

Bruder, die zwei Schwerpunktthemen im erinnerungskulturellen Diskurs ausmacht: die Befreiungsbewegung OUN-UPA und die stalinistischen Verbrechen, vor allem die Hungersnot – auch bekannt unter dem Begriff Holodomor – in den Jahren 1932/33.

Einzelne Beiträge sind also sehr aufschlussreich und zu empfehlen. Einen kohärenten, durchdachten und weiterführenden Sammelband können sie aber allein nicht bilden, so dass der Band insgesamt leider als wenig gewinnbringend bezeichnet werden muss.

Warszawa

Maren Röger

Clashes in European Memory. The Case of Communist Repression and the Holocaust. Hrsg. von Muriel Blaive, Christian Gerbel und Thomas Lindenberger. (European History and Public Spheres, Bd. 2.) Studienverlag. Innsbruck – Wien 2011. 294 S. ISBN 978-3-7065-4812-0. (€ 39,90.)

The central aim of this volume is to provide “representative studies of a diversity of European constellations of fiercely debated, and at times clashing, memories” with the main focus on “the history/memory dialectics of the Holocaust and of communist repression” (p. 11). The collection is based on presentations delivered at the conference organized by the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute in Paris in September 2008. It is published in an environment where the inflated and often uncritical employment of the term “memory” admittedly threatens to lead to “mnemonic overkill” (p. 16). Moreover, it appears in an age when the political uses made of sensitive historical questions (the fate of victims in particular) through various forms of public remembrance seem to support both the ongoing processes of transnationalization or Europeanization as well as, though more controversially, marked attempts at renationalization observable in some European countries.

The eighteen relatively brief studies present theoretical considerations and empirical observations in varying measure. Chronologically organized, primarily informative case studies dealing with countries such as Austria, Bulgaria, Russia, Sweden and Switzerland, are complemented by contributions on more abstract questions penned by some leading theoreticians in the field, such as Aleida Assmann, Natan Sznaider or Henry Rousso. The disciplinary inspirations and methodological choices of the authors are truly heterogeneous, drawing on insights ranging from psychology through political science and sociology to philosophy. Their precise agendas and main conclusions are similarly diverse.

While the individual contributions differ in their assessment of many concrete issues, the main thrust of the volume opposes trends that try to integrate the study of history into a broadly conceived field of memory studies. The editors, Muriel Blaive, Christian Gerbel and Thomas Lindenberger are much more concerned to reaffirm the notion that historical expertise plays an irreplaceable critical role when confronted with the relativizing impact of current emphases on the primacy of ‘subjective’ and ‘authentic’ memory. At the same time, the volume offers some self-reflexive considerations on the role of historians as professional experts and their chances to serve as committed agents – or meta-critics – of the ongoing memory boom.

The volume helps conceptualize and comprehend the epochal transition, from attempts at heroization to the focus on victimization, the ongoing shift from celebrations of the collective self to fostering the possibility of individual catharsis. The contributors tend to present these momentous changes in a favorable light and discuss their still unfulfilled potential. At the same time, some authors (most notably Pieter Lagrou) harshly criticize aspects of new historical cultures for fueling “intolerant” and even “autistic” discourses of identity (p. 287) or, as Natan Sznaider does, point to the dangerous implications of the rise of structural trauma with its universalistic pretensions. In Sznaider’s eyes, conceptions of structural trauma not only overlook the human dimension of historical events but can directly obfuscate the victim/perpetrator dichotomy. The contributors to the volume thus raise centrally important questions such as the difference between universalistic and particularistic conceptions of victimhood and their implications (Sznaider), the possibilities of

post-national, dialogical remembrance, and the appropriate forms of reconciliation between the asymmetric memories dominating the two halves of the continent (Assmann), or the relation of official, public memory to inter-generational memory transmission and contemporary identity needs in a comparative context (Harald Welzer and Claudia Lenz).

At the same time, the history and memory of communist repression and the Holocaust are rarely compared or contrasted. The book presents far fewer considerations of the various valuations of Nazism and communism and their sometimes fierce contest than I would have expected in the light of its title and declared agenda. The marked divergences between Eastern and Western European memory cultures are often hinted at but little detail is given on the false expectations and the often (and almost inevitably) resulting mutual disappointments. This is more than just a surprising, but otherwise hardly significant, shortcoming, but rather reveals the greatest structural weakness of the volume and offers sad insights into the current working of the European republic of letters (to paraphrase Pascale Casanova).

While the volume highlights its commitment to a pan-European "encounter, public debate and sincere engagement" and is published in English, with few exceptions the exchange that takes place on its pages is between native speakers of German and French (p. 18). What is more, in spite of the declared ambition to treat communist repression and the Holocaust simultaneously, the perspective of Eastern European scholars is sadly missing – in spite of the region having to confront precisely this dual legacy. While Austrians or Swiss were invited to discuss their own countries, scholars from France (Blaive), Germany (Stefan Troebst) and Italy (Maria Ferretti) cover East Central Europe, Bulgaria and Russia, respectively. This is hardly the way to overcome asymmetric relations in Europe.

For the sake of fairness I ought to add that, on the other hand, three studies compare countries across the seemingly still decisive dividing line where the Iron Curtain used to stand: the study of Welzer and Lenz discusses, besides Western memory cultures, two ex-Yugoslav republics, Oliver Rathkolb compares Austria with three East Central European countries in primarily quantitative terms while Berthold Molden's explicit aim is to study the two sides of the Cold War border. The volume otherwise appears rather like another Western effort at rapprochement, which is (ironically enough) all too familiar from the previous era in European history.

Jena

Ferenc Laczó

Heike Amos: Die Vertriebenenpolitik der SED 1949 bis 1990. (Schriftenreihe der Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, Sondernummer.) Oldenbourg. München 2009. 297 S. ISBN 978-3-486-59139-2. (€ 44,80.)

Auf der Grundlage bisher noch nicht ausgewerteter Akten aus dem Bundesarchiv und dem Archiv der Bundesbeauftragten für die Unterlagen des Staatssicherheitsdienstes der ehemaligen DDR in Berlin untersucht Heike Amos die Vertriebenenpolitik der SED von der Gründung der DDR bis zu deren Ende 1990. Die mehr als 4 Millionen „Umsiedler“ wurden seit 1951/52 nicht mehr gesondert statistisch erfasst. Ihre Eingliederung galt offiziell als erfolgreich abgeschlossen. Nichtsdestoweniger standen sie unter Beobachtung der Organe der DDR-Staatssicherheit, wollte man doch jedes Sondergruppenbewusstsein und jede „Umsiedlerkonzentration“ in Betrieben, Institutionen und an Wohnorten (S. 12) verhindern.

A. ordnet den Quellenbefund in vier Themengruppen. Zunächst untersucht sie „Das Vertriebenenproblem in den 1950er Jahren“ und zeigt, wie trotz der Tabuisierung die „Umsiedler“ ein Thema der Politik gewesen sind. Die SED-Führung beobachtete die als Zoobesuch getarnten informellen Vertriebenentreffen in Halle (Saale) und Leipzig in den 1950er und 1960er Jahren ebenso aufmerksam wie die „Stimmungen unter den ehemaligen Umsiedlern“ (S. 42) und die Haltung der Bevölkerung zur Ostgrenze. Zugleich observierte die Staatssicherheit in den 1950er und 1960er Jahren durch informelle Mitarbeiter die Ak-