

KRISTINA KAISEROVÁ and GERT RÖHRBORN

“The generation affected will have to see it through.” Literary paths out of dictatorship

“The professional human rights activist is not a politician, he is more like a priest, an artist. [...] He is an artist, his field the violation of the law.”¹

Is a violation of the law a work of art? Or must every work of art include a violation of the law in order to be recognized as an artistic act? 30 years ago, the Hungarian author and dissident Miklós Haraszti drew a totally different conclusion. For him, art is not political per se, or resistant according to a particular school of thought; it simply seeks out space for itself and nestles between the lines of any legislation, whether it be democratic or dictatorial. It pushes at boundaries of many and various types, boundaries whose violation always corresponds (in a secondary sense) with the violation of laws. Yet in the majority of cases artists are calculating lawbreakers, torn between desire for individual expression on the one hand and social recognition on the other. All regimes (and indeed some people) therefore feature an idealized conflict between the artist as a freely creative individual and what Haraszti calls a “corporate artist”. Artists’ identities are split into a number of fragments, and it is therefore with great effort that a number of them retrospectively portray earlier contradictory (alienating) expressions of their Self as a whole in the context of their Self and their environment.²

The European unification process has provided evidence over a number of decades of the great influence which can be exerted—even on entire societies—by the existence of the capacity to remember and shared memory. In a speech to mark the 60th anniversary of the liberation of the Buchenwald and Mittelbau-Dora concentration camps, the Spanish author Jorge Semprún voiced a heady claim: “One of the most effective ways in which a path can be cleared for the future of a united Europe—or rather the reunited Europe—is to share our past, our memory, with each other and to unite our memories, which have remained separate up to now.”³ Some authors even take the view that, without some type of reunification of history (or histories), the political unification of Europe cannot be successful.⁴

Given the manifold and overlapping experiences of grief, and in particular the experiences of the 20th century, we are drawn towards the human issue of reconciliation. Nonetheless, with the exception of the general realization that collective injuries and traumata need to be dealt with there is anything other than unity amongst opinions on the impositions which can be made on greatness and pride-oriented national remembrance associations. Shared memory needs common points of reference, and in a superficial sense the suffering of violence means an end to all communication unites all victims.⁵ If even a reasonably similar perspective is lacking, the same unholy spiral of dissociation and struggles to establish the supremacy of the respective sides' interpretations will continue to unfold over and over again. Each and every human experiences violence as an individual, even if its use is mainly legitimized on the basis of collective characteristics and decisions. "All shots on target are orbiting in space. God ordains. Only the evil justifies."⁶

To provide an example, it makes a great difference whether the history of Hungary as a culture-rich Central European nation is described against the backdrop of the annihilation of the European Jews (i.e., Hungary as the nation of the Arrow Cross Party), imperial Soviet oppression of the people of Eastern Europe (with reference to the events of 1956, for example) or cross-border migration (further to the Treaty of Trianon). Opposing national views of history have continued to provide hidden fuel to political conflicts in Europe in recent times, as amply illustrated not only by Hungary's relationships with Romania and Slovakia, but also by the confrontations between Estonia and Russia, as well as those between Poland and Germany. Tangible economic and political conflicts of interest, cultural misunderstandings and lack of synchrony in the experiencing, processing and passing on of historical processes are further factors.

Arrival at a common narrative despite changing perspectives is nonetheless not to be completely ruled out. Yet it is surely not just "better" alternatives—which the Europe-wide epoch-defining dates 1968, 1789/1989 or 1848/1948, celebrated at regular intervals and as a matter of course, could be taken for—to those mentioned above which are required.⁷ On the contrary, a central value must be sought which is able to represent a real point of intersection between the various perspectives. The unconditional protection of minority groups could take on this integrative role in today's Europe: "It required an eventful and more-or-less accurately studied history spanning many thousands of years to gradually grasp the fact that diversity is not a cause for war."⁸

We should therefore examine the role of culture in the processing of dictatorships and their legacies. Historical relationships are naturally not re-

stricted to the political sphere; they also thoroughly penetrate the public cultural sphere and daily life. The subject of history tends towards a niche existence in modern painting, both in terms of artistic production and public awareness. This notwithstanding, a close and resonant relationship continues to exist between history and sculpture, and particularly as an element of public memory—as illustrated by innumerable memorial sites and signs of remembrance. Theatrical and literary creation also have a significant influence on the sense of history and collective assessment of a period of history: there can surely be hardly a member of the audience at a puppet theatre play such as *Das Lager* [The Camp] by Pauline Kalker, Arlene Hoornweg und Herman Helle (in which prisoners are beaten to death over a period of several minutes while the fires of the crematorium burn incessantly in the background) that leaves devoid of emotion.⁹ Who was aware at the time and who is still aware today of *Largo Desolato*, which was played extensively across the political stages of Eastern Europe just a few years ago?¹⁰ This distinction goes beyond mere tenses, as James E. Young points out in reference to research into and literature based on the annihilation of the Jews: “Contrary to the view that the world and the way in which we portray it have absolutely no influence on one another, there has always been a reciprocal penetration of ‘life’ and ‘written life,’ of catastrophe and our reactions to it, therefore literature—even when expressing our practical reactions to the current crisis—nevertheless still recalls past devastation.”¹¹

In addition to museums and exhibitions, the appeal of audiovisual media in particular has increased significantly. The rise and social dominance of the mass media has brought commercialization with it, and the role of the author and artist as a traditional communicator of culture needs to be redefined independently. Having previously been the defenders of inventories of priceless national traditions or the mouthpiece of dissident opponents, they have now been forced into sectioned-off areas where intellectual life concepts are to be played out. Yet it is just this development which brings an opportunity with it: a living, emotionally-gripping remembrance culture is based on the narration, uncovering and discussion of individual experiences in conscious dialogue with fellow human beings. A work of art initially establishes itself and then continuously re-establishes itself within the reader; it is digested individually, processed and passed on.¹² It therefore encounters hidden layers which are broader than those encountered by the academic and cultural fraternities, as the latter’s professional dealings with history are conducted on a much broader front.

György Konrád has summed up what it is that sets the special value of literature apart where European remembrance culture and shared social ex-

perience are concerned. In his view, the first factor is the century-old, cross-border pioneering spirit of European literature per se—a spirit which is far ahead of any political union. The second factor is the practical opportunity to actually make plurality a reality using the active assistance of innumerable translators, who Konrád would like to see respected as the “true weavers of Europe” alongside politicians and financiers. The third factor is the method of professional watching in the form of participative observation, which represents a “third view” that takes sides with victims when it would otherwise only be the victors who get to write history.¹³ In doing this authors do not simply assume the pose of the tragic Cassandra: “In a sense, as soon as we lay our hand on the pen, or the computer keyboard, we already cease to be the helpless victims of whatever it was that enslaved and diminished us before we began to write. Not the slaves of our predicament nor of our private anxieties; not of the ‘official narrative’ of our country, nor of fate itself.”¹⁴

The contributions included in this literary anthology are taken from the project “Overcoming Dictatorships – the Encounter of Poets, Artists and Writers”, which is being carried out under the supervision of the Technische Universität Dresden. Participants in the projects hail from Germany, Italy, Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Romania—all countries which were subjected in their own specific way to 20th-century authoritarian or totalitarian dictatorships. The project sees them report on their experiences of life under dictatorships and the influence of the political change brought about by the fall of communism on their artistic activity. The variety of different generations, European countries and artistic directions from which they come has represented both an advantage and a challenge where the cooperation between them is concerned. Though their original motivation to take part may have varied from that of their fellow contributors—a biography of persecution, a feeling of personal historical responsibility or artistic curiosity—a unanimous desire to share and work together has emerged during the course of the project.

Three-day workshops in the countries named above see the writers and poets read from their work, thereby making others familiar with the culture of neighbouring European countries. The artists are working on a joint travelling exhibition due to open in October 2008 at the University of Birmingham, Great Britain—a country which, despite not having witnessed dictatorships within its borders, created or actively supported authoritarian situations during its time as a colonial power. The transfer of culture is designed to explode prejudices and create better understanding between Central-Eastern and Western Europe. The primary cause of these prejudices is the insufficient processing of Europe’s dictatorial past—a past which has left deep

psychological scars and caused material and cultural loss in almost all countries across the continent.¹⁵ Encounters between counterparts from East and West therefore have a significant role to play.

A wide spectrum of memory and digestion has been opened up not only to the public, but also to the participants in the project. The contributions which have taken shape over the course of the last few months bear not only the trademarks of their respective authors, but also signs of the reflections which have taken place within them as a result of their participation. Individual development has been clearly influenced by cooperative work on the topic at hand. Concrete problems with the politics of dealing with the past have not been at the forefront of the discussions which have gone on, though a notable exception has come in the form of the voicing by Eduard Vacek at a meeting in Ústí nad Labem of his stance on the compensation for and the prevention of injustice carried out under dictatorships. In Vacek's view it is a question of decorum that the former opposition are these days no worse off than former perpetrators. His demand for the complete replacement of former leadership personnel and vehement support for common, decidedly anti-totalitarian history books provoked considerable protest. He insists on the necessity of reconciliation, including amongst the affected generations. The majority of his colleagues, on the other hand, attach greater importance to interhuman exchange and political education, though they also lament the insufficient resources made available for such measures. Fundamental disagreement regarding prevention ensued, the essence of which was formulated during the debate by the Dresden painter Ulf Göpfert, as follows: "The affected generation will have to see it through. Prevention is a matter for youth. Not our generation. For me, real prevention is becoming a European."

Compensation is therefore not an issue for discussion amongst literary figures due to the fact that it is a legal matter—and in any case one which is extremely complex. It is a form of dealing with the past which is conducted between governments or between governments and civil groups, and is based on the one-sided recognition of responsibility, the suffering of victims and an apology from the perpetrators. The primary aim of such voluntary gestures towards victims (global or individual restitution, reparations, etc.) is the balancing-out or annulment of losses suffered in the past. A further related issue is the display towards the victims of both respect and a desire for reconciliation. A risk of political orchestration and instrumentalisation does, however, exist, as the "political use of history is [...] an important part of the self-image of societies with pluralist constitutions, and therefore an elixir of life for democracy."¹⁶ It is also not possible to rule out negative impacts on

victims if gestures are not linked to efforts to create a *modus vivendi*—one which reconciles previously opposing group identities rather than perpetuating them, and gives rise to a shared, positive historical awareness despite the crimes of the past.¹⁷ Efforts towards retrospective legal security therefore mainly serve to counteract traumatising based on severe experiences of helplessness which may attain exemplary interpretative sovereignty in the psyche of victims. It is here that literature and art are able to reach beyond the limits of legal processing and the consequences of the drawing of (necessary) new political boundaries and yet still avoid the partial exaggerations of academic and journalistic debate¹⁸: “De-traumatisation occurs both in dialogue and within each individual. Neither side is obliged to wait until it reaches the other side, and in waiting for one another the two sides may keep each other in their traumatized states.”¹⁹

It is the investigation of the lasting legacies of dictatorships which have marked both their lives and the lives of others which has fascinated and occupied the participants in the project to an ever-increasing extent. Fears that develop towards neurosis, disturbances in interpersonal communication and the debasement and misuse of societal resources have all proven to be of great significance. The work presented here is neither a new political history nor an economic analysis of recent times: a view of the flayed minion has been opened up.²⁰ The fact that this view is extremely multi-faceted is also linked to the additional differentiation between remembered and remembering victim groups, with the Germans having recently (been allowed to) re-join(ed) the latter on the basis of bombing tactics and forced migration.²¹ The suffering of victims may not—at least in an initial sense—be turned into new cultural capital, with every political-journalistic proxy war of the type conducted in Western Europe during the 1990s—and in particular amongst literary figures (as illustrated by the case of Peter Handke)—to be avoided.²² It is rather the development of an “ethnography of a past everyday life, one which is neither part of an agenda nor takes itself or its protagonists to be representatives of an era”²³ which characterizes the contributions collected together in this volume. Authors and poets prefer to pose their own questions rather than answer questions posed by others.²⁴ In reading between the lines one is continually confronted with the realization that inhumanity essentially reflects on its protagonists, and does not even spare their descendants. Remaining silent puts the future—which has been endangered by previous violence—completely at risk.²⁵ In allowing grief and pain to exist the high moral tone of the feature pages is replaced. In cases where violence is explored in the contributions selected for this anthology barbarism is neither stylized nor stereotyped.²⁶

The paths of reconciliation which have been taken and are being taken within the framework of this project can be illustrated using the example of an event which took place in Cracow in November 2007. The event saw the author Utz Rachowski (Reichenbach), the photographer Harald Hauswald (Berlin) and the poet Denisa Mirena Pişcu (Bucharest) take part in a joint discussion and reading.

Time and again the texts of Utz Rachowski—whose ancestors originate from Sdunska Wola in Poland—bring suppressed biographical interweavings to light: his father’s National-Socialist and latterly socialist career; his grandmother’s atmospheric and war-atrocity-laced recollections of her youth; the dubious past of detested teachers. It is the heart and not the ear of his readers that is sought out by his composed, urgent voice, with each text similar to a poem. Having been arrested in 1979 as a result of his poems, 1980 saw him sold to the Federal Republic of Germany. Though he was able to settle in West Berlin for over a decade—and was therefore “protected” by the Wall—he had to admit to himself that he had not only been engaged in the GDR and its prisons, but also in his own poetry: “Notes, questions. The all-encompassing reality which was to be adhered to lost all its power when I took up my pen and wrote. Without knowing it, I was practising a survival technique which would be of use to me both in the army and in prison: switching off, stopping time. I admit that I held this loss of consciousness, this impotence in the face of the bloodhounds against language, against this thing which could perhaps be called literature. In no way did I want to accept the facts that it let me become a victim despite me giving myself to it, that it was not omnipotent, that I had to suffer just as others did. The wound this left ran deep.”²⁷

The photography of Harald Hauswald is not presented as a rough image of reality: it is a profound insight into it. He does not arrange shots, but fits elements together and looks for things that other do not see. He waits for the right moment before grasping little wonders, the *pars pro toto* of the bewildering crowds. His work is therefore consciously one-sided though certainly honest. He has always avoided celebratory photos, and is heavily rebuked for this by the same crowds he has been capturing on film for the last 30 years. Hauswald quotes an extreme example of this stance experienced by him at a well-frequented exhibition in Jena during the spring of 2007: “When you look at your photos you could come to the conclusion that we’d lived in a police state” was the comment of an indignant visitor, who continued “Where are the photos of our happy, smiling Pioneers?”²⁸ When in the company of those who really want to listen, Hauswald recounts almost unbelievable stories of the little shards of freedom offered by the moment,

of the clever out-maneuvring of dictatorial authorities despite oppression and a lack of any great deal of freedom. The photographer speaks openly about his pain, and remains exuberantly pleased about his successes and hidden coups. He not only confronts people who lived in the former GDR with what was going on at the time, but also with what was possible. And what the result of that situation is today. In his view, and as used in the title of a collaboration published by Hauswald and author and friend Lutz Rathenow, things have “gewendet” (turned)—a term which echoes the most popular description of the decline of the GDR.²⁹

Vaclav Havel risked his neck as a dissident under dictatorship.³⁰ George Soros shipped vast numbers of photocopiers to the Polish opposition. Now, in the age of the internet, users are presumed to be just a click away from great personal deeds. Modern indulgences are sold, politics commercialized. These seem to be the reasons why Denisa Mirena Pişcu feels like a stranger in the West. In her eyes, Prague appears to be mutating into a huge bazaar from which Eastern European history is flogged to fashion-conscious yet completely clueless Westerners. On the other hand, her description of a journey through crisis-ridden Moldavia—a journey she slipped away from a conference to undertake—reverts to a familiar tone of melancholic support: “Heads thrust out of the car, greetings, and locals taken aback, as yet unsure as how they’re supposed to react in the presence of freedom.”³¹ Perhaps there really is such a thing as a community of Central-Eastern European experience, one which could overcome old national entrenchments under the auspices of transformation as an adjustment to Western norms and behaviour. Central-Eastern Europeans would have a lot to say to each other—if they listened to one another. Pişcu started this process in Cracow. Her method was an attempt to appreciate how her audience heard her in Polish and English translations as she spoke simultaneously in Romanian. She later reported enthusiastically on how the experience of such a variety of and wrestling between languages had taken her into a trance-like state. This is an experience which no-one can take away from her, and one which she will hopefully pass on in her own way.

Poets and authors are also people with firmly-set self-images and prejudices, however they are surely thankful to an above-average extent for the opportunity to carry out at least partial revision. The results of their cross-border dialogue have enriched the project organisers with important experiences and encouraged all involved to carry on along the path the project has taken. The publication of at least its written results is designed to allow a wider public audience in the countries in question to profit from these results. Multilingualism was therefore of importance to us. We wish to open up

routes towards a European culture, or to be more precise a post-nationalist community of communication. This is not a question of the creation of a political European public sphere, but rather the further civilisation and humanization of political culture. This, in turn, neither means that national politics are to be scrapped, nor that the creation of a constitutional European conception of history and remembrance canon is to be supported. In instances where legal protection is used to make truths into moral victories, the persuasiveness of the resultant victories is often questionable.³² It is the disappearance of the individual behind social and political attributions that this project seeks to overcome.

The “exodus from the camp” of modernity is the appearance of a human being as a singular being, one whose life is unique and therefore to be protected unconditionally. A human being who, after the hecatombs have been sacrificed “in the name of the people,” only wishes—and is only able—to testify for themselves.³³ It is only then that the conditions have been met which enable them to be judged in a valid way and, where necessary, condemned. Such a human being who no longer endeavours to distance themselves from the experience of their own being, desires and actions using ideological protective mechanisms and psychological defensive reflexes is better placed to engage in permanent development. Their role is not that of a “shining example” (carrying out “heroic” duties, following the “true” path, etc.), but rather that of a point of reference, a partner in the definition of one’s own path. A certain eschatological nature may be inherent in this train of thought, one which perhaps comes across as somewhat anachronistic. In her analysis of the totalitarian temptation of modernity, Hannah Arendt stresses that the social revival of (Christian) religion no longer represents a way out, and that it is no longer possible to expel evil from the world.³⁴ Yet can we not see it as a higher form of humanity if the judgement of a human being as a singular being—formerly known as divine justice—does not just remain an otherworldly hope, but actually becomes a worldly opportunity for all?

We recommend that readers keep in mind our editorial principles while browsing through this volume. Our top priority is the genuine representation of the diversity of the literary approaches and perspectives used and exhibited within the framework of this project. Each contribution is included both in its original language and in the form of an English translation. We have used slight amendments and annotations only in cases where it seemed to be in the best interest of international readers. The three sections into which this volume is divided (*sediments*, *voids*, *time travels*) have been chosen on an allegorical basis in order to facilitate an initial appropriation of the material.

We encourage all readers to reread and compare contributions in different orders after their initial reading. Readers with a sophisticated literary interest may consult the inspiring interpretations by Astrid Köhler. We would like to take this opportunity to extend our thanks to all the individuals and institutions that have made the publication of this book possible. First and foremost, of course, we would like to thank the contributors and partners who have taken part in our project, invested courage, time and joy and given their all in helping to define the path that our undertaking has taken. We are particularly indebted to the European Union for their general financing of the project (as part of the “CULTURE 2000” programme), as well as to the University of Ústi nad Labem for their generous contribution towards the book’s publication, which has been dealt with with prudence and competence by our colleagues at the Central European University Press. The printer’s copy was prepared by Helga Zichner. The vital role of the numerous and irreplaceable translators, assistants and documenters who facilitated personal exchanges between authors and poets at workshops, accompanied readings and collated contributions is also not to be forgotten. Though they are too many of them to mention in full here, we thank Eileen Schuldt, Justyna Smyka, David Tomiček, Susie Kerekes, Cristina Bordaş, Nellie Gilson and Barbara Lubich as representatives of their invaluable number. We hope that you, the readers of this book, will both sense and take away something of the unfettered sincerity which made each and every one of the meetings between the participants in this project an experience without comparison.

(2008)

Translated by *Peter Welchman*

Notes

- 1 “Der professionelle Menschenrechtler ist kein Politiker, er ist vielmehr ein Priester, ein Künstler. [...] Er ist ein Künstler der Gesetzesübertretung,” see Miklós Haraszti. “Zum Verrücktwerden. Kopfnoten eines Menschenrechtlers” [Enough to lose one’s sanity. Evaluations of a human rights activist], in *Kursbuch 81. Die andere Hälfte Europas* [Timetable. The other part of Europe], eds. Karl Markus Michel and Tilman Spengler, Berlin: Kursbuch, 1985, 25–33, 30f.
- 2 See Miklós Haraszti, *The velvet prison. Artists under state socialism*, New York/NY: Basic, 1987.
- 3 Quoted in *Woran erinnern? Der Kommunismus in der deutschen Erinnerungskultur* [What to remember? Communism within the German culture of remembrance], eds. Peter März and Hans-Joachim Veen, Cologne, Weimar, Vienna: Böhlaus, 2006, 10.

- 4 See Dorothee Wilms, “Erinnerungskultur in Europa. Zu den Aufgaben von Literatur und Geschichtsforschung” [The European culture of remembrance. On the tasks of literature and historiography], *Die politische Meinung*, no. 448 (March 2007), 41–43; Gabriele Baumann and Nina Müller. *Vergangenheitsbewältigung und Erinnerungskultur in den Ländern Mittelost- und Südosteuropas* [Coming to terms with the past and the culture of remembrance in Central Eastern and South Eastern European countries], Berlin, Sankt Augustin: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, 2006.
- 5 Cf. Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, new edition, New York/NY: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966, 460–479; see also idem, *On Revolution*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Classic, 1990.
- 6 Zsófia Balla, *Grass* (in this anthology).
- 7 Stefan Auer, “Das Erbe von 1989. Revolutionen für Europa” [The heritage of 1989. Revolutions for Europe], *Osteuropa*, no. 5–6 (2004), 31–46.
- 8 See György Konrád, *Der dritte Blick oder Betrachtungen eines Antipolitischen* [The third perspective. Meditations of an anti-political person], Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2001, 196.
- 9 See Martin Lhotzky, “Die Zonen der Erniedrigung” [Zones of humiliation], *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, no. 193, August 21, 2007, 35.
- 10 Václav Havel, *Largo desolato. Schauspiel in 7 Bildern* [Largo desolato. A play in 7 scenes], Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1990.
- 11 James E. Young, *Beschreiben des Holocaust* [Writing and rewriting the Holocaust], Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997, 18.
- 12 See Wolfgang Iser, *Der Akt des Lesens* [Act of reading], Munich: Fink, 1976.
- 13 See Konrád, *Der dritte Blick*, (op. cit. note 8), 211.
- 14 David Grossman, *Writing in the dark*. Adapted from The Arthur Miller Freedom to Write Lecture, delivered at PEN’s World Voices Festival on April 29, 2007 (<http://www.pen.org/printmedia.php/prmMediaID/1490>).
- 15 See Gerhard Besier, *Das Europa der Diktaturen. Eine neue Geschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Munich: DVA, 2006 (English translation forthcoming); *Exile and patronage. Cross-cultural negotiations beyond the Third Reich*, eds. Andrew Chandler, Katarzyna Stokłosa and Jutta Vinzent, Berlin: LIT, 2006; Michal Kopeček, *Past in the making. Historical Revisionism in Central Europe after 1989*, Budapest, New York: Central European University Press, 2008.
- 16 Hans Günter Hockerts, “Zugänge zur Zeitgeschichte: Primärerfahrung, Erinnerungskultur, Geschichtswissenschaft” [Approaches to contemporary history: primary experience, culture of remembrance, historiography], *Politik und Zeitgeschichte* B 28/2001, 15–30, 22.
- 17 See Elazar Barkan, *The Guilt of Nations: Restitution and negotiating historical injustices*, Baltimore/ML: W. W. Norton, 2000; Richard Vernon, “Against Restitution”, *Political Studies* 51 (2003), no. 3, 542–557; Michael Wolffsohn, “Geschichte als Falle. Deutschland und die jüdische Welt” [History, the trap. Germany and the Jewish world], in *Geschichte als Falle: Deutschland und die jüdische Welt*, eds. idem and Thomas Brechenbacher, Neuried: Ars Urna, 2001, 35–44.

- 18 See the extremely critical analyses in Young, *Beschreiben* (op. cit. Note 11), 7–20; Anne Fuchs, “From ‘Vergangenheitsbewältigung’ to generational memory contests in Günter Grass, Monika Maron and Uwe Timm”, *German Life and Letters* 59 (2006), no. 2, 169–186; Antonia Grunenberg, *Die Lust an der Schuld. Von der Macht der Vergangenheit über die Gegenwart* [Lust for guilt. How the past rules the present], Berlin: Rowohlt, 2001.
- 19 Bernhard Schlink, “Epilog: Die Gegenwart der Vergangenheit” [Epilogue: The presence of the past] in idem, “Die Bewältigung von Vergangenheit durch Recht”, in idem, *Vergangenheitsschuld und gegenwärtiges Recht* [The guilt of the past and contemporary law], Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2002, 145–156, 153; see Günter Jerouschek, “Straftat und Traumatisierung. Überlegungen zu Unrecht, Schuld und Rehabilitierung der Strafe aus viktimologischer Perspektive” [The criminal act and traumatization. Reflections on injustice, guilt and the rehabilitation of retribution from the victim’s perspective], *Juristen Zeitung* 55 (2000), no. 4, 185–194; Christoph Görg, “‘Verlust des Weltvertrauens’. Die Bedeutung von Rechtssicherheit für die Aufarbeitung von Traumata”, *Mittelweg* 36 10 (2001), no. 2, 77–90.
- 20 See Giorgio Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz: The witness and the archive*, New York: Zone Books, 2002.
- 21 See Aleida Assmann, “On the (in)compatibility of guilt and suffering in German memory”, *German Life and Letters* 59 (2006), no. 2, 187–200.
- 22 See Karoline von Oppeln, “Imagining the Balkans, imagining Germany: Intellectual journeys to former Yugoslavia in the 1990s”, *The Germany Quarterly* 79 (2006), no. 2, 192–210.
- 23 Thomas Anz, “Epochenumbruch und Generationenwechsel? Zur Konjunktur von Generationenkonstrukten seit 1989” [Transition and generational change? On the boom of generational concepts since 1989], in *Schreiben nach der Wende. Ein Jahrzehnt deutscher Literatur 1989–1999* [Writing after the changes. A decade of German literature 1989–1999], eds. Gerhard Fischer and David Roberts, 2nd unabridged edition, Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2007, 31–40, 35.
- 24 Cf. Richard Swartz, “Nachwort” [Epilogue], in *Der andere nebenan. Eine Anthologie aus dem Südosten Europas* [The other next door. An anthology from South Eastern Europe], ed. Richard Swartz, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2007, 333–337.
- 25 See Slavenka Drakulić, “Drei Monologe über die anderen” [Three monologues on the others], in Swartz, *Der andere* (op. cit. note 24), 87–100.
- 26 See Michael Wildt, “Sind die Nazis Barbaren? Betrachtungen zu einer geklärten Frage” [Are the Nazis barbarians? Meditations on a clarified question], *Mittelweg* 36 15 (2006), no. 2, 8–26.
- 27 Utz Rachowski, “Das Erschrecken über die eigene Sprache (1983)” [Frightened by one’s own language], quoted after idem, “Die Farben des Jürgen Fuchs” [The colors of Jürgen Fuchs], in idem, *Red’ mir nicht von Minnigerode. Erzählungen und Aufsätze* [Don’t bother me with Minnigerode], Dresden: Thelem Universitätsverlag, 2006, 106–118, 114f.

- 28 Here: “Pioneers” is the translated short form for the GDR youth movement *Junge Pioniere*.
- 29 Harald Hauswald and Lutz Rathenow, *Gewendet. Vor und nach dem Mauerfall: Fotos und Texte aus dem Osten* [Turned. Before and after the fall of wall], Berlin: Jaron, 2006.
- 30 See Václav Havel, “Anatomie einer Zurückhaltung (1985)” [The anatomy of aloofness], in *Dazwischen. Ostmitteleuropäische Reflexionen* [In between. Central Eastern European reflections], eds. Frank Herterich and Christian Semler, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1989, 34–64, 62.
- 31 Denisa Mirena Pişcu (in this anthology).
- 32 See Reinhard Kaiser, “Versiegelte Geschichte. Erinnerungsgesetze helfen nicht” [Sealed history. On the vanity of laws of remembrance] *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, no. 177, August 2, 2007, 33.
- 33 See *Auszug aus dem Lager. Zur Überwindung des modernen Raumparadigmas in der politischen Philosophie* [Exodus from the camp. On overcoming the spatial paradigm of modernity in political philosophy], ed. Ludger Schwarte, Berlin, Bielefeld: Transcript, 2007; Giorgio Agamben, “Bartleby, or On Contingency”, in idem, *Potentialities. Collected essays in philosophy*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999, 243–271.
- 34 See Hannah Arendt, “A Reply to Voegelin”, in *Essays in Understanding, 1930–1954. Formation, Exile, Totalitarianism*, ed. Jerome Kohn, New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1994.