government started to build what was officially known as the Anti-Fascist Protection Rampart in order to keep out the West—and keep in the East Germans. Initially built in Berlin, a city divided between West and East, the wall came to eventually cover the entire east-west German border. Border guards, provided by the secret police or Stasi, were told to shoot to kill if anyone tried to cross. Some 5,000 attempted to do so from 1961 to 1989, with estimates of those shot ranging from 136 to 200. Building on the suspicion of its own citizens, the East German regime also massively expanded the Stasi, and increasingly, this organization was charged with spying within East Germany and developed an aggressive suspicion of its own citizens. Beginning first with its own agents, what was most notable about the Stasi was the fact that by the mid-1980s it had over 110,000 informants assisting the agents—this in a country of approximately 16 million. Ordinary citizens were roped into spying on their friends, families, and coworkers either through coercion or on their own accord. Informants were part and parcel of the system since the Stasi's creation in 1950 but played a major role in the organization and in the monitoring of the East German population by

the 1980s. This was not targeted surveillance of suspects brought to the police's attention but rather a more general and pervasive surveillance that underlined again a sense of occupation.

Because of the growth of secret police and state-sanctioned violence against protest such as seen in Prague in 1968, by the 1970s opposition to Communist totalitarian rule was smaller, often involving intellectual opposition in the form of writings and petitions, especially after many Eastern European nations signed the Helsinki Agreement in 1977 that included guarantees of human rights. One such example was the movement Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia, a human rights advocacy group that sought to get the nation to uphold treaties that it had already signed, such as the Helsinki Agreement. Other movements emerged within churches, Catholic in Poland, Lutheran in East Germany. The only mass movement to emerge in Eastern Europe after the Prague Spring that advocated political reform was in Poland in the form of the non-Communist trade union, Solidarity. In that country, the 1980 government decision to again raise food prices led to a strike in the shipyards of Gdansk: the strikers from Solidarity made twenty-one demands that went far beyond the immediate price issues to include calls for the legalization of free and non-Communist trade unions, less censorship within society, and much more. Solidarity came to be led by one of the strikers in the shipyard, Lech Walesa. As Solidarity's demands indicated, this was far more than a trade union; this widespread movement questioned the economic and political controls held by the state. It was legalized in September 1980 in the first agreement reached between the strikers and the government and soon after it had ten million members, representing a quarter of the nation's population, including one million individuals who were also members of the Communist Party. Thus, it was clear that this unprecedented call for reform resonated with many Poles and was not to be repressed by the regime. The Communist leader Edward Gierek resigned in the face of this opposition to his rule. However, all this momentum for change came to an end on December 13, 1981, when the new Communist leader Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski declared martial law. Poland's borders were sealed and five thousand Solidarity activists were arrested, and the organization was declared illegal again. By October 1982, the remnants of the union went underground as Walesa and others remained in prison. In a Christmas 1981 speech, and since the fall of Communism, Jaruzelski stated that he acted because of a Soviet threat to invade Poland, as it had Czechoslovakia and Hungary before.

While these episodes were not wars, they nonetheless brought force and violence into the daily lives of citizens, lives already structured by the imposition of regimes from outside and the presence of the secret police. In Hungary, some twenty-five thousand deaths can be attributed to the state during the Communist period, and even in Poland, some one hundred executions occurred in the aftermath of martial law.

THE END OF COMMUNISM: 1989 AND AFTER

This all changed in 1985 when Mikhail Gorbachev became the leader of the Soviet Union and instituted a series of changes meant to reform the stagnant Soviet economy and reduce Soviet military spending. Economic reform was necessary given the lack of growth since the end of the 1960s; military spending increasingly took up a large portion of the USSR's GDP in trying to keep up with the Cold War arms race with the United States, which by the mid-1980s had both a growing economy and increased military spending. Gorbachev's economic reforms, called *perestroika*, gave lower-level factory managers more leeway in decision making, including the ability to reduce the workforce if necessary. Accompanying this, Gorbachev instituted a series of reforms concerning censorship, known as *glasnost*, or openness, meant to encourage debate over different policy options. All of this was new in the USSR, and by 1989, the Soviet leader allowed free elections to the Soviet parliament to a minority of seats, reserving the majority for the Communist Party. While many believe Gorbachev never intended to rid the USSR of Communist's one party rule, the process for that was well underway and soon enough a well-organized non-Communist opposition appeared, first in the non-Russian regions of the country like Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and then in Russia itself, under the leadership of Pres. Boris Yeltsin. A failed coup by Communist military leaders against Gorbachev in August 1991 was largely defied in Russia by Yeltsin, not Gorbachev, and by December 1991, the Soviet Union itself was dissolved. Russia became its own country, as did the other regions from the Baltic to central Asia and south to the Caucuses that had made up the USSR since 1917. The Cold War was over.

In most of the Communist states of Eastern Europe, reforms that led to the end of Communism were initiated alongside Gorbachev's reforms in the Soviet Union. Those with longer traditions of reform, like Poland and Hungary, embraced change, especially after Gorbachev renounced the Brezhnev Doctrine in June 1989, removing any possibility of an invasion to halt reforms like those from the past. Both

Hungary and Poland negotiated their way out of Communism and toward free elections in 1989, working with preexisting groups like Solidarity in Poland, which had been legalized again in 1988.

In other countries, change had to be forced. One such example was East Germany, which celebrated its fortieth anniversary in October 1989 and expressed complete opposition to follow the changes its neighbors were making. However, in the months previous, thousands of East Germans began to flee into Hungary and Czechoslovakia, countries they were permitted to travel to, and in turn, those countries began to allow East Germans to exit for West Germany and Austria, giving East Germans access to the west for the first time since 1961. In the first nine months of 1989, 150,000 East Germans left, and inside East Germany, groups began to call on SED leader Erich Honecker to pursue reforms similar to those underway in Poland and Hungary. By the fall, regular Monday marches in the city of Leipzig led by a group called New Forum spread across the country. By mid-October, Honecker was forced out, but protests continued; for example, five hundred thousand marched in East Berlin on November 4. The government decided to ease travel restrictions, allowing for short visits across the borders to the west. When news of this spread, the public in Berlin went straight to the Berlin Wall and on the night of November 9 and into November 10, 1989, they breached it and stormed into West Berlin, welcomed by those on the other side. The popular dismantling of the wall that began at night and continued over the next weeks symbolized the end of Communist-controlled East Germany and, in a way, the end of the Cold War that had, in part, created the Communist-controlled east. West German chancellor Helmut Kohl, who first proposed the reunification of Germany into a single country by the end of November 1989, seized upon the shock of the event.

Some two million people crossed into West Germany the first weekend after the wall fell; with the collapse of the wall, however, the popular movement against East Germany did not end: in fact, it continued to grow, fueled by the anger of being held back, in comparison with West Germany, for so long. Such attacks included not only those who picked up Kohl's suggestion and demanded reunification but also those who wanted to reform East Germany and those who were simply frustrated with the East German regime. In January 1990, the most popular form of protest in East Germany was in attacking the headquarters of the Stasi and destroying files there on informants and targets. This act was equal parts political protest, self-preservation (in case one had

themselves been an informant), and an act of collective memory for the Stasi soon became equated with the entire regime itself in the minds of many. In the collapse of Communism, many came to equate the former regime with the secret police, many remembered Communism as the police, so attacking the secret police headquarters was a way to become anti-Communist. Already early on, then, the collective memory of the old regime as a secret police regime—and not much else—was being established.

In December 1990, the SED gave up its monopoly of power and the new chancellor, Hans Modrow, began to negotiate with opposition groups for a coalition government that would lead to elections. When those elections were held in March 1990, they became, in effect, a referendum on reunification. The winning party, the Christian Democrats, were funded in large part by Kohl's West German Christian Democratic party and advocated reunification. After their victory, negotiations ensued, and in October 1990, the German Democratic Republic disappeared as the constitution and laws of the West German Federal Republic took over. Less than a year after the regime's fortieth anniversary celebration, it was gone.

This was clearly one of the most rapid and most striking stories in the history of 1989 and 1990 and the end of the Cold War in Eastern Europe. Protests too were necessary to change the government of Czechoslovakia; in Romania, violence was required as a short civil war broke out against the supporters of Communist Party leader Nicolae Ceausescu. In the former Soviet Union, it was mostly former Communist Party leaders that emerged as the leaders in the Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia. Yet in the end, Communist regimes and the heavy hand of the Soviet Union were gone, and the 1990s became a decade focused on political and economic reconstruction and renovation, with varying results across the region, and the need to deal with the memory of the previous forty years.

MEMORY WORK: REPLACING COMMUNISM IN PUBLIC SPACE

Regardless of the nature of the regime that replaced Communist ones across Eastern Europe, one very clear focus was to remove from public spaces vestiges of the previous regime, and especially those markers that most linked the Eastern European country with Russia and the Soviet Union. Thus, one could argue that the first step in memory work was to reclaim suppressed memories of the past in the act of renaming of places that celebrated the Communist regime and/or

the Soviet Union. This was not a new phenomenon but something that happens with every political transition, for controlling commemoration of public space, like a street, is in part about creating identity and affiliation. In the case of post-Ceausescu Romania, the removal of Communist or regime-dominant names in favor of older, Christian ones and historical greater Romanian images reflected the new religious-based nationalism of the successor regime. In Budapest, changes to the cityscape were wholesale from 1985, the starting period of Communist-era reform, through the transition to the first free elections in 1990 and through the next decade, to 2001. In that period, some 1,094 new street names were introduced, which included 448 that had been used before the Communist era. The sense that Hungary had rediscovered its independence after a period of occupation and forced friendship with the Soviet Union dominated the nature of the renaming process. Not only were Communist symbols replaced, but they were replaced with names and images that celebrated Hungarian defiance and independence from all occupiers and empires, not only the Soviet one. For example, one major theme in street renaming was to celebrate the Hungarian uprising of 1956 as expressing a desire for more independence from the USSR. Another was to use the Hungarian word for freedom, *szabadság,* in naming, as well as the word *liberation.* They also renamed streets and parks in order to commemorate Hungarian struggles against the Habsburg Empire in the nineteenth century, especially the Hungarian revolt of 1848. In other cases, renaming was simpler: the Hungarian-Soviet Friendship Park in Budapest became Old Hill Park, Socialist Brigade Park became New Hill Park, and references to enforced ideology disappeared into the language of normal, apolitical living spaces. The Communist era was, of course, not forgotten, but previous suppressed memories and histories were highlighted and the Communist ones brushed aside.

There were certainly disputes in the course of this renaming process, for instance when supporters of the new conservative and right-wing political movements fought to name public spaces after Miklos Horthy, the admiral who ruled Hungary in an authoritarian fashion from 1922 to 1944 and entered into alliance with Hitler's Germany in the Second World War. In 2000, a more right-wing city council in the eleventh district of Budapest moved to rename a significant street in the district after Horthy; the main Budapest city council rejected this but did allow a smaller street in the area to be named for Horthy. Instead, the larger street retained its name, after the Hungarian composer Béla Bártok.

A second form of drastic change came in the form of the public physically assaulting Communist-era statuary across the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Again, this was nothing new, as Hungarians participating in the events of October 1956 attacked a statue of Stalin in Budapest October 23, 1956. In Eastern Europe, toppling of statues of Lenin were so widespread in the non-Russian and even Russian sections of the Soviet Union at its end that Pres. Mikhail Gorbachev called for calm and respect for Lenin statuary in October 1990. Soon enough, what began as spontaneous activities took on an organized form, and after Lithuania's election of a non-Communist government in summer 1991, the official dismantling of the statue of Lenin in the capital of Vilnius occurred on August 23, 1991.

Where statues could not be toppled, they were often repurposed. Budapest's Liberation Memorial, which the Red Army erected in 1947, was notable for its two statues of Red Army soldiers at the front, meant to commemorate the Soviet Union's liberation of Hungary from Fascism. Of course, by 1990, it represented for most the imposition of Communism by the Soviet Union. But rather than remove it, which would have been incredibly costly, it was renamed as the Freedom Statue, and the forms of the Red Army soldiers were removed; references to the USSR were similarly removed and the wording changed to reflect that the statue was now for "the memory of all those who lost their lives for the independence, freedom and happiness of Hungary." In some places, even doing this was not possible. In Treptower Park in southeast Berlin lay the graves of some seven thousand Soviet soldiers who died in the battle for Berlin in 1945, alongside a massive statue commemorating the Red Army that was built from 1946 to 1949. The property has been turned over officially to the Russian Federation, as the successor state to the Soviet Union, and it is in charge of graveyards of soldiers fallen in war. However, the iconic statue of a lone Red Army soldier that stood over the memorial space was removed in 2003 then, surprisingly, restored again in 2004. So even though the memorial remains, its continuation was not without some controversy and debate.

For the most part, new governments welcomed these physical changes to their urban geography. The former statues were reminders of enforced solidarity and alliance with the Soviet Union and the sense of occupation described above that was, for many, the history of Communism in Eastern Europe during the Cold War. In 1993, however, something unusual occurred in Budapest: there a new park was created for the express purposes of housing old Communist-era statues

for the public to visit. The open-air museum, Memento Statue Park, houses some forty sculptures that once were displayed in the prominent spaces of the city and now sit together in a park on the outskirts of town (fig. 9.1). They celebrate Lenin, Soviet-Hungarian friendship, the heroes of Hungarian Communism, and Hungarian Communists who fought in the Spanish Civil War from 1936 to 1939. The space rejects the complete or even partial forgetting of the past that renaming streets and parks and removing statues suggests, but at the same time, it does not celebrate the past, for these vestiges of Communism are isolated from the city's daily life, in their own space, no longer serving the propaganda purposes in more populated areas that they were designed for. In line with the nationalism that one sees in Hungary's renaming of streets and parks, the statue park is meant to remind Hungarians of a past where their nationalism was subsumed under forced alliance with the Soviets. The grouping together of some ten monuments to Soviet-Hungarian friendship is meant to emphasize just how forced that was. At the same time, however, the maintenance of these statues allows for an artistic appreciation of the public art that accompanied the Communist era and a desire to preserve it as an important phase in history. The statues sit alone with no more analysis than a plaque describing the artists, the title, and the year, as well as the original location of the

Figure 9.1. Statues of the Communist era in Memento Park, an open-air museum about ten kilometers southwest of Budapest, Hungary. Photo by iStock/Heracles Kritikos.

statue in Budapest. No direct judgment of the work is given to the visitor. I would argue, however, that while the appreciation of the artistry of Communism is encouraged, there is no desire in this space to celebrate the Communist past. The souvenir store that sells jokey and kitschy mugs and T-shirts makes it clear that Communism has no place in contemporary Hungary. Both the desire to preserve and dismiss the past coexist here and throughout the public spaces of Eastern Europe but in a very particular way. This happened but should not happen again.

MEMORY WORK: TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE

Beyond the transformation of Eastern Europe's public space, Eastern Europeans sought to deal with their Communist past following the transition by asserting the illegality of many Communist policies, especially those that dealt with the secret police and former leaders of the Communist state. Through the means of legislation and the courts, post-Communist governments sought to develop policies that can collectively be termed policies of transitional justice, defined broadly as the seeking of justice using the rule of law in political transition from nondemocratic to democratic societies. So how did non-Communist states come to do this? How could asserting the rule of law help bring justice to those who felt victimized by the previous regime? And what role would such justice have in shaping the popular memory of the former regimes?

In the case of Czechoslovakia and later the Czech Republic, after Slovakian independence in 1993, the answer to the question of justice was straightforward: those with close ties to the Communist era were deemed guilty until proven otherwise. The result of this was a very strict lustration law against anyone who archives showed had been a former collaborator with the secret police of the Communist era. The sanction on such individuals were clear: they could not hold public office in the new democracy. Initiated in the early 1990s under the Czechoslovakian government, the same legislation held under the Czech Republic that emerged in 1993. The result of this was an investigation into some 402,000 people from 1991 to 2001, with many being banned from office until the legislation was cast aside in 2001.

Most post-Communist states passed lustration laws at some point in the 1990s, the exception being states that did not transition into democracy but remained authoritarian non-Communist states where former Communist leaders still ruled, especially in Belarus and the former Soviet provinces of central Asia. In the many states that did

have lustration, however, none were as strict and far ranging as that of the Czech Republic. Monica Nalepa argued that the past history of the secret police mattered to how informants were treated. In the case of the Czech Republic, the secret police failed to infiltrate the opposition movements such as the previously mentioned human rights group Charter 77; thus when those opposition figures became the government in the 1990s, they could turn against those who had sought to destroy them.[6] In Slovakia, by contrast, many Slovak nationalists, who desired nothing more than the independence they achieved in 1993, joined the Communist Party as a way to influence policy. Thus, most members of the Slovak governments in the early to mid-1990s had ties to Communism. In that instance, lustration did not seem all that significant. Similarly, Nalepa argued that in Hungary and Poland lustration was delayed until the later 1990s (1994 in Hungary, 1999 in Poland) because the secret police had infiltrated opposition movements, and thus, the successors to Communism, who came from the opposition, knew they or their allies would be compromised.[7] Only after the passage of time, other examples of lustration, and a growing international expectation of transitional justice did lustration laws get passed and never were enforced as severely as in the Czech case.

In those states, rehabilitation won over lustration. In Poland, President Walesa in the early 1990s opposed any purges of police or army, and rumors that he himself may have been an informant with the secret police have never dissipated. The desire to expose and carry out some kind of purge of past accomplices with the Communist regime did not fade, despite the lack of a law such as the Czech Republic's. At the end of 2006, Stanislaw Wielgus was appointed archbishop of Warsaw, the most important religious post in Catholic Poland, but within two weeks, news reports circulated that he had been an informer for the Communist secret police from his time as a student in the 1960s through the 1980s. Moreover, at the time, he was just one of the most prominent members of the clergy to have been identified as such, despite the fact that the Polish pope John Paul II and many other church leaders had long held that the Catholic Church in Poland had been the center of moral and political opposition to Communism and had argued that the active opposition of local priests and the pope to Communism in the 1980s was at least partly responsible for the collapse of Communism there. Yet by the 2000s, journalists across Poland were revealing many cases like that of Wielgus, showing that because of the threat posed by the church, Communist agents had infiltrated

the church and developed an extensive network of informants from within, including many close friends of John Paul II. In a sense, people began to reconsider the church as a bastion of anti-Communism and saw it instead as an institution that had made a deal with the Communist regime to remain alive if it did not rock the boat. Wielgus confirmed the reports of his time as an informant and then removed his name from consideration as archbishop in January 2007.

The debate that emerged in the case of Wielgus and others centered on the question if they even had a choice to cooperate or not under the regime in the 1960s or 1970s. Did other people not do the same thing? Was he a collaborator with Communism or just someone in the position of many, many others who had to conform with the powers of the day? These questions were even more prominent in reunited Germany, where the extensive network of informants from the Stasi era became citizens of the reunified country. Indeed, in the first months after the Berlin Wall came down, even before the reunification of Germany occurred, crowds stormed the offices of the Stasi in Leipzig and Berlin, covering the Berlin office in graffiti with the phrase "Stasi Raus!" or "Stasi Out!" Some half a million records were destroyed in these attacks, by people legitimately angered at the Stasi and perhaps too by some of those over 100,000 who were Stasi informants, not to mention the some 102,000 employees of the Stasi or 175,000 former employees. How should society manage such anger in the transition to reunification?

In 1991, the German Reichstag passed legislation that created a commission for the administration of former Stasi records, more commonly known as the Gauck Commission after its first special commissioner, Joachim Gauck, a former Lutheran pastor in East Germany. The commission, at its height, employed some three thousand people in fifteen locations throughout the former East German state. Its charge was to manage the Stasi archives, disseminate material about the history of the East German police state to the general public, and decide the means of access to the files. Individuals who were victims and citizens under surveillance by the Stasi were given the privilege first to see who informed on them and what the Stasi collected on them; by 1997, some 3.4 million eastern Germans had done this. There was too, as in Czechoslovakia, a formal vetting of parliamentary and government officials, and some lost their jobs because of their roles in the Stasi. Over time, historians have been able to examine the files as well. However, privileging the victims made the process of dealing with the past of the secret police more of a personal, rather than a centralized, affair.

Trials under East German law have also occurred in Germany. Reunified Germany allowed charges to be made if a crime was clearly shown to have been against East German law; there would be no retroactive persecution for acts that may have been illegal in West Germany but not in the east. This, naturally, would exempt most of the Stasi informants and agents who spied on their fellow citizens. Thus, many of the trials held have concerned orders given to the Stasi border guards to shoot to kill when people were attempting to escape the Berlin Wall from East to West Germany. Four members of the last East German Politburo, were tried in the mid-1990s and found guilty of manslaughter for the issuance of such orders. One of those found guilty was Erich Mielke, former head of the Stasi. Other leading figures of Stasi border and espionage operations have been tried, and some 6,641 investigations into East German state crimes were launched between 1990 and 1996. Since most charges related to espionage and treason, and the German statute of limitation of such crimes is five years, there was much less activity after 1997, although charges of manslaughter and murder, kidnapping, torture, and other crimes could still be held.

The distinction in East Germany between bodily crimes, which were to be dealt with in the court system, and more indirect political actions, like being an informant, is important. Memory politics in East Germany could not only be based on revenge or justice but also had to focus on reconciliation given the situation of reunification. After all, these former East Germans were now Germans, just like those in the west, with full political rights to participate in the reunified democracy. Moreover, so many had been informants or part of the Stasi system at some point in time. A purge or trials motivated by anger over the past would inevitably tie up resources of the state for years, and to what end? Distinguishing between the majority who were drawn into the East German system, perhaps unwillingly, and who would not face any sort of punishment, and those who had committed crimes as leaders of the secret police seemed to strike a balance most people supported. Not that there have not been disagreements over the process; many Eastern Germans feel those in the west have been reluctant to prosecute because of their experience of not prosecuting many Nazi criminals after World War II. However, the primary motivator seemed to be rehabilitation not revenge. Even though many countries imposed laws to separate themselves from the Communist past by focusing on the illegality and immorality of the secret police in the aftermath of the fall of Communism in 1989, for the most part relatively few people have

been tried or gone to prison for jobs they carried out under Communist dictatorship. There are very clear limits to how far rehabilitation can extend, and the continued public naming (and shaming) of various prominent people who were informers for the secret police in many states, even twenty years after 1989, indicates that, while many do not want to see trials, they still are willing to raise questions about the past and make assessments as to how that might influence one's leadership or role in society today. The question moves away from seeing memory and justice as a legal affair involving crime but more about how choices made in the past might reflect upon someone's suitability to play a role in contemporary life.

MEMORY WORK: MUSEUMS OF THE COMMUNIST PAST

The creation of museums and public spaces meant to commemorate the Communist past and the history of oppression in now non-Communist societies has followed public discourse and debates and similarly given significant emphasis on the history of the secret police and the violent repression of non-Communist protestors by local Communists and the forces of the Soviet Union. The result is a fairly important anti-Soviet, anti-Communist, and often pronationalist bent to such sites in many countries.

One of the first major public acts following Communism's collapse in Budapest was the symbolic reburial of Imre Nagy, the leader of the country in 1956 whose proposed reforms and policies led to the Soviet invasion and ultimately to his arrest, imprisonment, and execution. The official state interpretation of Nagy after 1956 portrayed him as a traitor, although he lived on in popular memory as a nationalist whose memory was being manipulated by Soviet occupiers and their Hungarian Communist allies. This demonstrates the power of cultural memory, even when attempts to suppress it are made. Even before the former Communist government had left power in June 1989, some three hundred thousand citizens participated in his reburial, which the Communist Party now welcomed. It was clear, however, that citizens participating saw their role in the Nagy ceremony as a repudiation of Communist authority. Sandor Razc, a participant in the events of 1956, spoke at Nagy's reburial by clearly seeing the event as a repudiation of the Russian occupation, for he stated that "these coffins and our bitter lives are the result of Russian troops on our territory."[8]

Moreover, following Nagy's reburial, at the same part of the cemetery where he and the others killed during the Communist seizure

of government and in the aftermath of 1956 were buried in unmarked graves in 1961, a rejuvenation of the space was carried out. In what is now known as Plots 298 to 301 of Budapest's New Public Cemetery, bodies were exhumed and the site prepared as a public memorial and burial ground. Nagy, now in his own marked grave, and 260 others in unmarked graves, now lay in a field replete with the symbols of traditional Hungarian burial culture, wooden posts. Many of the posts display the Hungarian flag of 1956 with the center—where the Communist Party symbol had been placed—ripped out, in a nod to the nationalistic and anti-Communist activists of that fall who had done the same thing to the flags of the time. It is still a distant site, far from the city center and a good two mile walk into the cemetery, but it is nonetheless a striking place of nationalistic martyrdom that is meant to evoke thoughts of oppression and occupation when thinking about Hungary's past and the Communist era in particular. Indeed, by October 1989, Communism was replaced by a new republic in Hungary, and a new statue of Nagy facing parliament was erected in Martyrs' Square in 1996, again linking him (despite being a Communist Party member) to the idea of Hungarian nationalism and independence in the face of Soviet Communist oppression.

A similar space in Budapest is at 60 Andrassy Street, the site of both the Arrow Cross (Fascist) secret police in 1944 and 1945 and then the Soviet and Hungarian secret police from 1945 through the 1980s (fig. 9.2). The first rooms document the Arrow Cross's anti-Semitism and collaboration with the Nazis in the last years of the war, years that saw the deportation and murder of over 440,000 Hungarian Jews. The majority of the museum, however, centers on the era of Communist rule and the Communist secret police, who also used the building. Created in 2002 by the center-right government then in power led by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, the museum depicts not only the actions of the Communist secret police but also the propaganda associated with the Communist era and other aspects of life during that time. The implication, then, is that all of the Communist period, was linked to the secret police. There is an extensive and detailed history of the repression of those associated with the rising of 1956. However, there are also some presentations of the past that raise questions. It is unclear, for instance, who was Hungarian and who was Soviet. Orbán, in opening the museum, stated that Hungarians did not create Communism or Fascism, but rather that these movements were brought in by outsiders. As a result, the sense the museum gives is that the secret

Figure 9.2. House of Terror museum in central Budapest, Hungary. The former SS and KGB headquarters have been converted into a museum and memorial to those killed during the Cold War. Photo by iStock/T.Slack.

police and their repressive efforts were Soviet and that the victims were Hungarian. While aspects of this are true, of course Hungarians also were active in the Communist Party and in the secret police. The result is that the museum creates an impression that the Communist era is not remembered as a period of Hungarian history but rather as an era that primarily was about an occupation from the outside, from the Soviet Union. While certainly there is no doubt that Hungarians suffered from the secret police and the secret police were sponsored and trained by the Soviet Union, which also coordinated their activities, it is memory tilted in a single direction, suggesting all of Communism ultimately must be seen through the lens of the police and through the lens of Soviet occupation. In many ways, this is just a more dramatic means of emphasizing occupation and repression that is apparent throughout post-Communist eastern Europe, but one that, unlike in the Czech Republic or the former East Germany, moves Hungarians further away from any responsibility for the era. In creating such a message, the museum seeks to shape the cultural memory of Communism in Hungary away from blaming Hungarians. The fact that Imre Nagy was indeed a Communist, albeit one opposed to Soviet control, is neglected or at least "problematic."[9] The construction of Hungarian

cultural memory of the Communist period as one completely imposed from the outside, as presented at the House of Terror museum, represents a certain conception of Hungary that certainly has aspects of truth but is not complete.

CONCLUSION

These are just some of the ways in which the Communist era has been and is being remembered in post-Communist Europe. Alongside the emphasis on justice, secret police, and Soviet occupation, there also have been remembrances of what in eastern Germany came to be called *Ostalgie*, or a nostalgic remembrance of the Communist past; this is most evident at the privately run DDR Museum in Berlin that largely is a collection of former consumer products from the East German past. The continuation of small but not negligible Communist or left-leaning parties in the region is another way to measure the memory of the past. Cultural memory is not monolithic, even when one regime is replaced by a completely different one. In places that never have fully democratized, especially in Russia into central Asia, political dynamics create a very different set of memory politics. Nonetheless, the common existence of a focus on Soviet occupation and the role of the secret police in society have shaped the dynamics of memory in a similar manner across multiple states now entering their third decade of post-Communist life.

TEN

WAR, VIOLENCE, AND MEMORY RETURN
The Collapse of Yugoslavia and the War in Bosnia

Despite the fact that much of eastern Europe transitioned from Cold War Communism to democracy through peaceful means, the period of 1989 through the early 1990s did see violence in brief periods, such as in Romania and parts of the former Soviet Union. In none of these cases, however, was there outright war. Indeed, as was argued in chapter 9, eastern Europe's memory of the Communist period was framed with ideas of war and occupation although the history was not exactly in these terms as it was, for example, in World War II. However, war, occupation, and war crimes did emerge in the 1990s from the transition from Communism in one country, Yugoslavia, which broke into many more countries by the end of the decade. The freshness and brutality of this violence still mark the region today as it remembers that period.

WAR, PEACE, AND DISSOLUTION IN YUGOSLAVIA

Yugoslavia came into being in the aftermath of war, the First World War, and war continued to shape its history throughout the twentieth century. The country itself was created on December 1, 1918, as the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, popularly called Yugoslavia (and officially Yugoslavia after 1929), as a successor state to the Austro-Hungarian Empire that had ruled parts of this land since the occupation of Serbia in 1686, combined with smaller states that had gained their independence in the nineteenth century. Moreover, the victorious powers of the First World War believed that since Serbs, Croats, and other were close ethnically and linguistically that the union made sense. The union of Serbs and Croats had actually taken place through acts of both groups immediately following the armistice that ended the war in 1918.

By the time of World War II, Yugoslavia was a neutral state that attempted to balance itself between the emerging Axis powers, including its neighbor Italy and the western powers like France and Great

Britain. It signed a nonaggression treaty with Italy and a treaty of friendship with France. However, within Yugoslavia, there were nationalist Fascist movements in Croatia, known as the Ustaše, and pro-Western movements that were strong in Serbia. So, tensions between Serbia and Croatia within the federation grew as the war loomed.

After France was defeated in June 1940, and Britain stood alone against the Axis, Prince Paul of Yugoslavia sought accommodation with Hitler and Mussolini, even after Italy invaded Yugoslavia's neighbor to the south, Albania, in April 1939 and then Greece in October 1940. At the same time, however, the government sought ties to the British through secret negotiations. These did not result in any practical agreements, prompting Yugoslavia to officially join the Axis powers in war against Britain in March 1941. Pro-Western elements of the military responded by staging a coup d'état against the prince, and on April 6, 1941, German, Italian, and Hungarian forces invaded the country in order to maintain its status as an Axis ally. The army attempted to fight back, but the battle was short, and as a result of the Axis victory, Yugoslavia was dismembered. Germany annexed Slovenia, due south of Austria, which the Nazis had annexed in 1938. Direct occupation of most of Serbia by German forces was initiated in the manner in which German occupation occurred elsewhere across Europe. In Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Ustaše were given control of a new independent state, closely aligned with the Nazis. Italy occupied Kosovo and parts of Croatian Dalmatia and Montenegro, and Hungary occupied a small part of northern Serbia. Bulgaria took over Macedonia and small parts of eastern Serbia.

Two armed resistance movements emerged in Yugoslavia to push back against the occupation. The first of these was the Chetnik movement that was almost entirely Serbian; most of its supporters moved toward collaboration with the occupiers by the autumn of 1941. The second group, the Partisans, was Communist led and advocated the return to a multicultural Yugoslav state. The Partisans were led by a small group of activists who had had military experience in Spain during the civil war and understood the nature of guerrilla-style war that needed to be fought against the Nazis. As Communists, they also rejected nationalism and thus had support among the many ethnic groups that constituted Yugoslavia, unlike the Chetniks that were almost entirely Serbian. The Communist uprising against the occupation began in July 1941, but soon, there was a civil war ongoing between Chetniks and Partisans within Serbia. Over time, the Partisans defeated the Chetniks and came to take

significant amounts of territory away from the Germans and other occupiers. After Italy left the war in September 1943, the Allied powers moved to supply the Partisans with weapons and other forms of assistance; in November 1943, the Allied powers recognized the Partisan leadership under Josip Broz Tito. By 1944, the Partisans resembled a regular military force, with almost eight hundred thousand troops and four field armies. In 1944, Tito formed a coalition government with remaining Yugoslav royalists and concluded fierce battles with the retreating Germans and their Croatian allies throughout the second half of 1944 into 1945. By November 1945, the royalists were removed from the Yugoslav government, and a socialist state emerged, without the occupying forces of the Red Army. Nearly six hundred thousand Yugoslavs lost their lives fighting in battle in World War II.

The creation of the new Yugoslav state not only had to account for these losses and ferocity of the fighting but also the fact that Croatia had been ruled by a nationalistic Fascist movement of Yugoslavia, the Ustaše. Thus, a third part of the civil war within the Second World War was the fact that while the Chetniks and Partisans fought each other, as well as the Axis, they also fought the Ustaše that ruled Croatia as a semiautonomous ally of Hitler, and Croatian troops often fought alongside the Germans against Tito and the Partisans. Indeed, in Bosnia-Herzegovina and in the border regions of Croatia, the Partisan movement became much more multicultural and less Serbian, thus giving it a legitimate claim to have fought for a united Yugoslavia.

During the Ustaše's period of rule over Croatia and Bosnia, they ruled mercilessly in favor of the 3.3 million ethnic Croatians and attacked the other 3 million of its own citizens. Particularly targeted were the 40,000 Jews and 1.9 million Serbs. The confiscation of Jewish property and incarceration in concentration camps, massacres of Serbians in camps and in their own communities, and the forced deportation of another 180,000 Serbs all occurred in a three-year period following 1941. The notorious concentration camp at Jasenovac was established in August 1941 and expanded numerous times through February 1942. There Serbs, Jews, and Romanies were imprisoned, worked as slave labor, and murdered. Some 77,000 to 99,000 people were killed at Jasenovac. The Croatian regime murdered two-thirds of Croatia's Jewish population and 320,000 to 340,000 Serbs in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. The Ustaše also carried out violent attacks against the Muslim population, particularly in Bosnia, where Muslims represented the plurality of the population.

The Yugoslav state that Tito created after the Second World War celebrated the Partisan victory over the German occupation. The civil war with the Chetniks and with the Ustaše was rarely discussed. After Tito broke with the Soviet Union in the late 1940s and came to operate as a Communist state that had relations with both west and east, the fact that the Partisans ruled an Eastern European Communist state without the support of the USSR or the presence of the Red Army only created conditions that further emphasized the Partisan victory as a liberation of Yugoslavia from a foreign occupier. Another way in which the wartime experience was portrayed was as a class war, where the Fascists and Nazis represented elites and Tito the workers; thus, any massacres were those of elites against workers and peasants, not of one ethnicity against another. The cult of Tito himself aided in the postwar construction of war memory in Yugoslavia, for he was seen as a savior and protector of Yugoslavia and of Communism but most importantly of peace. In this way, ethnic hatred, genocide, and division were neglected in the propaganda of the regime. Only late in life, in 1972, did Tito acknowledge that the reality of World War II in Yugoslavia was a civil war. Over 1 million Yugoslavs died in World War II, including some 487,000 Serbs, 207,000 Croats, 86,000 Muslims, and 60,000 Jews.

The disintegration of Yugoslavia as a postwar multinational state can be traced to the death of the Tito in 1980. Tito himself was important to the construction of the postwar Communist state and to the myths of its construction, most notably the ideas of brotherhood and unity, and the forgetting of severe ethnic conflict and violence that marked the Second World War. After he was gone, for a number of reasons, the regional wings of the Communist Party in each province of the federation fell into disagreement with one another, and general debates about the role of the six federal provinces and two autonomous regions in the Yugoslav state escalated. Under Tito, the balance between centralized government and regional autonomy was maintained, but it quickly collapsed without him. The constitution of 1974, meant to create a post-Tito system, was unwieldy, granting more autonomy to the regions and rotating presidential authority. Debates over who had what constitutional authority led to increased claims to govern each regional Communist party more and more in opposition to the others. Structural weakness of the Yugoslav state was soon exploited by a new generation of Communist leaders, most notably Slobodan Milosevic in Serbia, who rose to power in 1987. Milosevic set about centralizing power and reducing the autonomy of ethnic minority groups within

Serbia, claiming that the disparate power structures of Yugoslavia hurt Serbs as an ethnic and cultural group; by early 1989, Milosevic not only was in control of the Serbian government but in control of the government in the province of Montenegro and in the autonomous regions of Kosovo and Vojvodina, all of which had significant Serbian populations. This revival of Serbian nationalism was met with a proliferation of nationalist groups advocating outright independence in Croatia, Macedonia, and Slovenia, all of whom felt Milosevic was planning to turn the Yugoslav state into a Serbian enterprise. In this way, Milosevic conflated Serbian nationalism and Yugoslavism in a way Tito had not, and the reactions of other regional leaders were to push for more autonomy and eventually secession.

Obviously, such nationalist politics had popular roots and reflected in many ways pent-up frustration with the inability to actively discuss ethnicity in the Tito years, but the structural situation and the difficult constitutional arrangements of post-Tito Yugoslavia encouraged this. Ethnic division alone was not sufficient to break up Yugoslavia. Division also was encouraged by the events that occurred across Eastern Europe in these same years, for as Communism fell in many states, the value of a Communist regime was questioned and the rise of political nationalism in all the provinces provided an alternative to the continuation of the Yugoslav state as constructed by Tito and the Partisans. By 1990, non-Communist political parties were legalized, and shortly thereafter, the Communist Party itself disbanded. In places like Serbia, former Communist leaders like Milosevic formed new parties with themselves still at the head and won elections. Milosevic claimed to want to continue Tito's idea of a unified Yugoslavia but sought significant constitutional changes that would centralize power in Belgrade and diminish the power of the provinces, leading to a Serb-dominant government; he also moved to centralize the military instead of basing it on the existing regional model. Notions of victimhood took over in the largest two provinces of Serbia and Croatia, Milosevic claiming that the system hurt Serbs, and his counterpart Franjo Tudjman in Croatia claiming that the system punished Croatia. Memory became part of the debate that occurred in the last years of the Yugoslav state, especially the memory of World War II—Serbians claimed that the Ustaše were returning in the form of Tudjman's nationalist movement, and Croats seeing Milosevic as a new era of Chetnik violence. On top of all of this, the economy worsened as Communism faded into the past and dissatisfaction with the general state of the country grew. All three

factors encouraged the movement toward nationalistic parties that increasingly advocated for either Serbian dominance, as in Milosevic's case, or independence, as in the smaller provinces like Slovenia.

In both Slovenia and Croatia, proindependence governments were elected in 1990 while Milosevic worked to mobilize Serbian populations in Croatia and Bosnia and centralize the military in order to prevent the dissolution of Yugoslavia. In March, Milosevic stated that Serbia would no longer recognize the authority of the rotating Yugoslav federal presidency, which effectively destroyed the 1974 constitution; thereafter, Serbia effectively ran the central government. Thus, on June 25, 1991, they both unilaterally declared independence from Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav army, now almost entirely Serbian, moved in first against Slovenia, leading to a number of armed skirmishes. The European community intervened, and after ten days, Slovenian independence was recognized by the government of Yugoslavia, which continued to exist, but now was primarily an ethnically Serbian country. In Croatia, war was centered in the east, while Bosnia began to divide between Serbs and Croats declaring autonomous territories and de facto separating from the existing government, a fact both Milosevic and Tudjman had agreed to in their last meetings in March. By the end of 1991, the Yugoslav (Serb) army controlled one-third of Croatia, but intervention by the United Nations in February 1992 led to a settlement that acknowledged Croatian independence; Macedonia then negotiated its independence in 1992 as well.

The war in Croatia is now known as the Homeland War, and the memory of Serbian attacks on Croatian civilians remain prominent in official and popular memory. Particularly prominent were events like the massacre of some two hundred civilians by the Yugoslav national army at Vukovar in November 1991. Indeed, in 2005, Croatian prime minister Ivo Sanader compared the suffering of Croats during the war to the suffering of Jews in the Holocaust during a visit to Israel.

WAR IN BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

Given the success of Slovenian, Croatian, and Macedonian independence, Bosnia-Herzegovina held a referendum on independence in March 1992; 65 percent of the population, primarily Muslim and Croat voted for independence; practically all of the Serbian population opposed it (one-third of the total vote). A new state was created in the capital of Sarajevo, dominated by Bosnian (Muslim) leaders. Bosnia was unique in the Yugoslav federation for the fact that nether Bosnians,

Croats, nor Serbs were a majority. Activity by Serbs and Croats to ignore the Bosnian government were already clear in 1991 and encouraged by both Milosevic and Tudjman. Thus, almost immediately following the announcement of referendum results, violence broke out between Bosnian police (Muslim for the most part) and Bosnian Serbs, and soon these attacks became a full-scale war.

In April 1992, the Bosnia Serbs had the support of the Yugoslav army and began to besiege the capital of Sarajevo; soon enough, the Yugoslav army controlled nearly 70 percent of the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The United Nations Protective Force (UNPROFOR), already deployed in neighboring Croatia following the end of that war, entered into Bosnia. UNPROFOR secured the airport at Sarajevo so medical and other relief supplies could be taken into the besieged city. Gradually, the mission of UNPROFOR expanded, moving from protection of the airport to the creation of UN safe zones along roads and in particular villages where fleeing refugees, mostly Muslim, could find security from the fighting. Even though the Yugoslav army officially withdrew, the Bosnian Serb forces were left with armaments and support from Serbia itself, and they organized themselves into the Army of the Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina; soon enough, Croatia was also involved in assisting Bosnian Croatians in their zone of the country. War and violence spread widely and the conflict in Bosnia turned into the first protracted war on European soil since the end of the Second World War.

By late 1992, Bosnian Croatians were at war with Bosnian Serbs in the southeast, while Bosnian Serbs continued their assault on the capital of Sarajevo and elsewhere. The new government of Bosnia armed its forces and sought to regain territory. Sarajevo remained under siege for the entire war, the longest siege of a single city in European history. By 1994, the war expanded again, when Bosnian and Croatian Serbs attacked the Bosnian enclave at Bihac and Croatians entered the war supporting the fledgling government of Bosnia-Herzegovina. The United States and its allies in NATO increasingly intervened in the conflict, beginning with air strikes against Bosnian Serb targets in April 1994. US pressure led to Serbia cutting off its support for the Bosnian Serbs and a four-month truce at the end of 1994. In 1995, NATO air strikes resumed, particularly after the Bosnian Serb massacre of nearly eight thousand Muslim men in Srebrenica (fig. 10.1). In August, the Croatian and Bosnian militaries launched an operation military intervened and took the two-hundred-square-mile region of Krajina and

Figure 10.1. The monument erected for the tombs of the Bosnian Muslims killed in the Srebrenica massacre and during the Bosnian War, Srebrenica, Bosnia-Herzegovina. Photo by iStock/tarihgezgini.

forced out over two hundred thousand Serbs. This action helped spur Serbia to the negotiating table, and in November 1995, the Dayton Agreement, brokered by the United States, ended the Bosnia war.

Despite the military history described above, the most notable aspect of this was the level of violence against civilian populations, violence that at the time was termed "ethnic cleansing" but that some would not be afraid to call genocide. The massacre at Srebrenica was only the most notable example. Some 97,000 to 104,000 people died or are missing as a result of the war, and the Bosnian community suffered more civilian than military losses, 33,070 civilians and 30,966 soldiers. Meanwhile Serbian losses totaled 4,075 civilians and 20,830 soldiers, and Croatian losses in Bosnia were 2,163 civilians and 5,625 soldiers.[1] Rapes by Bosnian Serb men against Muslim and Croatian women in the course of the conflict were estimated at 20,000 by a European community investigation immediately following the war, but the figure of 50,000 is more likely since more than 75 percent of those held in camps during the conflict were women and children. Moreover, rape was not simply a result of general battlefield violence and the "spoils" of war but was an organized strategy by many units to intimidate the civilians they captured and drive others from their homes so territorial control

could be established. Mass rapes of village women were thus very pub-
lic, in the effort to get the rest of the population to flee or be rounded
up into a concentration camp. This rape is not just an act of violence
but an assault on identity and independence of the broader commu-
nity. Many women were not raped in their village but in concentration
camps established to hold women and children while the men were
being murdered. There were four concentration camps in the Prijedor
region for almost the entire period of the war. At one of the most notori-
ous, Omarska, rape was regularized as part of imprisonment. Not only
did Bosnian Serbs have camps, but Bosnian Croats also had camps to
hold Bosnian Muslims, such as the one at Dretelj. Bosnians held Serbs
in camps as well. There were over 381 concentration camps in Bosnia
from 1992 to 1995.

Memory was used constantly throughout the wars in order to jus-
tify crimes against civilians. In moving on Srebrenica in 1995, Bosnian
Serb military leader Ratko Mladić referenced battles between Serbs
and Muslims going back to the Middle Ages and called the Bosnians
"Turks" in reference to the fact that it was the Ottoman Empire that
had conquered those lands in the 1300s. What was also important in
the war were constant Serbian references to the crimes of the Nazi-
affiliated Croatian Ustaše against Serbian populations in World War II.
Such references were used whether Serbs were fighting Croats or Bos-
nians, both of whom attacked Serbian civilians, and in the justification
of camps and the violence committed there. It was not uncommon for
Serb soldiers to scream either "Turkish whore" or "Ustaše whore" at the
women they raped.[2] In this way, the collective memory of crimes past
was used to justify contemporary violence. Violence fueled by memory
destroyed places like Mostar. The Yugoslav People's Army attacked this
city of one hundred thousand, dominated by Serbs, in 1992, and then
by 1993, a war between Bosnian and Croat populations within the city
broke out, which included the destruction of the historic bridge that
segregated (and untied) the two communities. Despite the opening of a
new bridge in 2004, the city to this day effectively operates as two dis-
tinct communities. In the use of past memory to justify rape or in the
memory of a destroyed bridge to justify continued segregation, we can
see how collective memory both fueled the war and how the memory of
that war continues to impact the region.

Since the end of the war, more than 12,000 corpses have been
exhumed from around 250 mass graves. The World Bank estimated the
financial damages of the war to lie between 15 to 20 billion US dollars.

Countless cultural artifacts, such as the old bridge of Mostar, the Fer-hadija Mosque in Banja Luka, and the National Library in Sarajevo were either completely destroyed or badly damaged. The total number of ref-ugees produced by the war was 2.2 million, many of whom were con-sidered internally displaced, meaning that they remained refugees in their own land. Even ten years after the war, some one hundred refugee camps remained in the vicinity of the city of Tuzla, for people who have not been allowed to return home.

The Dayton Agreement did not punish either Serbia or Croatia for their interventions in Bosnia. Indeed, there was neither a victor nor a loser in the war in the language of Dayton. It maintained the multieth-nic character of Bosnia-Herzegovina and mandated territorial division of ethnic groups and a political system that guaranteed a certain per-centage of Muslim, Serbian, and Croatian representation at all levels of power, including at the top in a tripartite kind of presidency, and considerable regional autonomy in what were now overwhelmingly single ethnicity regions of the state. So multiethnic government was maintained but one based not on multiculturalism but rather on geo-graphical divisions.

WAR CRIMES TRIALS, RAPE, RETURN, AND DIVIDED MEMORY

Dayton's creation of a multiethnic, multicentric power-sharing arrange-ment in Bosnia had implications for the immediate memory of the war. Institutionally, its implementation was to be overseen by outsiders, from NATO and UN countries as well as through organizations like the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Numer-ous nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) also arrived to assist. All in all, some fifty thousand officials and thirty-five thousand soldiers from outside were present in 1996 to help create the new Bosnia. Given that no one won or lost the war and that the settlement was being imposed from the outside, there was little reason for the different sides to change their memories of why the war occurred or how it played out, which also meant there was little reason for them to use memory for reconciliation. Every tool that could do so came from external, not internal, forces. For members of the Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian communities within Bosnia-Herzegovina, the war was the fault of the "other," crimes were committed by the "other," and territory controlled by one or another group was not to change simply because the fighting ended. The myths and memories used to justify conflict and violence were still present. In 2010, 87.4 percent of Bosnian Serbs characterized

the war of 1992 to 1995 as a civil war, whereas 96.6 percent of Muslim Bosnians considered it a Serbian assault on Bosnia-Herzegovina.[3]

As has been shown in other cases, such as Germany, war crimes trials offer societies a way to confront the past and move beyond, changing the memory of the war and its role in a nation. Even in places where collaboration with the Nazis and the commission of war crimes by non-Germans took decades to seep into the national consciousness, as in France, war crimes trials have been seen as important ways in which the memories of trauma and violence in war have been dealt with. For these reasons, among others, the international community in 1994, even before the end of the war, created a special war crimes tribunal for crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia in The Hague, the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY). More than 161 individuals were indicted by the ICTY, with 90 sentenced, 19 acquitted, 13 referred to trial in other jurisdictions, and 39 cases withdrawn before the court shut down in December 2017.[4]

The trials and coverage of the trials played a large role in establishing the immediate context in which society in Bosnia, Serbia, Croatia, and elsewhere would remember the wars that ended Yugoslavia. Placing the discussion about crimes against civilians carried out in war in a legal institution frames the way memory is presented in a very specific manner, due to the nature by which lawyers present and debate evidence. Investigators look at documents and take testimony not for the record of history, not for the overall healing of society, but rather in a way that will help them make a case. Yet, the stories that emerged from this process shape collective memory. Another way that these trials formed memory of the wars was the fact that the tribunal, its investigators, and its staff were international, not from the states involved in the conflict. For many in the Balkans, this meant that what came from the ICTY would be seen as an imposed history, an imposed memory, not a collective one. As a result, they would reject it out of hand. Related questions that all countries coming out of a period of war crimes must deal with are how long should trials go on for and when does a society move out of transition and into a new era. If one believes memory was being imposed from the outside, not only would one want to reject the stories and memories emerging from the trials but also wrap them up quickly and move on.

The trials that have been held under the ICTY's authority have done much to establish the broad extent of war crimes committed in Bosnia, Croatia, and elsewhere during the wars of the 1990s. Importantly, the

tribunal effectively demonstrated that rape in times of conflict must be considered a war crime. In 2001, the ICTY found three Serbian soldiers guilty of raping Muslim women at concentration camps in the Foca region, the first time rape in war had been categorized as a crime against humanity and a war crime.[5] It has also shown its reach in prosecuting the former leader of Serbia, Slobodan Milosevic, and other prominent political and military figures. Croatia decided to cooperate with the ICTY, despite many politicians claiming there were no war criminals in Croatia, and in 2005, a Croatian investigation discovered that Gen. Ante Gotovina was hiding in the Canary Islands and arranged his arrest and deportation to The Hague for trial. However, at the end of his trial in 2012, he was found innocent of war crimes. This was more celebrated in Croatia than any other aspect of the trials and confirmed Croatian beliefs that only the other two sides, not themselves, had committed war crimes. While the ICTY certainly has been progressive on certain legal actions, the Gotovina case demonstrates that it may not have changed memory of the war or promoted reconciliation. Selective and individual cases, natural in any court of law, can have larger implications for collective memory and not always for the right reasons.

Another aspect of memory is that despite the work of the ICTY in establishing rape as a war crime, in reality the memory of rape as a weapon of war has been limited in the eyes of the average person in Bosnia. In this way, overlooking the significance of rape as a weapon of war and its significance in the war has shaped memory in a way that goes against the legal precedent established by the court. This is not to say that people have forgotten about the past or about the extent to which rape was used as a war tactic. Rather, the absence of any specific memory or memorial concerning the importance of rape in the conflict is just as powerful as memorializing it. When women do recount their stories, they often interpret rape though the lens of ethnic identity, even if victims had prewar lives in Bosnia that were quite multiethnic in terms of their friendships, work relations, and communities. More than seeing rape then as a gendered war crime, it is seen as an ethnic one.[6] When there is no public space to discuss or debate the role of rape in the war, then, other than as something that explains ethnic division, divided memory continues and the story of mass rape gets fitted into a framework that discourages reconciliation or an emphasis on women and war in particular. Obviously, rape is still remembered and women discuss it; it is therefore a cultural memory of war but perhaps not in a way that highlights or brings attention to the role of women in conflict.

Perhaps the most significant challenge that the ICTY has faced in determining whether trials can impact the memory of the conflict is the sense among Serbs that the ICTY was, and is, anti-Serbian. In the early years of the tribunal, almost all convicted of carrying out war crimes during the Bosnia conflict came from the Bosnian Serb community, and then, the ICTY turned its attention to leaders within Serbia itself for their involvement in the Croatian and Bosnian wars. Bosnian president Biljana Plavšić, representing the Serbian community of Bosnia, promised that he would not cooperate with the ICTY in 1997. Arrest warrants for leaders like Bosnian Serb Radovan Karadzic went unheeded, and Serbian prime minister Slobodan Milosevic remained in power after Dayton until he was ousted in 2000, despite the fact many thought his leadership of Serbia led to war crimes not only by the Bosnian Serbs but by soldiers of the Yugoslav (Serbian) army as well. Television coverage of the trial's hearings did not exist in Serbia until 2001. This created a sense of resentment marked by speeches in the Serbian parliament in the early 2000s that the ICTY was an "evil" perpetrated against Serbs by the international community and that those tried were "supposed" war criminals.

Over time, however, slowly, Serbian perceptions of the ICTY have changed. Of the sixty-two trials held by 2015, sixteen have been against non-Serbs, all found guilty. In 2004, Plavšić turned himself over to the ICTY for trial. A 2003 poll was the first time more than 50 percent of Serbians stated they believed that the ICTY had the right to try former leaders of the Yugoslav army, which demonstrates that perhaps they were coming to see the trials as an important means through which to document and remember the war. In 2002, Milosevic was arrested and sent to The Hague, where he was put on trial and where he died in the middle of that trial, in 2005. In 2003, the Serbian parliament, as Bosnia and Croatia had previously done, incorporated war crimes into its legal code, which led to eight trials for war crimes under Serbian domestic law by 2008. Also in 2008, Karadzic was eventually arrested after years of hiding in Belgrade, Serbia, and taken for trial at the ICTY beginning in 2010 and found guilty of war crimes in 2016.

What seems to have been most significant in the memory of the war was the acknowledgment of Serbian guilt of the Srebrenica massacre, a specific crime that Karadzic was charged with and found guilty of genocide. An investigation led by the assembly of the Republika Srpska in 2003 to 2004 established that the Republika Srpska army murdered 7,800 Bosnian Muslims between July 10 and 19, 1995, and

that perpetrators tried to cover up their actions by moving bodies to multiple graves. On November 10, 2004, the Republika Srpska government issued a formal apology to the Bosnian population of Srebrenica. Similarly, a Research and Documentation Center was established in Sarajevo in 2004 with the mission of collecting all kinds of documents in order to tell the history of the war. This was followed by a 2005 video of the massacre and the involvement of Serbian paramilitaries shown on Serbian television that seemed to be a fundamental moment in the changing discourse of memory there. Following the screening, the Serbian prime minister Vojislav Kostunica declared that those guilty for the crime and hiding in Serbia would be arrested and sent to The Hague; this marks the time that Bosnian Serb leader Karadzic went into complete hiding and assumed another identity in Belgrade before his 2008 arrest. Similarly, the Serbian deputy prime minister Ivana Dulic-Markovic stated in 2006 that the massacre "remains on the conscience of all humanity," and press coverage of the massacre and Serbian involvement grew dramatically. By 2010, the Serbian parliament offered a resolution that came close to an apology on the basis that not everything was done to prevent the massacre, and Serbian political leaders attended the 2010 official commemoration.

Despite the evidence presented above, pushback on Srebrenica has also occurred. In 2005, just as much of the Serbian population came to accept the facts of the Srebrenica massacre, a Belgrade newspaper published a booklet titled *The Book of the Dead* that listed the names of some 3,287 Serbs from the Srebrenica region who had been killed. Moreover, while Srebrenica is raised as an issue of genocide in Bosnia, Bosnian Serbs protest that not enough time or space has been given to the genocide of Serbs by the Ustaše in World War II. Thus, a competition of which memory, which genocide, is more significant occurs in contemporary Bosnia. Thus, when it comes to the memory of war crimes, memory remains divided in Serbia. In Bosnia, memory of the war and events like Srebrenica also remain divided and contradictory. In a 2010 poll, 56 percent of Bosnians considered the ICTY trials to be fair, but only 10.4 percent of Bosnian Serbs did. Even twenty years after the war, accounts of the conflict in Muslim and Serb communities are very different. The complex nature of social, political, and ethnic division is definitely part of this but so too is the imposition of war crimes trials and memory from the outside, especially in terms of the important institutional actors.

A final area of study in measuring how the memory of the war has

changed is in the memorialization practices of different communities impacted by the war, by looking at sites. Here, the footprint of the Dayton Agreement and the reality of ethnic cleansing clash further weaken the ability to overcome divided memories of the war. Despite its geographic division of Bosnia on ethnic grounds for the purposes of government and administration, the Dayton accord also included support for the return of refugees and the internally displaced to their previous homes and villages. All refugees had the right to return to their village and reclaim their property and be compensated for property that could not be replaced. The war had seen many waves of exile and internal displacement. The first was with the Croatian war of 1991 to 1992, which created the displacement of some 600,000 individuals, 50 percent of whom never left Croatia itself; second, and largest, with the Bosnian war of 1992 to 1995, with 2.5 million displaced, 1 million internally, and 1.5 million or so outside of Bosnia; and a third, following the Dayton Peace Agreement, where large groups of Bosnian Serbs left their villages to move to Serbia, some 250,000 immediately, and probably close to 750,000 Serbs from outside of Serbia moved into Serbia from 1991 to 1995. The goal of Dayton was to move about 870,000 people back in the first year of peace and gradually accommodate everyone who wanted to return. The right of return was a unique and important development in international policy dealing with refugees and those displaced by war and a precedent in the Dayton Agreements.

By 2010, fifteen years after Dayton, 113,000 internally displaced Bosnians remained in the country but not in their homes, and some 7,000 remained in refugee camps run by the international community.[7] Efforts to return to communities after the war were often met with violence, especially in the first year of peace, 1996. Where direct violence was averted and protests ensued, it was often because armed international troops associated with NATO's peace mission separated the crowds. Over time, efforts to return home proceeded, in small numbers, and others abandoned hope.

One consequence of this has been that residency has moved away from multicultural communities to ethnocentric ones. That has a direct impact on the memorialization and the memory of the war. In the Republika Srpska, as the Bosnian Serb region of Bosnia is known, monuments to Serbian dead are often placed in Orthodox Churches, reemphasizing the rhetoric of the war of a religious as well as national struggle between Christian Serbs and Muslim or "Turkish" Bosnians. Moreover, by placing memorials to the war in churches, there is inherently no space

provided for those not part of the religious community. Commemoration for others has by necessity been low-key, away from public spaces like the churches and the squares in front of churches. More often, commemoration of non-Serbs in the Republika Srpska has been in cemeteries, where the victims of massacres are buried. Even those displaced by the war often want to bury their relatives in the villages where they lived and died. Once bodies have been identified and removed from mass graves by forensic anthropologists, individual graves are dug and reburial takes place, some fifteen or more years after the crime. In many communities, these are the only memorial sites of the war. Yet, their future is in question because after reburial the displaced leave the community. There is no longer a permanent population that could engage in reconciliation with those who remain or provide a counternarrative to a memory of the war that encourages continued division. However, in the act of reburial, even people who know they cannot return regularly to mourn, the power of memory is clear.

CONCLUSION

There are places in Bosnia today where one can see broad, public memorials to war and trauma as elsewhere in Europe. The memorial and cemetery to victims of the Srebrenica massacre holds a wall with the names of victims as well as the individual graves of those who were exhumed from the mass graves and reburied (fig. 10.2). The opening of the memorial and graveyard was in 2003, attended by former US president Bill Clinton among others. In Sarajevo, a street full of 11,541 red plastic chairs—one for every victim of the war in the city—was set up in April 2012, the twentieth anniversary of the start of the war, to memorialize this difficult history. Yet, in the city of Mostar, still divided between Muslim and Croatian populations, the best city officials could do was erect a statue of martial arts movie actor Bruce Lee in 2005 as something that would not offend either group in the community. This odd event in many ways encapsulates the difficulty of establishing a memory of the war that deals with its aftermath—the fact that violence is over, but the different ethnic and political groups that fought have been unable, in practical terms, to reconcile either in day-to-day life or in how best to remember the conflict. Memory of the war, its origins, and its crimes remains divided on ethnic lines just as the Dayton Agreement effectively changed Bosnia-Herzegovina from an integrated, multicultural society to a society of ethnic enclaves, each with their own stories, histories, and myths. While the efforts of the

Figure 10.2. Memorial of Srebrenica massacre in Bosnia-Herzegovina with gravestones in the background. Photo by iStock/Kaaca.

ICTY to account for crimes and move beyond the war have had some success, even twenty years has not seemed enough time to move toward measurable reconciliation. Perhaps, this should not surprise us, as we look at how conflicts as old as the American Civil War continue to divide society in places like the American South. However, in comparison to the way other European societies have dealt with issues such as the difficult memories of Holocaust and collaboration in the Second World War, the case of the former Yugoslavia stands out. Bosnians, Croatians, and Serbians in Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia still have very divided and different memories of this conflict. Other conflicts in the region, most especially the Kosovo War between 1999 and 2000 that pitted ethnic Albanian Kosovars against Serbs, and the subsequent NATO occupation and declaration of Kosovar independence in 2008, have fostered similar patterns of divided memory in the lands of the former Yugoslavia. While many of the case studies examined in this book emphasize how memory of war has been shaped by different national contexts, myths, and stories, it has also been dealt with in many similar ways across borders and in different time periods. This has yet to happen in Bosnia and the other countries of the former Yugoslavia.

CONCLUSION

In Germany, France, Spain, and Poland, among other places in Europe, the wars of the twentieth century have been commemorated and remembered in many different ways. From the beginning of the end of the First World War, we have seen how themes of sacrifice worked their way into European consciousness, alongside themes of the nation and the cause. As war evolved over the course of the century and civilians became more drawn into conflict, it was not just battles, but occupation, collaboration, and resistance that were seen just as much a part of warfare as tanks and large-scale assaults. Commemoration followed course. In the case studies examined, we have seen how many nations moved to institutionalize and prioritize certain memories of past conflicts, how public space was set aside for that purpose, and how often, over generations, new actors emerged to challenge previous understandings and argue for different sorts of memories among the collective.

Each case study in this volume can be read on its own and can demonstrate the themes and the course of memory as outlined above, although not every case contains equal attention to institutionalization, the use of public space, and the role of specific actors. Nonetheless, it is worth asking, as we did in chapter 8 and in the introduction, if Europe also has developed a "cosmopolitan" memory of war, one that transcends national boundaries and Europeanizes the past on a broader scale. Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider first introduced the idea of cosmopolitan memory by suggesting that the common experience of Europe in the Holocaust and, by extension, World War II, has led to the fact that national and ethnic memories of that era now share a "common patterning." One can see the strength of this cosmopolitan argument by looking at how France and Poland rejected memories of victimhood and resistance, for some time, and any concept of collaboration and how that has changed and still is changing, especially as we learn more of the complexities of the Holocaust. Similarly, in Germany, debates about German civilians as victims of bombing, rape, and other atrocities in the Second World War bring the German wartime experience closer to that of the French or the British and not isolated as only a perpetrator experience.

There is no doubt that the emphasis on the Second World War and especially on the Holocaust has led to the idea of cosmopolitan memory, and in places like France, Poland, Germany, Hungary, and elsewhere, the proliferation of memorial spaces dedicated to telling the story of individual episodes and moments of the Holocaust and the Jewish traditions that preceded it prove the argument. As chapter 8 outlines, the more local memorials became, the more universal the Holocaust became for those traveling across Europe and conscious of these new emerging spaces of memory.

It is worth asking ourselves, after examining a series of case studies such as has been done in this volume, whether or not the concept of cosmopolitan memory can be expanded even further. Can we argue that Europe as a whole has not only come to remember World War II and the Holocaust in similar ways but war in the twentieth century as a whole? An examination of the refocusing of commemorative efforts in Spain around the civil war as less of a battlefield war and more a mass targeting of civilians, for ideological and other reasons, makes their experience much closer in our memory to those of other Europeans in the Second World War, does it not? More recent efforts to remember the Armenian genocide in ways that we have remembered the Holocaust also fit into this pattern. In the hundredth anniversary of the First World War, from 2014 to 2018, demonstrating the brutality of war and its impact on soldiers as they became civilians is part of rethinking twentieth-century conflict as more and more about the impact it had on everyone's lives, not just those of soldiers.

There is no question that the national remains vital to understanding the commemoration of war across Europe. National memorials, official spaces, and the focus of memory actors on their own local and national governments remains crucial to understanding how war is remembered. This volume examines institutional memories of war, public spaces dedicated to war memorials and museums, and the actors who push for such spaces and such memories. The national community or social group remains the focus of all these efforts. However, in examining national case studies and spaces, one cannot neglect the commonalities in ideas, concepts, and processes as one moves from country to country. To walk among the memorial to the Warsaw uprising of 1944 then the memorial to the French resistance at Mont Valérien reinforces this message; to examine the space dedicated to the deportation of Warsaw Jews, the Umschlagplatz, and then see the memorial at the deportation camp of Westerbork in the Netherlands do the same; to

see the many spaces that were former bomb refuges across Catalonia and then visit museums across London that tell the story of the London Blitz in World War II inevitably leads one to make comparisons. To visit a space that tells the history of the Gestapo, as at the Gestapo Museum in Warsaw, and then see one depicting the history of Communist secret police, as in the House of Terror Museum in Budapest, do the same.

War as a way of targeting Europe's civilians, of bringing them into the era of total war by making them part of the conflict, whether they desired it or not, and of the impact that war and conflict had in shaping the daily lives of Europeans, is a consistent message at war memorial spaces across the continent. War and violence, often at unimaginable levels, made twentieth-century Europe through many different conflicts and many different fronts of the same conflicts. Thus today, the memory of war and conflict across the continent focuses on the impact war had on civilians and their lives. In this respect, both the national and local memories of war deserve space alongside more transnational ways of remembering. Understanding the impact of war on nations, on neighborhoods, on communities and across the continent, is an ongoing and important process. Memory is and remains a living thing.

NOTES

Introduction

1. Mark Mazower, *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 233.

Chapter 1

1. James J. Sheehan, *Where Have All the Soldiers Gone? The Transformation of Modern Europe* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2008), xvii.

2. Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, excerpted in *The Collective Memory Reader*, ed. Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, 141 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

3. Geoffrey Cubitt, *History and Memory* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2007), 77.

4. Halbwachs excerpt in Olick et. al., *Collective Memory Reader*, 143.

5. Michel Foucault, "Film in Popular Memory: An Interview with Michel Foucault," in Olick et. al., *Collective Memory Reader*, 253.

6. Iwona Irwin-Zarecka, *Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory* (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1994), 4.

7. "Smithsonian Substantially Alters Enola Gay Exhibit after Criticism," *New York Times*, October 1, 1994; Michael J. Hogan, "The Enola Gay Controversy: History, Memory and the Politics of Presentation," in *Hiroshima in History and Memory*, ed. Michael J. Hogan, 200–232 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

8. Marlene Manoff, "Theories of the Archive from across the Disciplines" *Libraries and the Academy* 4, 1 (2004).

9. Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember*, excerpted in Olick et. al., *Collective Memory Reader*, 338.

10. Connerton.

11. Jan Assmann, excerpt from *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*, in Olick et. al., *Collective Memory Reader*, 212.

12. Steven Hoelscher and Derek H. Alderman, "Memory and Place: Geographies of a Critical Relationship," *Social and Cultural Geography* 5, 3 (2004): 348.

13. Ukadzislau Belavusau and Anna Wójcik, "Renaming Streets: A Key Element of Identity Politics," *New Eastern Europe* 3, 4 (2018).

14. Jeffrey K. Olick, "Collective Memory: The Two Cultures," *Sociological Theory* 17, 3 (1999).

15. Olick.

16. Olick.

17. Peter Burke, *Varieties of Cultural History* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997), 46.

18. Jan Assmann, "Communicative and Cultural Memory," in *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, ed. Astrid Eril and Ansgar Nunning, 110 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).

19. Aleida Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives* (1999; repr., in English, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

20. Irwin-Zarecka, *Frames of Remembrance*, 67.

21. Jacques Le Goff, *History and Memory*, trans. Steven Rendall and Elizabeth Claman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 54.

22. Tzvetan Todorov, *History and Memory: Lessons from the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003).

23. Kenneth E. Foote, *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003).

24. Jennifer A. Jordan, *Structures of Memory: Understanding Urban Change in Berlin and Beyond* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006).

25. Elizabeth Jelin, *State Repression and the Labors of Memory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), 33.

26. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (London: Verso, 2006), 188, 196.

27. Yael Zerubavel, excerpt from *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*, in Olick et. al., *Collective Memory Reader*, 237.

28. Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008), 265.

29. Michael Howard, *War in European History* rev. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 110.

30. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 199–203.

31. Maria Bucar and Nancy M. Wingfield, "Introduction," in *Staging the Past: The Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present*, ed. Bucur and Wingfield, 3 (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2001).

32. Dan Diner, *Cataclysms: A History of the Twentieth Century from Europe's Edge*, trans. W. Tempar and J. Golb. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007), 84, 87.

33. Philipp Ther, *The Dark Side of Nation-States: Ethnic Cleansing in Modern Europe*, trans. C. Kreutzmuller (New York: Berghahn, 2014), 5.

34. Ther, 9.

Chapter 2

1. "War Losses" *International Encyclopedia of the First World War*, https://encyclopedia.1914-1918-online.net/article/war_losses, accessed August 27, 2018.

2. See, for example, John N. Horne and Alan Kramer, *German Atrocities, 1914: A History of Denial* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001).

3. Jay Winter, *Remembering War: The Great War between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006), 104.

4. From this, George L. Mosse argued that a near universal cult of the "fallen soldier" emerged in Germany in particular. George L. Mosse, *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).

5. Tracey Loughran, "Shell Shock and British Psychological Medicine," *Social History of Medicine* 22 (2009).

6. Marzena Sokolowska-Paryz, *Reimagining the War Memorial, Reinterpreting the Great War: The Formats of British Commemorative Fiction* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012), 27.

7. Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975).

8. Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 4–6.

9. Winter, *Remembering War*, 136.

10. Winter, *Sites of Memory*, 79.

11. Stefan Goebel, "Intersecting Memories: War and Remembrance in Twentieth-Century Europe," *Historical Journal* 44, 3 (2001): 854.

12. Daniel J. Sherman, *The Construction of Memory in Interwar France* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 10.

13. Sean A. Forner, "War Commemoration and the Republic in Crisis: Weimar German and the Neue Wache," *Central European History* 35, 4 (2002): 537.

14. Forner, 534.

15. Keith Jeffery, "Commemoration in the United Kingdom: A Multitude of Memories," *Australian Journal of Political Science* 50, 3 (2015): 564.

16. Jeffrey, "Commemoration in the United Kingdom," 566.

17. Gregory Stanton, "The Cost of Denial," *Genocide Watch: The International Alliance to End Genocide*, http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutus/thecostofdenial.html, accessed August 27, 2018.

18. Richard G. Hovannisian, "The Armenian Genocide and Patterns of Denial," *The Armenian Genocide in Perspective*, ed. Hovannisian, 122 (New

Brunswick, NJ; Transaction Books, 1986).

19. Michael M. Gunter, *Armenian History and the Question of Genocide* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 79–80.

20. Taner Akcam, *From Empire to Republic: Turkish Nationalism and the Armenian Genocide* (London: Zed Books, 2004), 218–23.

21. Paul von Blum, "A Journey to Armenia: Visual Reminders of Genocide and Oppression," *Tikkun* 32, 1 (2017): 52–53.

Chapter 3

1. See, for example, the special issue of *Russian Studies in History* 56, 2 (2017) entitled "Russian Peasants and Soldiers during World War I: Home and Front Interacting."

2. Ronald Suny, *The Soviet Experiment: Russia, the USSR and the Successor States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 51.

3. Mark von Hagen, *Soldiers in the Proletarian Dictatorship: The Red Army and the Soviet Socialist State, 1917–1930* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), 125.

4. Karen Petrone, *The Great War in Russian Memory* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011), 209.

5. Petrone, 211.

6. Aaron Cohen, "Oh That! Myth, Memory and World War I in the Russian Emigration and the Soviet Union," *Slavic Review* 62, 1 (2003): 80.

7. von Hagen, *Soldiers in the Proletarian Dictatorship*, 281.

8. Cohen, "Oh That," 75.

9. Eva Plach, *The Clash of Moral Nations: Cultural Politics in Pilsudski's Po- land, 1926–1935* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2006).

10. Nancy Wingfield, "National Sacrifice and Regeneration: Commemora- tions of the Battle of Zborov in Multinational Czechoslovakia," in *Sacrifice and Rebirth: The Legacy of the Last Habsburg War*, ed. Mark Cornwall and John Paul Newman (New York: Berghahn Books, 2016).

11. Mark Cornwall, "Apocalypse and the Quest for a Sudeten German Man- nerbund in Czechoslovakia," in Cornwall and Newman, *Sacrifice and Rebirth*, 63.

Chapter 4

1. Paul Preston, *The Spanish Holocaust: Inquisition and Extermination in Twentieth-Century Spain* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2012).

2. Preston, xi.

3. Layla Renshaw, *Exhuming Loss: Memory, Materiality and Mass Graves of the Spanish Civil War* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2011), 22.

4. Madeleine Davis, "Is Spain Recovering Its Memory? Breaking the *Pacto del Olvido*," *Human Rights Quarterly* 27 (2005): 860.

5. Fernando Martínez López and Miguel Gómez Oliver, "Political Responsibilities in Franco's Spain: Recovering the Memory of Economic Repression and Social Control in Andalusia, 1936–45," in *Memory and Cultural History of the Spanish Civil War: Realms of Oblivion*, ed. Aurora G. Morcillo, 116 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2014).

6. Javier Rodrigo, "Internamiento y Trabajo Forzoso: Los Campos de Concentración de Franco," *Hispania Nova: Revista de Historia Contemporánea* 6 (2006).

7. Michael Richards, "Civil War, Violence and the Construction of Francoism," in *The Republic Besieged: Civil War in Spain, 1936–39*, ed. Paul Preston and Ann L. MacKenzie, 239 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996).

8. Antonio Cazorla-Sánchez, *Fear and Progress; Ordinary Lives in Franco's Spain (1936–1975)* (Oxford: Blackwell-Wiley, 2009).

9. Paloma Aguilar Fernández, *Memory and Amnesia: The Role of the Spanish Civil War in the Transition to Democracy*, trans. Mark Oakley (New York: Berghahn Books, 2002), 2–3.

10. John Hargreaves, *Freedom for Catalonia? Catalan Nationalism, Spanish Identity and the Barcelona Olympic Games* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 28.

11. Laura Desfor Edles, *Symbol and Ritual in the New Spain: The Transition to Democracy after Franco* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 36.

12. Omar G. Encarnación, *Democracy without Justice in Spain: The Politics of Forgetting* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 21.

13. Omar G. Encarnación, *Spanish Politics: Democracy after Dictatorship* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2008), 134.

14. Encarnación, *Democracy without Justice in Spain*, 105.

15. Preston, *Spanish Holocaust*, 520.

16. David A. Messenger, "Memory Politics and Memorial Democràtic in Catalonia," *Catalan Journal of Communications and Cultural Studies* 8, 1 (2016): 176.

17. Encarnación, *Democracy without Justice in Spain*, 142.

18. Encarnación, 160.

19. Encarnación, 162.

20. http://www.parlament.cat/departments/docs/30051119130403.doc, accessed January 1, 2015.

21. "Plan to Exhume Franco Renews Spain's Wrestle with History," *New York Times,* July 7, 2018.

Chapter 5

1. Doris Bergen, *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust*, 3rd

ed. (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2016), 52.

2. Evan Mawdsley, *Thunder in the East: The Nazi-Soviet War, 1941–1945* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), 11.

3. David Gilbertson, *The Nightmare Dance: Guilt, Shame, Heroism and the Holocaust* (Leicestershire, UK: Matador Press, 2014), 208.

4. Gerhard Weinberg, *A World at Arms: A Global History of World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 476.

5. Hans Mommsen, "Hitler's Reichstag Speech of 30 January 1939," *History and Memory* 9, 1/2 (1997).

6. US Holocaust Memorial Museum, *Holocaust Encyclopedia*, "Warsaw," https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005069, accessed November 1, 2016.

7. Richard Rhodes, *Masters of Death: The SS Einsatzgruppen and the Invention of the Holocaust* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002), 191.

8. Bergen, *War and Genocide*, 229.

9. Peter Fritzsche, *Life and Death in the Third Reich* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000), 217.

10. Peter Calvocoressi, Guy Wint, and John Pritchard, *The Penguin History of the Second World War* (London: Penguin Books, 1999), 539.

Chapter 6

1. Lisa Yavnai, "U.S. Army War Crimes Trials in Germany, 1945–1947," in *Atrocities on Trial: Historical Perspectives on the Politics of Prosecuting War Crimes*, ed. Patricia Heberer and Jürgen Matthaus, 49 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008).

2. William I. Hitchcock, *The Bitter Road to Freedom: A New History of the Liberation of Europe* (New York: Free Press, 2008), 178.

3. Wulf Kansteiner, "Losing the War, Winning the Memory Battle: The Legacy of Nazism, World War II and the Holocaust in the Federal Republic of Germany," in *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, ed. Richard Ned Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner, and Claudio Fogu, 107–8 (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).

4. Caroline Pearce, *Contemporary Germany and the Nazi Legacy: Remembrance, Politics and the Dialectic of Normality* (London: Palgrave Macmillian, 2008), 10–11.

5. Jeffrey K. Olick, *In the House of the Hangman: The Agonies of German Defeat, 1943–1949* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 175.

6. Alon Confino, *Foundational Pasts: The Holocaust as Historical Understanding* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 21.

7. Gilad Margalit, *Guilt, Suffering and Memory: Germany Remembers Its Dead*

of World War II, trans. Haim Watzman, 100 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010).

8. Catherine Epstein, "The Production of 'Official Memory' in East Germany: Old Communists and the Dilemmas of Memoir-Writing," *Central European History* 32, 2 (1999): 183–84.

9. Bill Niven, *Facing the Nazi Past: United Germany and the Legacy of the Third Reich* (London: Routledge, 2002), 21.

10. Kansteiner, "Losing the War," 136.

11. Wulf Kansteiner, "Moral Pitfalls of Memory Studies: The Concept of Political Generations," *Memory Studies* 5, 2 (2012): 112.

12. Jeremy Leaman, "The Decontamination of German History: Jürgen Habermas and the 'Historikerstreit' in West Germany," *Economy and Society* 17, 4 (1988).

13. Konrad H. Jarausch and Michael Geyer, *Shattered Past: Reconstructing German Histories* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), 49.

14. Sam-Sang Jo, *European Myths: Resolving the Crises in the European Community/European Union* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2007), 145.

15. Cecily Harris, "German Memory of the Holocaust: The Emergence of Counter-Memorials," *Penn History Review* 17, 2 (2010): 37.

16. James E. Young, *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), 119.

17. Bill Niven, *Facing the Nazi Past: United Germany and the Legacy of the Third Reich* (London: Routledge, 2002), 26.

18. Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York: Vintage Books, 1997).

19. K. Michael Prince, *War and German Memory: Excavating the Significance of the Second World War in German Cultural Consciousness* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009), 55.

20. Marianne Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).

21. Jörg Friedrich, *The Fire: The Bombing of Germany 1940–1945* (2002; repr. in English, New York: Columbia University Press, 2006).

22. Günter Grass, *Crabwalk* (2002; repr. in English, New York: Mariner Books, 2004).

Chapter 7

1. Debbie Lackerstein, *National Regeneration in Vichy France: Ideas and Policies, 1930–1944* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2012).

2. Julian Jackson, *France: The Dark Years, 1940–1944* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 327–30

3. Jean-Marc Dreyfus, "France Confronts the Holocaust," December 1, 2001, *Brookings Institute*, www.brookings.edu/articles/france-confronts-the-holocaust/amp/, accessed August 14, 2018.

4. Jackson, *France.*

5. Jackson, 437, 476.

6. Tzvetan Todorov, *A French Tragedy: Scenes of Civil War, Summer 1944.* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1996).

7. Jan Gross, *Neighbors: The Destruction of the Jewish Community in Jedwabne, Poland* (New York: Penguin Books, 2002), xvii.

8. Timothy Snyder, *Bloodlands: Europe between Hitler and Stalin* (New York: Basic Books, 2012).

9. US Holocaust Memorial Museum, Holocaust Encyclopedia, "Polish Victims," www.ushmm.org/wlc/mobile/en/article.php?Moduleld=10005473, accessed August 14, 2018.

10. Norman Davies, *Heart of Europe: The Past in Poland's Present*, new ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 58–59.

11. Anna M. Cienciala, "An Unknown Page of History: The Poles Deported to the Soviet Union in 1940–1941," *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 22 (2009): 306.

12. Tadeusz Piotrowski, *Poland's Holocaust: Ethnic Strife, Collaboration with Occupying Forces, and Genocide in the Second Republic, 1918–1947* (London: McFarland, 1998), 23.

13. Israel Gutman, *Resistance: The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising* (repr., New York: Mariner Books, 1998).

14. Norman Davies, *Rising '44: The Battle for Warsaw* (London: Penguin Books, 2005).

15. David G. Williamson, *The Polish Underground, 1939–1947* (Barnsley, UK: Pen and Sword Books, 2012).

16. Alice Kaplan, *The Collaborator: The Trial and Execution of Robert Brasillach* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

17. Sarah Farmer, *Martyred Village: Commemorating the 1944 Massacre at Oradour-sur-Glane* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 135–70.

18. For more on numbers and impact, see Robert Gildea, *Fighters in the Shadows: A New History of the French Resistance* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2015).

19. Todd Shepard, *The Invention of Decolonization: The Algerian War and the Remaking of France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006), 80.

20. See Patrick Marnham, *Resistance and Betrayal: The Death and Life of the Greatest Hero of the French Resistance* (New York: Random House, 2000).

21. Richard J. Golsan, ed., *The Papon Affair: Memory and Justice on Trial* (New York: Routledge. 2000)

22. Jan Gross, *Fear: Anti-Semitism in Poland after Auschwitz* (New York:

Random House, 2006).

23. "Ethnic Origins and Number of Victims of Auschwitz," *Panstywowe Muzeum Auschwitz-Birjkenau w Oswiecimlu*, http://70.auschwitz.org/index. php?option=com_content&view=article&id=89&Itemid=173&lang=en, accessed August 14, 2018.

24. Jonathan Huener, *Auschwitz, Poland and the Politics of Commemoration, 1945–1979* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2003), 80.

25. Huener, 92–93.

26. Huener, 122.

27. Huener, 146.

28. Huener, 174–76.

29. "Poland Agrees to Change Auschwitz Tablets," *New York Times*, June 17, 1992.

30. "Poland Erects Ambiguous Memorial to Victims of Katyn Massacre," *New York Times*, April 10, 1985.

31. Gross, *Neighbors*.

32. Anna M. Cienciala, "The Jedwabne Massacre: Update and Review," *Polish Review* 48, 1 (2003): 51.

33. Eva Wolentarska-Ochman, "Collective Remembrance in Jedwabne: Unsettled Memory of World War II in Postcommmunist Poland," *History and Memory* 18, 1 (2006): 167.

34. "Poland's Holocaust Law Weakened after 'Storm and Consternation,'" *New York Times*, June 27, 2018.

Chapter 8

1. Jie-Hyun Lim and Peter Lambert, "Introduction: Coming to Terms with the Past of Mass Dictatorship," in *Mass Dictatorship and Memory as Ever Present Past*, ed. Jie-Hyun Lim, Barbara Walker, and Peter Lambert, 4 (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

2. Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider, "Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory," *European Journal of Social Theory* 5, 1 (2002): 93.

3. Sharon Macdonald, *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today* (London: Routledge, 2013), 200.

4. Paul Williams, *Memorial Museums: The Global Rush to Commemorate Atrocities* (London: Bloomsbury, 2008), 75.

5. Marianne Hirsch, "Surviving Images: Holocaust Photographs and the Work of Postmemory," *Yale Journal of Criticism* 14, 1 (2001); and Barbie Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget: Holocaust Memory through the Camera's Lens* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

6. James Young, *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contem-*

porary Art and Architecture (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), 2.

7. Williams, *Memorial Museums*, 6–8.

8. Ruth Gruber, *Virtually Jewish: Reinventing Jewish Culture in Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 8–9.

9. Gruber, 156.

10. http://www.polin.pl/en/grand-opening-of-the-core-exhibition, accessed March 15, 2019.

11. Elzbieta Janicka, "The Square of Polish Innocence: POLIN Museum of the History of Polish Jews in Warsaw and Its Symbolic Topography," *East European Jewish Affairs* 45, 2/3 (2015).

12. Michael Meng, "From Destruction to Preservation: Jewish Sites in Germany and Poland after the Holocaust," *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 46 (Spring 2010): 46.

13. Gruber, *Virtually Jewish*, 132.

14. Jordan, *Structures of Memory*, 137.

Chapter 9

1. Snyder, *Bloodlands*, 315.

2. Anne Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944–1956* (New York: Doubleday, 2012), 94–95.

3. Applebaum, 111.

4. Applebaum, 82.

5. Applebaum, 460.

6. Monika Nalepa, *Skeletons in the Closet: Transitional Justice in Post-Communist Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 68.

7. Nalepa, 70.

8. Karl P. Benziger, "The Funeral of Imre Nagy: Contested History and the Power of Memory Culture," *History and Memory* 12, 2 (2000): 153.

9. Benziger, 156.

Chapter 10

1. Gerard Toal and Carl T. Dahlman, *Bosnia Remade: Ethnic Cleansing and Its Reversal* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 136.

2. Lynda E. Boose, "Crossing the River Drina: Bosnian Rape Camps, Turkish Impalement, and Serb Cultural Memory," *Signs* 28, 1 (2002): 75.

3. Roland Kostic, "Transitional Justice and Reconciliation in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Whose Memories, Whose Justice?" *Sociologija* 54, 4 (2012): 655.

4. United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, www.icty.org, accessed August 7, 2018.

5. Kristen Campbell, "Rape as a 'Crime against Humanity': Trauma, Law

and Justice in the ICTY," *Journal of Human Rights* 2, 4 (2003): 507.

6. Inger Skjelsbæk, "Victim and Survivor: Narrated Social Identities of Women Who Experienced Rape during the War in Bosnia-Herzegovina," *Feminism and Psychology* 16, 4 (2006): 381.

7. Toal and Dahlman, *Bosnia Remade*, 296.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akcam, Taner. *From Empire to Republic: Turkish Nationalism and the Armenian Genocide.* London: Zed Books, 2004.

Aly, Götz. *"The Final Solution": Nazi Population Policy and the Murder of the European Jews.* London: Hodder, 1999.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso, 2006.

Applebaum, Anne. *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944–1956.* New York: Doubleday, 2012.

Assmann, Aleida. *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Assmann, Jan. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." Translated by John Czaplicka. *New German Critique* 65 (1995): 125–33.

Banjeglav, Tamara. "Conflicting Memories, Competing Narratives and Contested Histories in Croatia's Post-War Commemorative Practices." *Politicka Misao* 49, 5 (2012): 7–31.

Bartov, Omer. *Hitler's Army: Soldiers, Nazis and War in the Third Reich.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Bartov, Omer, and Eric Weitz, eds. *Shatterzone of Empires: Coexistence and Violence in the German, Habsburg, Russian, and Ottoman Borderlands.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Benziger, Karl P. "The Funeral of Imre Nagy: Contested History and the Power of Memory Culture." *History and Memory* 12, 2 (2000): 142–64.

Bessel, Richard. "Policing in East Germany in the Wake of the Second World War." *Crimes, History and Societies* 7, 2 (2003) 5–21.

Biskupski, M. B. B. *Independence Day: Myth, Symbol and the Creation of Modern Poland.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Bobelian, Michael. *Children of Armenia: A Forgotten Genocide and the Century-Long Struggle for Justice.* New York: Simon and Shuster, 2009.

Bougarel, Xavier, Elissa Helms, and Ger Duijzings, eds. *The New Bosnian Mosaic: Identities, Memories and Moral Claims in a Postwar Society.* Aldershot, UK: Ashplant, 2007.

Browning, Christopher. *The Path to Genocide: Essays on Launching the Final Solution.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Bruce, Gary. *The Firm: The Inside Story of the Stasi.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Bucur, Maria, and Nancy M. Wingfield, eds. *Staging the Past: The Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present.* West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2001.

Burke, Peter. "History as Social Memory." In *Memory: History, Culture and the Mind*, edited by Thomas Butler, 97–113. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1989.

Burrin, Phillppe. *France under the Germans: Collaboration and Compromise*. New York: New Press, 1998.

Campbell, Kristen. "The Laws of Memory: The ICTY, the Archive and Transitional Justice." *Social and Legal Studies* 22, 2 (2013): 247–69.

———. "Rape as a 'Crime against Humanity': Trauma, Law and Justice in the ICTY." *Journal of Human Rights* 2, 4 (2003): 507–15.

Cazorla-Sánchez, Antonio. *Fear and Progress; Ordinary Lives in Franco's Spain (1936–1975)*. Oxford: Blackwell-Wiley, 2009.

Chandler, David. *Bosnia: Faking Democracy after Dayton*. 2nd ed. London: Pluto Press, 2000.

Cienciala, Anna M. "The Jedwabne Massacre: Update and Review." *Polish Review* 48, 1 (2003): 49–72.

Cohen, Aaron. "Oh That! Myth, Memory and World War I in the Russian Emigration and the Soviet Union." *Slavic Review* 62, 1 (2003): 69–86.

Cohen, Deborah. *The War Come Home: Disabled Veterans in Britain and Germany, 1914–1939*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Corney, Frederick C. *Telling October: Memory and the Making of the Bolshevik Revolution*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Cornwall, Mark, and John Paul Newman, ed. *Sacrifice and Rebirth: The Legacy of the Last Habsburg War*. London: Berghahn, 2016.

Cubitt, Geoffrey. *History and Memory*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Davies, Norman. *Heart of Europe: The Past in Poland's Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

———. *Rising '44: The Battle for Warsaw*. Reprint, London: Penguin Books, 2005.

———. *White Eagle, Red Star: The Polish-Soviet War 1919–1920*. London: St. Martin's Press, 1972.

Davis, Madeleine. "Is Spain Recovering Its Memory? Breaking the *Pacto del Olvido*." *Human Rights Quarterly* 27 (2005): 858–80.

Deák, István, Jan T. Gross, and Tony Just, eds. *The Politics of Retribution in Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Devine-Wright, Patrick. "A Theoretical Overview of Memory and Conflict." In *The Role of Memory in Ethnic Conflict*, edited by Ed Cairns and Michael D. Roe, 9–33 (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Diner, Dan. *Cataclysms: A History of the Twentieth Century from Europe's Edge*. Translated by W. Tempar and J. Golb. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007.

Edles, Laura Desfor. *Symbol and Ritual in the New Spain: The Transition to Democracy after Franco*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Eksteins, Modris. *Rites of Spring: The Great War and the Birth of the Modern Age*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1989.

Encarnación, Omar G. *Democracy without Justice in Spain: The Politics of Forgetting*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.

———. *Spanish Politics: Democracy after Dictatorship*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2008.

Erll, Astrid. *Memory in Culture*. Translated by Sara B. Young. Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Evans, Richard J. *The Third Reich at War*. New York: Penguin Books, 2010.

Farmer, Sarah. *Martyred Village: Commemorating the 1944 Massacre at Oradour-sur-Glane*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Fernández, Paloma Aguilar. *Memory and Amnesia: The Role of the Spanish Civil War in the Transition to Democracy*. Translated by Mark Oakley. New York: Berghahn Books, 2002.

Fijalkowski, Agata. "Politics, Law and Justice in People's Poland: The Fieldorf File." *Slavic Review* 73, 1 (2014): 85–107.

Flower, John. "A Continuing Preoccupation with the Occupation." *French Cultural Studies* 25, 3–4 (2014): 299–308.

Foote, Kenneth. *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003.

Fredericks, Vanessa. "Remembering Katyn: Mourning, Memory and National Identity." *Memory Connection* 11 (2011): 197–210.

Frei, Norbert. *Adenauer's Germany and the Nazi Past*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Friedlander, Saul. *The Years of Extermination, 1939–1945*. Vol. 2 of *Nazi Germany and the Jews*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2008.

———. *The Years of Persecution, 1933–1939*. Vol. 1 of *Nazi Germany and the Jews*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1998.

Fussell, Paul. *The Great War and Modern Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *The Cold War: A New History*. New York: Penguin, 2005.

Gagnon, Valere Philip. *The Myth of Ethnic War: Serbia and Croatia in the 1990s*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Gassert, Phillip, and A. Steinweis, eds. *Coping with the Nazi Past: West German Debates on Nazism and Generation Conflict, 1955–1975*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2006.

Goebel, Stefan. *The Great War and Medieval Memory: War, Remembrance and Medievalism in Britain and Germany, 1914–1940*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Golsan, Richard J., ed. *The Papon Affair: Memory and Justice on Trial*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Graham, Helen. *The War and Its Shadow: Spain's Civil War in Europe's Long Twentieth Century*. Brighton, UK: Sussex Academic Press, 2012.

Gross, Jan T. *Neighbors: The Destruction of the Jewish Community in Jedwabne, Poland*. New York: Penguin Books, 2002.

Gruber, Ruth. *Virtually Jewish: Reinventing Jewish Culture in Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Gunter, Michael M. *Armenian History and the Question of Genocide*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *The Collective Memory*. Translated by Francis J. Ditter and Vida Yazdi Ditter. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

Halilovich, Hariz. "Beyond the Sadness: Memories and Homecomings among

Survivors of 'Ethnic Cleansing' in a Bosnia Village." *Memory Studies* 4, 1 (2011): 42–52.

Harris, Cecily. "German Memory of the Holocaust: The Emergence of Counter-Memorials." *Penn History Review* 17, 2 (2010): Article 3.

Hastings, Max. *Inferno: The World at War, 1939–1945*. New York: Vintage Books, 2012.

Hauner, Milan. "Crime and Punishment in Communist Czechoslovakia: The Case of General Helidor Pika and His Prosecutor Karel Vas." *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 9, 2–3 (2008): 335–54.

Herf, Jeffrey. *Divided Memory: The Nazi Past in the Two Germanies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Hilberg, Raul. *The Destruction of the European Jews*. 3rd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

Hirsch, Marianne. *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

———. "Surviving Images: Holocaust Photographs and the Work of Postmemory." *Yale Journal of Criticism* 14, 1 (2001): 5–37.

Hitchcock, William. *The Bitter Road to Freedom: A New History of the Liberation of Europe*. New York: Free Press, 2008.

Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Rev. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Hoelscher, Steven, and Derek H. Alderman, "Memory and Place: Geographies of a Critical Relationship." *Social and Cultural Geography* 5, 3 (2004): 347–55.

Hogan, Michael J. "The Enola Gay Controversy: History, Memory and the Politics of Presentation." In *Hiroshima in History and Memory*, edited by Michael J. Hogan, 200–232. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Hovannisian, Richard G., ed. *The Armenian Genocide in Perspective*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1986.

Howard, Michael. *War in European History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Huener, Jonathan. *Auschwitz, Poland and the Politics of Commemoration, 1945–1979*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2003.

Irwin-Zarecka, Iowna. *Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1994.

Jackson, Julian. *France: The Dark Years, 1940–1944*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

James, Beverly. "Fencing in the Past: Budapest's Statue Park Museum." *Media, Culture and Society* 21, 3 (1999): 291–311.

Janicka, Elzbieta. "The Square of Polish Innocence: POLIN Museum of the History of Polish Jews in Warsaw and Its Symbolic Topography." *East European Jewish Affairs* 45, 2/3 (2015): 200–214.

Jarausch, Konrad H., and Michael Geyer. *Shattered Past: Reconstructing German Histories*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Jelin, Elizabeth. *State Repression and the Labors of Memory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Jerez-Farran, Carlos, and Samuel Amago, eds. *Unearthing Franco's Legacy: Mass Graves and the Recovery of Historical Memory in Spain.* South Bend, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2010.

Jordan, Jennifer. *Structures of Memory: Understanding Urban Change in Berlin and Beyond.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006.

Judt, Tony. *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945.* New York: Penguin, 2005.

Kaplan, Alice. *The Collaborator: The Trial and Execution of Robert Brasillach.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Kershaw, Ian. *Hitler: A Biography.* Reprint, New York: W. W. Norton, 2010.

Klein, Kerwin Lee. "On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse." *Representations* 69 (2000): 127–50.

Koehler, John O. *Stasi: The Untold Story of the East German Secret Police.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1999.

Koreman, Megan. *The Expectation of Justice: France, 1944–1946.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000.

Koshar, Rudy. *From Monuments to Traces: Artifacts of German Memory, 1870–1990.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Kostic, Roland. "Transitional Justice and Reconciliation in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Whose Memories, Whose Justice?" *Sociologija* 54, 4 (2012): 649–66.

Kramer, Alan. "The First World War and German Memory." In *Untold War: New Perspectives in First World War Studies*, edited by Heather Jones, Jennifer O'Brien, and Christoph Schmidt-Supprian, 385–415. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2008.

Leaman, Jeremy. "The Decontamination of German History: Jürgen Habermas and the 'Historikerstreit' in West Germany." *Economy and Society* 17, 4 (1988): 518–20.

Lebow, Richard Ned, Wulf Kansteiner, and Claudio Fogu, eds., *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006.

Le Goff, Jacques. *History and Memory.* Translated by Steven Rendall and Elizabeth Claman. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Lehrer, Erica T. *Jewish Poland Revisited: Heritage Tourism in Unquiet Places.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Levy, Daniel, and Natan Sznaider. "Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5, 1 (2002): 87–106.

Lim, Jie-Hyun, and Peter Lambert. "Introduction: Coming to Terms with the Past of Mass Dictatorship." In *Mass Dictatorship and Memory as Ever Present Past*, edited by Jie-Hyun Lim, Barbara Walker, and Peter Lambert, 1–13. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Lukas, Richard C. *Forgotten Holocaust: The Poles under German Occupation, 1939–1944.* 3rd ed. New York: Hippocrene Books, 2012.

Macdonald, David Bruce. *Balkan Holocausts? Serbian and Croatian Victim-Centered Propaganda and the War in Yugoslavia.* Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2002.

MacDonald, Sharon. *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today.* London: Routledge, 2013.

Magaš, Branka, and Ivo Žanić, eds. *The War in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1991–1995.* London: Frank Cass, 2011.

Manoff, Marlene. "Theories of the Archive from across the Disciplines." *Libraries and the Academy* 4, 1 (2004): 9–25.

Margalit, Gilad. *Guilt, Suffering and Memory: Germany Remembers Its Dead of World War II.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010.

Marrus, Michael R., and Robert O. Paxton. *Vichy France and the Jews.* New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Martín, R. D. "Legal Framework for Democratic Memory Policies and Mass Graves in Catalonia and Spain and Services for People who Suffered Retaliation." Paper given at London School of Economics and Political Science, Catalan Observatory, 2010. http://www2.1se.ac.uk/europeanInstitute/research/catalanObservatory/documents/pdf/Memorial/RaulRigon.pdf, accessed March 7, 2013.

Mazower, Mark. *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century.* New York: Vintage Books, 2000.

———. *Hitler's Empire: How the Nazis Ruled Europe.* New York: Penguin Books, 2008.

McMahon, Patrice C., and David P. Forsythe. "The ICTY's Impact on Serbia: Judicial Romanticism Meets Network Politics." *Human Rights Quarterly* 30, 2 (2008): 412–35.

Meng, Michael. *Shattered Spaces: Encountering Jewish Ruins in Postwar Germany and Poland.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.

———. "From Destruction to Preservation: Jewish Sites in Germany and Poland after the Holocaust." *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 46 (Spring 2010): 45–59.

Miller, Paul. "Contested Memories: The Bosnian Genocide in Serb and Muslim Mind." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, 3 (2006): 311–24.

Millington, Chris. *From Victory to Vichy: Veterans in Inter-War France.* Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2012.

Moeller, Robert G. *War Stories: The Search for a Usable Past in the Federal Republic of Germany.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Morcillo, Aurora G., ed. *Memory and Cultural History of the Spanish Civil War: Realms of Oblivion.* Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2014.

Mosse, George L. *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Muro, Diego, and Gregorio Alonso. *The Politics and Memory of Democratic Transition: The Spanish Model.* London: Routledge, 2011.

Nalepa, Monika. *Skeletons in the Closet: Transitional Justice in Post-Communist Europe.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Nebesar, Darren Anne. "Gender-Based Violence as a Weapon of War." *University of California, Davis Journal of International Law and Policy* 4, 2 (1998): 147–80.

Niven, Bill. *Facing the Nazi Past: United Germany and the Legacy of the Third Reich.* London: Routledge, 2002.

Olick, Jeffrey. "Collective Memory: The Two Cultures." *Sociological Theory* 17, 3 (1999): 338–48.

———. *In the House of the Hangman: The Agonies of German Defeat, 1943–1949*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Olick, Jeffrey, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, eds. *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Overy, Richard. *The Bombers and the Bombed: Allied Air War over Europe, 1940–1945*. New York: Viking, 2014.

Palonen, Emilia. "The City-Text in Post-Communist Budapest: Street Names, Memorials and the Politics of Commemoration." *GeoJournal* 73 (2008): 219–30.

Paxton, Robert O. *Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order, 1940–1944*. Rev. ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

Pearce, Caroline. *Contemporary Germany and the Nazi Legacy: Remembrance, Politics and the Dialectic of Normality*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Petrone, Karen. *The Great War in Russian Memory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011.

Plach, Eva. *The Clash of Moral Nations: Cultural Politics in Pilsudski's Poland, 1926–1935*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2006.

Prazmowska, Anita J. *A History of Poland*. 2nd ed. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Preston, Paul. *The Spanish Holocaust: Inquisition and Extermination in Twentieth Century Spain*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2012.

Prince, K. Michael. *War and German Memory: Excavating the Significance of the Second World War in German Cultural Consciousness*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009.

Prusin, Alexander V. *The Lands Between: Conflict in the East European Borderlands, 1870–1992*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Renshaw, Layla. *Exhuming Loss: Memory, Materiality and Mass Graves of the Spanish Civil War*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2011.

Ribeiro de Menezes, Alison. *Embodying Memory in Contemporary Spain*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Richards, Michael. *After the Civil War: Making Memory and Re-making Spain since 1936*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

———. "Civil War, Violence and the Construction of Francoism." In *The Republic Besieged: Civil War in Spain, 1936–39*, edited by Paul Preston and Ann L. MacKenzie, 197–240. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996.

———. *A Time of Silence: Civil War and the Culture of Repression in Franco's Spain, 1936–1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Rodrigo, Javier. "Internamiento y Trabajo Forzoso: Los Campos de Concentración de Franco." *Hispania Nova: Revista de Historia Contemporánea* 6 (2006): n.p.

Rousso, Henry. *The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France since 1944*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Saxonberg, Steven, and Magdalena Waligórska. "Klezmer in Kraków: Kitsch or Catharsis for Poles?" *Ethnomusicology* 50, 3 (2006): 433–51.

Sheehan, James J. *Where Have All the Soldiers Gone? The Transformation of Modern Europe*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2008.

Sherman, Daniel J. *The Construction of Memory in Interwar France*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Skjelsbæk, Inger. "Victim and Survivor: Narrated Social Identities of Women Who Experienced Rape during the War in Bosnia-Herzegovina." *Feminism and Psychology* 16, 4 (2006): 373–403.

Snyder, Timothy. *Bloodlands: Europe between Hitler and Stalin*. New York: Basic Books, 2012.

Suny, Ronald. *The Soviet Experiment: Russia, the USSR and the Successor States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Süss, Walter. "The Socialist Unity Party (SED) and the Stasi: A Complex Relationship." *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* supplement 9 (2014): 87–98.

Ther, Philipp. *The Dark Side of Nation-States: Ethnic Cleansing in Modern Europe*. Translated by C. Kreutzmuller. New York: Berghahn, 2014.

Toal, Gerard, and Carl T. Dahlman, *Bosnia Remade: Ethnic Cleansing and Its Reversal*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *A French Tragedy: Scenes of Civil War, Summer 1944*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1996.

———. *Hope and Memory: Lessons from the Twentieth Century*. Translated by David Bellos. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Tomasevich, Jozo. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941–1945: Occupation and Collaboration*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001.

Tooze, Adam. *Wages of Destruction: The Making and Breaking of the Nazi Economy*. New York: Viking, 2007.

Troyansky, David. "Monumental Politics: National History and Local Memory in French Monument aux Morts in the Departement of the Ainse since 1870." *French Historical Studies* 15, 1 (1987): 121–41.

Ungváry, Krisztián. "The Memory of Communist Crimes: The 'House of Terror' and the Central Cemetery." *European Network Remembrance and Solidarity Reading Room*. www.enrs.eu/images/Teksty%20pdf%20ang/ Ungvary_ang.pdf, accessed December 20, 2014.

Vari, Alexander. "Re-territorializing the 'Guilty City': Nationalist and Right-Wing Attempts to Nationalize Budapest during the Interwar Period." *Journal of Contemporary History* 47 (2012): 709–33.

Verdery, Katherine. *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Post-Socialist Change*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

von Blum, Paul. "A Journey to Armenia: Visual Reminders of Genocide and Oppression." *Tikkun* 32, 1 (2017): 52–56.

von Hagen, Mark. *Soldiers in the Proletarian Dictatorship: The Red Army and the Soviet Socialist State, 1917–1930*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Weinberg, Gerhard. *A World at Arms: A Global History of World War II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Weine, Stephen. *When History Is a Nightmare: Lives and Memories of Ethnic Cleansing in Bosnia-Herzegovina*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1999.

Williams, Paul. *Memorial Museums: The Global Rush to Commemorate Atrocities*. London: Bloomsbury, 2008.

Winter, Jay. *Remembering War: The Great War between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006.

———. *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Wolentarska-Ochman, Eva. "Collective Remembrance in Jedwabne: Unsettled Memory of World War II in Postcommmunist Poland." *History and Memory* 18, 1 (2006): 152–78.

Wood, Nancy. *Vectors of Memory: Legacies of Trauma in Postwar Europe*. Oxford: Berg, 1999.

Young, James E. *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.

———. *Texture of Memory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.

Zelizer, Barbie. *Remembering to Forget: Holocaust Memory through the Camera's Lens*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Ziemann, Benjamin. *Contested Commemorations: Republican War Veterans and Weimar Political Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Zubok, V. M. *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

INDEX

Page numbers in italics refer to figures.