Postsocialist, Postmigrant, and Postcolonial Dynamics in Germany's Changing Memoryscape. Introduction

Andrei Zavadski, Sharon Macdonald & Irene Hilden

ABSTRACT: *This essay introduces the 89th issue of* Berliner Blätter *entitled* Germany's Changing Memoryscape. Postsocialist, Postmigrant, and Postcolonial Dynamics. *The introduction, as well as the issue as a whole, is dedicated to how German remembrance is being transformed by various posts, first and foremost those invoked in the title. It argues that while postmigrant, postsocialist, and postcolonial memories have still to make considerable inroads into changing the existing Holocaust-centered memory regime in Germany, they have already changed the country's broader memoryscape and are continuing to do so. The issue's focus is on ways in which this transformation is experienced in practice, and the following introductory remarks present the editors' key arguments, contextualizing them within German memory as it developed after World War II (WWII) and substantiating them with the volume's contributions.*

KEYWORDS: *Germany, Holocaust, memoryscape, postcolonial, postmigrant, postsocialist*

HOW TO CITE: *Zavadski, A., Macdonald, S., Hilden, I. (2024): Postsocialist, Postmigrant, and Postcolonial Dynamics in Germany's Changing Memoryscape. Introduction. In: Berliner Blätter 89, 3–23.*

Germany's memoryscape is experiencing a radical transformation. Long structured predominantly by the Nazi past and the Holocaust, it is increasingly incorporating — and being transformed by — other strands of collective remembrance. In particular, the pasts of the socialist (German Democratic Republic, GDR) period, of German colonialism, and of its citizens' multiple histories of migration have been gaining increased public presence. But how do these different mnemonic impulses come together and interact? What are the implications of this for the ongoing dynamics and directions of public remembering in Germany? And how is this transformation reshaping Germany's post-Holocaust memory regime?

These are the key questions that this issue addresses. It does so by bringing together selected original contributions of various genres that each considers particular dimensions and instances of the transformation. Mostly based on in-depth ethnographic or historical research as well as sometimes rooted in personal experience, the contributions, individually and collectively, shed new light on concerns, debates, struggles, interconnections, players, and practices involved in transforming Germany's memoryscape. Through their focused exploration of specific cases in which Germany's present and future collective or semi-

DOI: 10.18452/28743 | Creative Commons CC 4.0: BY-NC-SA

collective memory is being — often provisionally and sometimes conflictually — reshaped, they provide a vivid picture of the various constellations, complications, and dynamics in play. All of the contributions consider more than one past — the colonial, migrant, and/or socialist, and some focus on the entanglements of these pasts with others. There is no equal quota on each, and neither do we claim this to be a full or necessarily representative picture; we do not seek a survey or a comprehensive mapping of the memoryscape. Instead, the approach is more akin to the *experimental cartography* presented in this volume — and illustrating its cover — by Moses März, in which the aim is explorative and elucidatory, seeking out and highlighting relations, especially those that have been given less attention in the debates thus far.

Postmigrant, Postsocialist, and Postcolonial Memories

Another way of characterizing the various strands of remembrance that this volume addresses is with reference to them as *postmigrant*, *postsocialist*, and *postcolonial* — terms that variously feature in debates about contemporary Germany, including in questions of memory and heritage. Over the past decades, and especially in the last few years, these debates have centered on challenges to, and changes in, Germany's post-Holocaust memory regime as a result of attempts by various mnemonic actors to include these *posts* in how public memory is constituted and performed in the country. Our argument is not that the German memoryscape is formed in national isolation or that these strands are only evident in Germany. Moreover, we do not argue that the postmigrant, postsocialist, and postcolonial are necessarily the only factors that are changing the memoryscape; others, such as a wider turn to investigating family memory, an increased valuing of everyday pasts, and attempts to create ›European memory‹ as part of the formation of the European Union, also play a role. Nevertheless, the three posts on which we focus in this issue have come to the fore in recent debates in Germany and deserve further attention, as we provide here.

According to Michael Rothberg (2022, 1316), while the dominant Holocaust memory regime in Germany »represented a major societal accomplishment of the 1980s and 1990s, it has reached its limits in Germany's ›postmigrant‹ present.« Rothberg (2022, 1326) argues that »the lived multidirectionality experienced by migrant communities« and manifested in these communities' critical mnemonic work conjoining their own memories of violent pasts with memory of the Holocaust »neither denies the specificity of the Holocaust and its lessons for Germany's present nor elevates that specificity into a sacred and untouchable event.« In other words, in a society with a sizeable proportion of migrants and their descendants, for whom other pasts (including of atrocity) are significant, reductive national narratives prescribing how one should and should not engage with the Holocaust — elegantly referred to by Rothberg (2022, 1318) as »truisms of German memory culture« — are being challenged by migrant and postmigrant communities and their mnemonic practices. Although regularly marginalized, postmigrant memories constitute an important part of the memoryscape, claiming increasingly more space and questioning — even »sabotaging« — the dominant memory regime (Rothberg 2022, 1326).

It is worth noting that, while Rothberg's focus is on multidirectional interactions of postmigrant memories with the Holocaust and their contribution to challenging German remembrance, the country's broader memoryscape also contains postmigrant memories that have little to do with the Holocaust — for example, the Turkish-German and Armenian-German communities and their mnemonic practices with regard to the Armenian geno-

cide (von Bieberstein, this volume). As Alice von Bieberstein argues in her contribution, »[u]nderstanding Germany as postmigrant ultimately also means going beyond a historical framework that is limited to the Holocaust and constantly confronting the question of the significance of other chapters of the global history of violence anew« (see also von Bieberstein 2016).[1]

Other posts have been playing a role in redefining Germany's memory too. Following the fall of the Berlin Wall and reunification, postsocialist memories have been slowly but steadily claiming space in the memoryscape. Often marginalized (Art 2014), sometimes accentuated (as in the Humboldt Forum's *Berlin Global* exhibition, see below), and regularly regarded as potentially relativizing the Holocaust, these memories are now more pronounced in public remembrance than ever.

Similarly, the country's colonial past, which was, until the 2010s, barely present in public life, has since come to occupy a visible place in its memoryscape. As with the socialist past after the unification, the specter of potentially relativizing — and thus, it is claimed, diminishing the atrocity of — the Holocaust, is raised. These pasts question what should form the content of national memory — or at least of a relatively authorized or dominant national remembrance. It can also be asked, as proposed by a postnational thesis, whether the nation is still, or whether it should be, the primary focus or container of collective remembering at all.

It is with such questions in mind that we look at Germany's memory. While postmigrant, postsocialist, and postcolonial memories have still to make considerable inroads into changing the existing WWII- and Holocaust-focused memory regime in Germany (even if, in some cases, this has been slowly happening — see Bach, this volume), they have already changed the country's memoryscape and are continuing to do so.

Germany's Memoryscape across the Posts

The term *memoryscape* is broader in scope than *memory regime*, *official narrative*, or *memory culture*; we see *memoryscape* as made up of various forms of official and vernacular remembrance.[2] In this light, Germany's memoryscape is increasingly encompassing — due to historical events, societal and technological changes, and permeability of international movements — a greater plurality of memories. Central to this transformation are dynamics between and across these posts and their impact on the country's dominant memory regime.[3] We argue that how memory is being done in Germany has already changed; what needs to follow is delving into this transformation's specific realizations and assessing its implications, including for future memory work.

In this issue, then, we are concerned with ways in which this transformation is experienced in practice. Through the varied cases that we bring together, we emphasize plurality in the wider memoryscape, especially giving space to voices and memories that are marginal to more mainstream memories. By doing so, we do not simply aim to show the coexistence of multiple memories — though that is important to do. In addition, however, we seek to highlight some of the actual and potential sources for the radical transformation that we see as underway. Furthermore, through these heterogeneous cases, we investigate how the posts variously come together in specific instances. These combinations, and any resulting points of tension and contention, or mutual support, can themselves be variously inhibiting or generative in the ongoing developments.

In what follows, we present some more immediate impulses for our engagement with the transforming memoryscape, including our own research focused on the Humboldt Fo-

rum — a cultural development that has widely been seen as significant for Germany's post-reunification official memory. In the next section, we first set out further what we mean by the posts that are discussed in this issue, introducing them in general terms and sketching out their uptake in German memory debates, before further explaining our own approach of looking at the German memoryscape across the posts. Following this, we provide background about German remembrance as it developed after WWII, which forms the context for the development of debates about colonialism, migration, and socialism in relation to German memory, and is part of the memoryscape that we see as being transformed. The final section turns more directly to discussion of the contents of this issue, arguing for the importance of research on the plurality of memories and remembrance practices.

Transforming German Memory: A Berlin Lens

Consideration of the nature of memory transformation in post-unification Germany was central to the research project within which this issue was conceived. Called *Making Differences. Transforming Museums and Heritage in the 21st Century*, this large-scale, multi-researcher project sought to investigate recent and ongoing changes underway in the institutions of collective remembering, namely museums and heritage.[4] A central focus was on the differentiations that such institutions make through their inclusions and exclusions; and a central question was that of how this was changing. The project proposal and sketches, formulated in the years before the project officially began in 2015, had already identified struggles over the socialist past, migration, and colonialism as implicated in a potential transformation (especially a diversification) of collective memory in Germany and, to varying degrees, in other parts of Europe. The extent to which that was indeed the case and, if so, how it would operate on the ground — who would be involved, which concepts and practices would be mobilized, and what would result — was to be investigated. To do so, a team of researchers — with a fluctuating membership over the seven years that the project ran — conducted multiple ethnographic studies in a wide range of museum and heritage locations within Berlin.[5]

Berlin was selected as the location for the research partly because of being Germany's capital but also because of its history of division, its wealth of varied heritage (including, for example, LGBTQI+ pride parades as well as the UNESCO world heritage site of the Museum Island), and some signature ongoing developments.[6] The latter included, above all, the Humboldt Forum. Often touted as one of, or even the, most significant cultural development(s) in Europe, and certainly in post-unification Germany, the Humboldt Forum had already become a focus for debates about what should be present at this highly symbolic site of the former imperial palace at the capital's heart. Questions centered on how it would address the socialist past (including materially, for it replaced East Germany's Palace of the Republic, which had in turn replaced the monarchical City Palace), German colonialism (not least in relation to the ethnological collections, some of which had been acquired by monarchs in the palace), and histories of migration to Germany. In what ways would all of this be negotiated? What would actually be included — and how — in exhibitions that, in 2015, were due to open in 2019?

Various team members conducted ethnographic research on aspects of the making of the Humboldt Forum, especially Margareta von Oswald (2020, 2022a, 2022b) on the ethnological collections and Sharon Macdonald (2022c) on the exhibition that came to be called *Berlin Global*.[7] The opening of the Forum was delayed until November 2020, when it had

a digital opening (see Hilden et al. 2021), and then a phased physical opening in 2021 and 2022. Originally, the *Making Differences* project was due to end in September 2020, but a two-year extension was granted, which allowed for undertaking some further research on what had actually resulted from the Humboldt Forum project and on visitor responses to this. Irene Hilden and Andrei Zavadski — who have expertise in colonial collections and in postsocialism respectively — were employed to do so; and this special issue is one result of this work.[8]

Our research included interviews with Forum staff as well as a survey and in-depth interviews with visitors to the Humboldt Forum exhibitions curated by the Berlin City Museum Foundation, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and the Berlin Ethnological Museum, which opened to the public in July and September 2021. The goal was to get a sense of the people visiting the exhibitions in the first months of their operation: who would come, for what reasons, and with what expectations. Due to the times at which the various exhibitions opened and to restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic, the resulting data related primarily to Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin's *After Nature* exhibition (in the Humboldt Lab) and *Berlin Global,* as well as to the Humboldt Forum overall. The data clearly demonstrated that visitors were interested in and often knowledgeable and opinionated about issues of memory, including the treatment of the Holocaust, colonialism, migration, and socialism.

When we asked visitors how they felt about the Humboldt Forum, we received a wide range of answers. A significant proportion of respondents said that they welcomed the recreation of what had been ruined by WWII and demolished by the GDR authorities (»the gap needed to be filled«[9]). Many liked the combination of the Forum's »old and new« architectural elements (that is, the mix of reconstructed ›historical‹ and contemporary facades of the Forum's building and the modern interior). Some visitors found the building »impressive« and saw it as »a beautiful ensemble, even though it is fake.« Others made explicit negative comments about the »artificial« building and its contents, seeing these as »highly problematic« and as a manifestation of nostalgic imperialism and persisting coloniality that disregards the feelings of formerly colonized peoples and Germany's (post)migrant population. The cross mounted on the building's cupola received numerous critical responses (see also Jethro 2020). The postcolonial and postmigrant displays in the Forum's *Berlin Global* exhibition, however, attracted a lot of positive feedback. This was the case, for instance, in relation to the film about everyday racism demonstrated within the exhibition. »I've never seen anything like it«, one person said, while another admitted to not having been »so clearly aware of racism in everyday life.«

Receiving the strongest response and from across the generations was the postsocialist dimension of the Forum and the *Berlin Global* exhibition. Again, opinions were divided. Some respondents voiced criticisms of the destruction of the Palace of the Republic, pointing to personal, family, or collective memories being »wiped out« with it. Others, however, supported the decision: in the words of one respondent, »the *Schloss* we had for several hundred years, and the *Palast* only for 20!«. Some were satisfied with the representation of the socialist period, welcoming the numerous references to life in East Germany in various exhibitions as well as in the museum shop (full of GDR souvenirs and knick-knackery, including, at the time of our research, pieces of glass from the Palace of the Republic's west façade displayed in a box lined with black velvet, on sale for 99 Euros). At the same time, a small number of visitors were upset about the perceived prominence of references and exhibits referring to the socialist past. Some of these and other visitors also expressed concern that there seemed to be only few references to the Holocaust and WWII.

The Humboldt Forum's visitors were eager to share their impressions of the exhibitions and provide their own memories and emotions related to the topics discussed. Our research made amply clear that people often engaged in evaluating what was being presented — and not presented — and did so especially across the various posts. Notable was that many visitors talked through different positions and negotiated between these (see Macdonald 2009), rather than simply adopting one position or another. Their diverse memories seemed to signify a memoryscape that was much broader and richer than is more commonly imagined in debates about the Humboldt Forum and about recent German memory more widely.

Posts: Their Limitations and Potentialities

As it has often been observed, *post* is a tricky term because of its ambiguity about whether what it prefixes is deemed to be over or continuing as well as about whether a theoretical position (of reflecting about whatever is prefixed) or an actual temporal period (the time after) is indexed. In general, our own take is that these terms refer to the theorizing of the continuing implications of a time or status that is — in some sense, but not necessarily fully — of the past. Indeed, to what degree and in what senses there is any kind of superseding actually underway are key questions, and, as such, they need to be empirically investigated as well as theorized. In contemporary scholarship and wider usage, however, *post*-terms — in our case, especially *postcolonial*, *postmigrant,* and *postsocialist* — are not used, and do not work, in identical ways, and, moreover, each is embedded in particular literatures and debates, as we explain below.

The term *postcolonial* had a wider traction and history long before being employed in Germany's memory debates, in which it has appeared especially frequently over the past decade. Originally used mainly as a descriptive term for countries that had previously been colonies but had gained independence, it was later developed to denote a particular form of theorizing that developed concepts and approaches to identify and analyze the far-reaching and insidious nature and consequences of coloniality, and of continuing colonial modes of apprehension. While such theorizing is far from being a single entity, its critical scope goes well beyond direct consideration of former colonies to examine the ways in which the effects of colonialism penetrate deeply and widely into numerous locations and areas of life, including certain forms of scholarship. In many ways, central to postcolonial theorizing is to demonstrate that colonialism is not *post* — in the sense of past — at all.[10] Nevertheless, as we noted for the prefix *post* in general, it does not necessarily mean *past* in the sense of *over* but points instead to the continuing effects of this *past* — that is, to the persistent ramifications of the colonial in the present. As far as the German memory debates and our focus in this issue are concerned, the term *postcolonial* primarily refers to those ramifications and the growing public awareness of them as well as to the critical approaches developed in postcolonial theorizing that can help identify, analyze, and suggest ways of tackling colonial effects.

Unlike *postcolonial*, the term *postmigrant* was coined in Germany, initially primarily to describe Germany itself, and has not as yet gained wide traction elsewhere. Beginning in the early 2000s, Germany made moves to officially accept itself as a ›society of immigration‹ (*Einwanderungsland*), thus recognizing that many of its inhabitants had themselves come from other countries or had relatives who had done so in recent generations (Foroutan 2019, 142).[11] The term *postmigrant* was itself first used by the theater-director Shermin Langhoff in 2011. It was intended to describe a society that could no longer be understood

in clear-cut categories of ›migrants‹ and ›natives‹ (*Einheimische*), with ›migrants‹ not only constituting a part of the society as a whole, but reassembling it (Foroutan 2019, 7; see also Bojadžijev/Römhild 2014; El-Tayeb 2016; Foroutan et al. 2018). A *postmigrant* perspective thus entails fully acknowledging the fact that migration has shaped current society and that, therefore, it makes little sense — and is socially detrimental — to divide society into migrants and non-migrants (see also Früh, this volume). At the same time, however, the diversity of experiences — and memories — of those who make up German society should not be effaced. How to achieve this dual recognition is the postmigrant challenge — one to be taken up in practical and normative terms by institutions such as theaters and museums. In relation to the German memoryscape, it emphatically does not mean forgetting migration but, instead, finding ways of addressing and remembering experiences related to migration without reducing the people with such memories and experiences to these alone. In effect, it means recognizing and seeking to bring about a more pluralized German memoryscape — something that all the posts, at least collectively, push towards.

Adding to the increased plurality in the German memoryscape is what can be called *postsocialist* memory. The term *postsocialist* came into usage shortly after the Soviet Union and other socialist regimes collapsed between 1989 and 1992 (see Müller 2019). Since then, and especially over the past years, it has been extensively criticized (see Hann et al. 2001; Červinková 2012; Tlostanova 2012; Müller 2019), mostly for being applied as an umbrella term to a diverse group of countries that used to be part of the Soviet Union or the socialist block but have existed independently for more than three decades by now (for a critical history of the term's usage, see Fretter/Nagel 2022, 6—9). While not disagreeing with these criticisms, we follow Carina Fretter and Klara Nagel (2022, 7—8), the editors of a previous *Berliner Blätter* issue entitled *Living in the Post: Ethnographische Perspektiven auf Postsozialismus und Erinnerung*, who observe that, rather than resulting in a discarding of the term, this critique was »in various ways incorporated into the debate itself« (see also Ringel 2022). The term's usage thus aims at »irritating hegemonic narratives and highlighting the powerful effects of stereotypical constructions of the East and deconstructing them at the same time« (Fretter/Nagel 2022, 8). Therefore, it remains a useful term in relation to societal remembrance as it raises the question of how socialist pasts should be remembered. This is a potentially disruptive question for contemporary society, for while many regard the socialist past negatively, there are others who recall it more positively or who call at least for more differentiated remembrance. In the case of post-reunification Germany this question has been especially fraught, in part because memory of the socialist period is readily seen as in competition with Holocaust memory but also because it feeds into and exacerbates continuing divisions between East and West German experiences, thus potentially disrupting the very ideal of reunification.

In this issue, our interest is not only in the workings of each of these posts alone but also and especially in the relationships and dynamics between them — that is, memory across the posts. What happens when impulses from the various posts come together? Do they stand in *antagonistic* or *agonistic* (Cento Bull/Hansen 2016; Cento Bull et al. 2019; Berger/Kansteiner 2021) relationships to each other? Does one post take precedence over another, or might they exist alongside one another? Can they, as Rothberg (2009) has suggested with his term *multidirectionality*, support and intensify each other? Or perhaps their relationship could be best described as *intersectional*: one that, unlike multidirectionality's pushing towards the positive impact that two or more memory streams can have — in a kind of ping-pong effect — on each other, has compounding and potentially also negative effects?[12] How do these posts and their *in-betweenness* or *acrossness* impact dominant

memory regimes? What memories are being performed more in the public space, and what are the inequalities and power imbalances still in place? Above all, our interest is in how the dynamics between them amount to ›German memory‹ now being done differently, contouring a new memoryscape.

Exploring the relationships and dynamics across the posts as well as their impact on Germany's memoryscape requires at least a brief survey of collective or semi-collective memory in Germany since WWII; that is, what memory regime formed in the country and how it changed over time, and in what ways the ›arrival of the posts‹ contributed to these processes.

Germany's Post-War Memory Regime

Germany's current culture of remembrance is the result of decades of mnemonic work (or absence thereof) that took place, in various forms and with several milestones, after WWII.[13] Remembrance of Nazism and the war were foundational for the two German states after 1945, as each defined themselves at least partly by contrast to that period and a commitment to »Never again.« As such, public remembrance in both the West and East was seen as imperative and was highly politicized, though how this worked in the two Germanys was significantly different, and in each there were notable changes over the years (see Herf 1997; Neumann 2000; Wolfgram 2010). In both, however, there were increasing numbers of initiatives over time, such as turning former concentration camps into spaces of education and commemoration, though there were also accusations, especially by the West of the East, of these being instrumentalized for other ideological ends. In both, the turn to publicly addressing perpetration beyond the identification of specific Nazi criminals came relatively late, primarily in the 1980s. It is only then too that, influenced at least in part by international developments, the terms *Holocaust* and *genocide of Jews* — rather than a wider and more diffuse notion of victims of Nazism and War — came to the fore, which they did primarily in West Germany (see Kansteiner 2006).

Increasingly, the Holocaust focus became dominant in West Germany — part of what Eric Langenbacher (2010, 43) refers to as »the Bonn memory regime.« Just how to remember the Holocaust was, however, far from uncontested, as witnessed notably by the *Historikerstreit* (Historians' Dispute) of the mid 1980s, when leading historians and public intellectuals in West Germany debated the issue of the Holocaust's singularity and (in)comparability. Voiced in these debates was the question of whether remembering other violence, such as that under socialist totalitarianism, was a relativization of the atrocity of the Holocaust — a question that became all the more pertinent after 1989. In the 1980s, however, what escalated in West Germany especially was an expansion of remembering WWII and the Holocaust, with school curricula updated, anniversaries commemorated, memorials erected, and museums opened.

After 1989/90, this trend continued in what had been West Germany. The former East Germany largely fell into the same orbit, with its representations of WWII — as in concentration camps — mostly rapidly dismantled and more slowly replaced with newly authorized versions, along the lines of the dominant Western historiography. The events of 1989—1990 also led to the opening of the previously inaccessible archives, which contributed to a gradual inclusion of other victim groups — Soviet prisoners of war, slave laborers, Poles, and others — in the collective remembrance framework (Langenbacher 2010).

After 1999, in what can be seen as »the second phase« of post-unification memory work, the influence of Holocaust-centered memory continued but was augmented by two new trends. The first trend had to do with a re-surfacing in the memory debates of the German suffering endured at the end of and immediately after WWII (Langenbacher 2010, 49–54). The second one concerns what Langenbacher (2010, 54–57) describes as »Cold War memories«, which includes such different strands as coming to terms with the Stasi legacy, debating East Germans' working through the Nazi past, and analyzing the phenomenon of *Ostalgie*, that is, nostalgic memories of the GDR (see Berdahl 1999, 2010; Neller 2006). It is worth noting here that the term *Cold War memories* is reductive with regard to *postsocialist memories*. On the one hand, it imposes a particular way of remembering East Germany (as an ›unjust state‹ (*Unrechtsstaat*) – a communist dictatorship with surveillance and political violence), thus indicating what Ronda Ramm, in this volume, calls a »West hegemonic« perspective on the GDR past. On the other hand, the term contains a certain disapproval of people's nostalgic feelings for the GDR, de facto denying them the right to have any positive non-nostalgic memories of East Germany. Langenbacher (2010) notes that, first, German memory has become »more fluid and pluralistic«, with »multiple collective memories *circulating* and *vying* for influence (based on the Holocaust, German suffering, and the GDR)« (Langenbacher 2010, 61–62, our emphases). In addition, he claims that »there is also evidence of diminishing interest in *all* collective memories«[14] (62, original emphasis), and that »[p]erhaps Germany's Nazi past has been ›mastered‹« (Langenbacher 2010, 64). If there seemed in 2010 to be such a reduction in interest and even a sense of the past being mastered, this is surely no longer the case, as shown by current debates as well as this volume's contents.

In the early 2010s, however, worries were that Holocaust memory was losing its critical potential as its institutionalization was seen by some as completed. This led to heated debates about »the new unease toward the culture of remembrance« (Assmann 2013), consisting in being unsure how to proceed. In her book, *Das neue Unbehagen an der Erinnerungskultur. Eine Intervention*, Aleida Assmann (2013) disagrees with those (for instance, Giesecke/Welzer 2012) who argue that, having drawn lessons from the past, Germans can move on to a more positive agenda. She points out that preserving memory is not the same as being fixated on it and sees the future of German memory in its *pluralization*, namely the inclusion of memories of the GDR – her focus is on victims of the GDR communist regime – and of migrants; postcolonial issues do not appear in Assmann's analysis.

Writing around the same time, David Art (2014, 196) states that German collective memory continues to be »so deeply structured« by the memory regime of the Nazi past and the Holocaust that other memories find it difficult »to become salient parts of the mnemonic field at all.« According to Art (2014, 197), whose focus is on postsocialist memories, the events of 1989 and the fall of the Berlin Wall have »failed to become part of a resonant founding myth of a unified, democratic Germany« due to three factors. The first factor, invoked above, consists in Germany's memory culture being deeply structured by Holocaust memories. The second one has to do with the economic division between the East and the West, which has persisted after the reunification, preserving, some argue, a ›wall in the head‹.[15] Finally, the debates on the nature of the political regime in the GDR – whether it was or was not an *Unrechtsstaat* – have helped reinforce an ›East German‹ political identity, continuing to divide Germans, even of younger generations (Art 2014; on the notion of *Unrecht*, see also Bach, this volume). Jonathan Bach (2017, 1) diagnoses the same problem: the GDR, according to him, »became a present absence, invoked mostly to be disavowed.« And yet, recent studies into *economic memories*, first and foremost of narratives about the

injustice of the West towards the East (Hilmar 2021, 2023) as well as on both dominant and marginalized perspectives on the 1989 events and GDR history more broadly (see Lierke/Perinelli 2020), show that these memories play a significant role in how Germans see themselves. Ethnographic approaches to »everyday encounters with the socialist past in Germany«, as in the subtitle of Bach's (2017) book, demonstrate that (post)socialist pasts and presents continue to be negotiated within German society — indeed, perhaps increasingly (see Gallinat 2016; Lettrari et al. 2016; Kendzia 2017; Straughn 2021; Banditt et al. 2023).

But it is not only postsocialist memories that are claiming their place in Germany's institutionalized public remembrance. Over the last ten years, the Holocaust-centered public memory culture in Germany has been challenged — and changed too — by so many events, discussions, and developments that it surely questions the proposition that it had ever become settled. Moreover, it is important to remember that alongside these debates in the public domain — argued largely by academics and prominent cultural commentators — there has also, throughout, been other memory work as part of the wider memoryscape. This has taken place in localities, communities, and groups in ways that do not necessarily fully concord with the above or even share the same concerns, as has been documented in part by more localized histories and ethnographic studies, and to which this special issue contributes.[16] Before commenting further on the volume's contents, we first turn to more recent debates about German colonialism and migration.

Colonial Pasts, Postcolonial Presents, and Postmigrant Society

The issue of German colonial history and postcolonial continuities has been a major focus in academic discussions and activist endeavors of the past decades, having spilled over into the public sphere in the last ten years.[17] This is reflected in the Humboldt Forum developments, which initially centered primarily on the question of the erasure of the socialist past involved in the reconstruction of the *Schloss*, but came to focus especially upon questions of the coloniality of the ethnological collections. Indeed, the debates about the Humboldt Forum have been argued to be a catalyst in raising public awareness of Germany's colonial past (see Morat 2019; Thiemeyer 2019). At the same time, and often intersecting with questions of colonial history (Thiemeyer 2019), there has been the undeniable realization — if accompanied by resistance from some — of Germany as a postmigrant society, that is, a society shaped by people with migration histories from many parts of the world, including those colonized by Germany or other European countries. How postcolonial and postmigrant memories stand in relation to the post-Holocaust memory regime and to German national identity have become major sources of debate and, sometimes, fierce controversy over the last decade.

One area where the entrance of the postcolonial into Germany's political and public sphere could be observed is in relation to colonial street names and monuments. For decades now, postcolonial activists, some of whom share family histories of migration from former German colonies, often building on the work of historians and postcolonial scholars, have been investigating the colonial origins of street names and calling for renaming them that would honor colonial resistance and make colonial history visible beyond pejorative terms or colonial perpetrators (see Aikins 2012; Jethro 2022; Jethro/Macdonald 2024). As street naming is a political and administrative matter, activists have had to convince not only members of the wider civil society but also local politicians of the fact that changing colonial street names was vital to Germany's coming to terms with its colonial past. This issue inherently being a matter of public space, postcolonial activists' efforts have often spilled out into the

streets, with protests, rallies, excursions, and festivals organized, as it has been the case with a street in Berlin, M~~ohren~~straße,[18] that is now in the process of being renamed into Anton-Wilhelm-Amo-Straße, after an eighteenth-century Black German philosopher (see Jethro 2018). Moreover, because changing street names is part of a historical and power-political continuity, relevant activism has been building on and at the same time emphasizing the entanglement of the postcolonial with other posts. After all, many streets referring to National Socialist ideology and violence were renamed throughout Germany following the end of WWII; similarly, the fall of the Berlin Wall saw political decision-makers — mainly from West Germany — renaming or rededicating street names from the GDR era.

Street renaming and debates surrounding the Humboldt Forum are only two developments among a raft of others, signaling and further fostering public awareness of German colonialism in recent years. Others include the German Historical Museum's 2016 colonialism exhibition as well as subsequent (including further planned) changes to its permanent exhibition. Addressing issues of colonialism — and restitution — has also become more frequent in other museums, especially ethnological ones (see Sieg 2021; von Oswald 2022a). *Decolonizing*, as such developments are often referred to, also includes wider considerations of diversity and inclusivity in the public sphere, such as, for example, the range of texts used in university curricula or awareness of discriminatory or offensive language in organizations. The diversity issues raised do not necessarily relate to specific colonial histories but, rather, to the postmigrant society more generally.

Questions about the place of migration within the German memory regime have long been simmering, reflected, for example, in debates (that go back decades now) over whether there should be a nationally funded museum of migration in Germany. Attempts to found such a museum, initially for migrants from Turkey, began immediately after reunification, and in 2007 merged with another initiative to encompass immigration from a wider range of countries.[19] Only in 2019, however, did the Parliament of the Federal Republic of Germany (*Bundestag*) commit funds for the creation of the (significantly named) House of Immigration Society (*Haus der Einwanderungsgesellschaft*) that is currently being constructed in Cologne. That it took so long shows the extent to which migration has been marginalized within Germany's memory regime. There was, however, a commitment from the Parliament in 2008 — so still relatively recently but long before funding the other initiative — to create a Documentation Center for Displacement, Expulsion, Reconciliation (*Dokumentationszentrum Flucht, Vertreibung, Versöhnung*). This opened in 2021 in Berlin. While it includes topics related to migration, its main emphasis is on what is called *forced migration*, particularly in the context of wars in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, including that relating to World Wars I and II. Prominent on the website is mention of »more than 14 million Germans who had to leave the former Prussian eastern provinces and their settlement areas in Central, South-Eastern and Eastern Europe in the course of the Second World War that started in Germany and the National Socialist policies and their consequences.«[20] Seemingly, only once this migration was incorporated into the memory regime could other migration histories and presences within Germany also be admitted.

This is not to say, however, that the idea of Germany as a postmigrant society in which there is acceptance of diversity and difference relating to migration histories is settled. On the contrary, this too has been the subject of extensive debate and controversy over the past decade. It was brought to the fore not least in relation to the ›long summer of migration of 2015—16‹ and associated ›refugee crisis‹, around which questions were raised in the media about how much difference (especially that of Islam, which was often the focus in controversies) Germany could accommodate (Bock/Macdonald 2019a).

Unsettlement over public memory and the relations between different memory communities has continued, with the implications for Germany's Holocaust memory often being the source of flare-ups. Examples of such include controversies over the legally non-binding 2019 Parliament resolution that declared the Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS) movement to be inherently antisemitic; the 2020 Achille Mbembe and Ruhr Triennial controversy; reverberations of the death of George Floyd and the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement; and the antisemitism scandal around the 2022 documenta fifteen edition (for overviews, see Brusius 2022; Rothberg 2022). In various ways, they all indicated the boundaries of Germany's post-Holocaust memory regime and sought to challenge them. At the same time, the heated debates highlighted — and brought into wider public consciousness — the existence of a memoryscape which had been forged by postcolonial, postmigrant, postsocialist, and other memories, and which had been largely disregarded by the dominant memory regime.

The continuing sensitivities about Holocaust memory were highlighted too by the publication in 2021 of the German translation of Michael Rothberg's (2009) book *Multidirectional Memory* (Rothberg 2021a) and of Dirk Moses's (2021) essay *The German Catechism*. These stirred up, once again, questions about the Holocaust's uniqueness and (in)comparability. The debates took such a heated turn that they were — erroneously, as they were initiated and mostly led by journalists rather than academics — dubbed *Historikerstreit 2.0* (see Biess 2023[21]). Responding to his critics, Rothberg (see 2021b) time and again returns to his argument that »public memory does not follow the logic of the zero-sum game. Specifically, the act of bringing the Holocaust into relation with memories of colonialism and slavery does not ›relativize‹ or minimize the Shoah or vice versa«; both can co-exist and interact with each other in the public sphere.

If all of this already showed, as do some of this volume's contributions (especially by Alice von Bieberstein), that Holocaust memory continues to have a particularly central — and even semi-religious, as Moses (2021) suggested — status in German memory, this was brought home all the more forcefully by its invoking in response to the Israel-Hamas war. Hamas's unprecedented brutal attack on Israel in October 2023 was framed by certain commentators and politicians in terms of the Holocaust and antisemitism, something that was criticized by some scholars of memory, who warned against the simplifying effects of such language (Bartov et al. 2023). Israel's subsequent and continuing violent actions in Gaza have also sometimes been referred to in terms of the Holocaust, often provoking strong negative reactions from Israel and also within Germany (see, for example, El Affendi 2024[22]). In Germany, intellectuals and artists, including Jewish ones, who have criticized Israel's actions in Gaza, have been accused of antisemitism and in some cases have had academic positions withdrawn (see, for example, Gessen 2023; Farago 2024; Oltermann 2024).[23] This clearly indicates that Holocaust memory has not lost its ›special place‹ in Germany. At the same time, there is a reported rise in both antisemitism and islamophobia, showing that the developments are complex as well as polarizing.[24] How far these will lead to a retraction of the more pluralizing moves that seemed to be underway in German memory culture remains to be seen. It surely shows, however, that the situation is far from settled and that its future directions are not assured.

To what extent, then, will Germany's memory regime see greater inclusivity, as Charlotte Wiedemann (2022 and in this volume) pleads for? Such an inclusivity could be fostered by diverse memory constituencies operating not in competition but instead *multidirectionally* — mutually strengthening one another, as Michael Rothberg has influentially suggested. As he also acknowledged (especially in Rothberg 2014), however, this can include conflict-

ual processes, and, moreover, in some cases we see some memories coming closer to the fore and others moving more to the margins. We can also ask to what extent the ongoing memory transformations can be seen as a form of *cosmopolitanization* of memory (Levy/Sznaider 2006; Thiemeyer 2019) shaped by and contributing to memory complexes beyond the nation. And if there is greater inclusivity within Germany's memory regime, does this really offer »the possibility of opening up space for currently marginalized groups and their memories«, or is it instead more »a means to manage the contradictions that arise in any plural society by creating certain norms for memorialization«, as Katrin Antweiler (2023a, 1541; see also 2023b) suggests? Are we in fact seeing the gradual formation of »a pluriversal memory landscape«, one that »nurtures contradiction« (Antweiler 2023a, 1541)? This latter implicitly configures — and argues that public memory should so be configured — as an »agonistic space« (Cento Bull et al. 2019, see also Ramm, this volume), that is, one that entails dialogue and even conflict without necessarily leading to consensus and resolution.

This Issue

While the contributions in this issue do not lead to a single overarching clear-cut answer to these questions, they support claims that a wide range of memories are jostling for presence in the public domain and that while these sometimes support each other in various ways, or even simply exist side-by-side, they can also be experienced as conflicting, or as variously marginalized relative to others. They also show the broader memoryscape as more diverse and replete with a greater diversity of memory work and memory players than is usually recognized. Within this, the various posts intersect — co-existing, overlapping, conflicting, polarizing or spurring each other on — in a wide variety of ways, as we show below.

Above, we have found it useful to employ the term *memory regime* to indicate institutionalized memory. One of the points made by some of our contributions, however, is that the line between the institutionalized and non-institutionalized is not always well-defined, and, moreover, there can be hierarchies and marginalization within the institutionalized. This is made evident by **Anja Früh** in her detailed account of the making of the Museum of European Cultures (MEK). Founded in 1999, its roots were in the Museum of Folklore (*Museum für Volkskunde*), and tracing its past shows well both a periodization of memory cultures and, within this, how certain histories — especially that of the National Socialist and GDR periods — were marginalized or strategically ignored over time. This was effected in part by the MEK's positioning itself as ›European‹, which it did by giving especial weight to migration and Germany as a postmigrant society. While this could be seen as an institutionalization of postmigrant memory, Früh points out that the MEK itself has been clearly marginalized as a memory institution relative first to the German Historical Museum and more recently to the Humboldt Forum, in which it was not included.

Also addressing the changing institutionalization of memory, **Jonathan Bach** looks at the growth of provenance research as part of Germany's addressing of its colonial past. In an in-depth examination of the growth of colonial provenance research that supports arguments about the expansion of official political attention to German colonialism within the past decade, he shows how this builds on memory infrastructures of provenance research established for tracking down Nazi looted art. By doing so, Bach argues, questions of colonial provenance became more »legible« to politicians and others, helping to gather support for conducting provenance research as well as sometimes literally sharing infrastructures (as in the case of the German Lost Art Foundation (*Deutsches Zentrum Kulturgutverluste*),

which set up a new office to deal with items from colonial contexts). Moreover, Bach's article points out that this institutionalization also built on »decades-long work by Black German organizations and allied activists« to bring issues to attention, and that activists have contributed in other ways too to the increased institutionalization, thus indicating the potential porousness of the membranes around such organizations and processes (see Tinius 2020). Bach also highlights the ambiguity of the developments. On the one hand, the newly increased attention to colonial provenance can be seen as »a breakthrough in how Germany confronts its implication in colonial injustice«, and, on the other, perhaps it is just setting up »new forms of evasion of accountability.«

Such ambiguity is evident too in **Duane Jethro**'s discussion of some of the opening exhibits in the Humboldt Forum's Ethnological Museum. On the one hand, he regards the *Matters of Perspective* installation as bringing necessary attention to questions of racism and museums' implication in this, not least through its prominent use of the quote »I have a white frame of reference and a white worldview« (from sociologist and activist Robin DiAngelo). In addition, an installation about Namibian children brought to the GDR shows the intersection between the postcolonial and postsocialist, highlighting often forgotten links between the GDR and Namibia, and drawing attention to the complications for the children's developing identities. At the same time, however, Jethro argues that the overall complex of opening exhibits is limited by remaining »blind to its own position« and highlighting »contrition while failing to show who takes responsibility for it.«

One of the observations made by Jethro in his discussion of the installation dedicated to Namibian children is that while it is a welcome inclusion of memory of the GDR, and one that shows a little-known history, it also basically ›indicts‹ the GDR for the project's failures. **Ronda Ramm**'s ethnographic study of a former detention center of the GDR's Interior Ministry, which in 2019 was opened as a *Lernort* (a place for historical-political education), also discusses how the GDR is depicted within current German memory. A location that has been featured in films such as *The Life of Others* (*Das Leben der Anderen*), *Lernort Keibelstrasse*, as it is called, has been developed as a place for visitors to learn about the history of detention in this specific location during the years of 1951—1990 when it was in use. Furthermore, it discusses practices and experiences of detention in West Germany during that time. Ramm's careful ethnography shows that the comparison between East and West Germany offers a ground to reflect on a »West hegemonic« perspective on detention in East Germany. At the same time, it runs the risk of becoming a comparison of moral values. In neither Ramm's work nor Jethro's is the intention to deny violence and failures of GDR practice; rather, they show how difficult it can be to avoid reproducing what Ramm calls »ethical pre-judgements« on German memory.

Alice von Bieberstein's essay also tackles the conventional ways in which German memory tends to be represented, asking what it would mean for there to be a »genuine, transnational, postmigrant perspective on memory culture.« To explore this, von Bieberstein considers recent literature on issues of migration, structural racism, and German memory culture after the Holocaust, which she expands with her own ethnographic research on transnational grassroots work to commemorate the Armenian genocide in Germany and beyond. For her, these initiatives and networks represent a means of decentering and provincializing Germany and questioning its attempt to »export« (as she puts it) a certain Holocaust-centered memory expertise. They also problematize and render visible other genealogies of historical revisionism/denial and hateful ideologies, in this case Turkish nationalism as it operates in Germany, affecting Armenians and Kurds, amongst others. This leads von Bieberstein to argue in favor of broadening the perspective to include histories

of migration and transnational violence and their impact on current processes of governmentality.

The issue of the transnational in German memory is a theme in the rest of the contributions too. These also all address the question of how to think and write about memory across the posts, as well as across national boundaries, and in doing so, all develop novel stylistic strategies. **Charlotte Wiedemann** here discusses her own book, *Den Schmerz der Anderen begreifen. Holocaust und Weltgedächtnis* (*Understanding the Pain of Others. Holocaust and World Memory*), which appeared in 2022 to considerable acclaim. Aimed at a wide audience, Wiedemann's book is a call for a more inclusive memory politics — one that does not work through hierarchies of suffering, binaries of »meaningful and meaningless death« or an idea of just adding on more cases. Instead, Wiedemann strives for a bringing-together of different narratives in a »collage of shared pain«, giving attention to points at which they touch each other and have touched her as she has traveled and listened to stories in many different places. Her mode of writing in the book, exemplified in excerpts here, is to gather and juxtapose narratives drawn from those people whom she has met over the years, and to raise questions about the usual constrictions of memory frameworks as she does so. In this way, her hope is to show »memory culture as an ethical resource that simultaneously belongs to nobody and everybody.«

Also pushing into new stylistic ground in order to try to grasp the possibilities for doing memory (and memory work, including memory scholarship) differently are contributions from **Amel Ouaissa** and **Moses März**. Ouissa's moving letter to her grandmother travels across national boundaries, and across various posts, in a way that is deeply personal but also, surely, speaks to the experience of many who now live in Germany. März provides examples of his innovative cartographic work while also explaining his sophisticatedly theorized aim to create an »experimental cartography [that] contributes to narrowing the gap between academic discourse and public media by rendering the multidirectional imagination at the basis of decolonial scholarship visible in a non-confrontational manner.«

This issue thus demonstrates that the broader memoryscape of Germany has changed and is continuing to do so, sometimes alongside the dominant memory regime but more often in defiance of it. Even though the posts discussed here have, to some extent, been included in how memory is officially done in Germany — as shown, for example, by Jonathan Bach in this volume — there is still considerable resistance to this transformation, especially pervasive since the beginning of the Israel-Hamas war. Yet, in-depth ethnographic and other studies, also those presented in this issue, emphasize the plurality of memories that goes far beyond the memory regime.

What is the relationship between these various memories, including postsocialist, postmigrant, and postcolonial ones? Is it competitive or multidirectional? Antagonistic or agonistic? Cosmopolitan or pluriversal? Our contention is that it comprises the whole variety of models, which may indeed be best characterized through Katrin Antweiler's (2023a, 2023b) model of pluriversality. We might further suggest, however, that what is also involved is a form of *memorial intersectionality*: the various memories and forms of remembrance do not just pluralize but may also have a compounding effect, leading to the emergence of new mnemonic states. In other words, the in-betweenness of the posts is not always about negotiations and support, but sometimes also about new complexities and formations that arise through the very intersection (for instance, memories of Black people who grew up in the GDR, as discussed by Jethro in this volume). The contents of this issue provide a starting point for investigating this — and indeed other memory dynamics — further.

This special issue illustrates the presence of postmigrant, postsocialist, and postcolonial memories in Germany and the ways in which they complicate more established national memory regimes. They show these memories not only as adding to the existing memoryscape but also as actively contributing to its transformations. Quite where that will go remains undetermined. But it seems certain that this transformation — and the accompanying unsettlement — will continue for the foreseeable future.

Acknowledgments

This introduction and the special issue as a whole are outcomes of the project *Making Differences. Transforming Museums and Heritage in the 21st Century*, which was supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, with further support from Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, the Museum für Naturkunde Berlin, and the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation, as part of Sharon Macdonald's Alexander von Humboldt Professorship. We thank all of the colleagues who were part of the project, as well as others in CARMAH (the Centre for Anthropological Research on Museums and Heritage) and the Institut für Europäische Ethnologie, for lively discussions over the years. We are grateful too to the organizations and individuals with whom we researched, in particular to members of the *Berlin Global* team who enabled the audience research included here, and the visitors who took part in it. We would also like to thank our student assistants, Dominik Biewer, Clara Dröll, and Sarah Felix, for their enormous help with the visitor research as well as the preparation of this issue. We are grateful to Harry Adler, Friederike Faust, Alik Mazukatow, Klara Nagel, and the other members of the *Berliner Blätter* team for their work and helpfulness as well as to Michael Beaney, Alice von Bieberstein, Anja Früh, and Ronda Ramm for their thoughtful comments on this introduction. Special thanks go to our contributors for their inputs, patience, and responsiveness.

Notes

1 All translations from German, including this one, are by the introduction's authors.

2 This aligns with Paul Basu's (2013) counterposing of *memoryscape* with *memory regime*; the latter as used by Radstone and Hodgkin (2003) and concerned primarily with institutionalized remembering, whereas »the memoryscape is comprised of a multiplicity of different forms of remembering: those that are intentional and communicable through language, narrative or material form, as well as those which are unintentional and ›inherently non-narrative‹, such as embodied forms of memory« (Basu 2013, 116).

3 Sharad Chari and Katherine Verdery (2009, 9) use the concept *between the posts* to argue that thinking between postsocialism and postcolonialism »can be useful for ethnographic and historical analysis of societies in the shadows of empires, whether capitalist or socialist.« Their call for thinking between the posts implies a »potential joining of postsocialist and postcolonial studies«, which would not only emphasize similar (»parallel«) archive problematics and research agendas, but also allow for »restor[ing] research connections that should never have been separated« (for instance, seeing »Eastern Europe and much of the former Soviet Union under a form of colonial domination«) (Chari and Verdery 2009, 11–12). In other words, Chari and Verdery argue for the benefits of a cross-pollination of the two research fields. Our focus in this article is on more than two posts, with each potentially denoting a multiplicity of different memories and a whole variety of relationships, interactions, and intertwinements between and across them.

4 The project was funded as part of Sharon Macdonald's Alexander von Humboldt Professorship, which also funded the establishment of CARMAH, the Centre for Anthropological Research on Museums and Heritage, where the project was located. Further funding was provided by Humboldt-

Universität zu Berlin, the Museum für Naturkunde, and the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation. For further information about the project, see: https://www.carmah.berlin/making-differences-in-berlin/, accessed on 16.4.2024) and Macdonald 2022a and 2022b. Macdonald 2016 outlines some of the wider European context that informed the project design.

5 See especially Macdonald 2022a and 2022b for an overview of the project and chapters on many of the studies.

6 These also included a major renovation of the Museum of Islamic Art (see Gerbich 2022), of the Jewish Museum Berlin, and of the Museum für Naturkunde.

7 Tinius/Macdonald 2020 include discussions of *Berlin Global* and the Humboldt Forum, as does Macdonald/Gerbich/von Oswald 2018 — alongside the Ethnological Museum and Museum of Islamic Art. Macdonald 2019 and 2023 also concern the Ethnological Museum, in addition to the works by von Oswald cited in the text. Further *Making Differences* research relating to the Humboldt Forum includes Nnenna Onuoha (2022) on an exhibition preparing for the ethnological displays in the Humboldt Forum, Larissa Förster's involvement in what became an exhibition about Namibia, and Tal Adler's exhibit *Who Is ID8470?* — about a skull from the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin's collections — that was created for the Humboldt Lab (discussed in Macdonald 2024; see also Adler/Macdonald 2024). Further project research on realization and reception is listed below.

8 The sub-project was called *Realizations and Reception in the Humboldt Forum* and also included Tal Adler's work on *Who Is ID8470?* as well as visitor research, on which Hilden and Zavadski have published Zavadski/Hilden 2023; they also conducted research on participation projects in *Berlin Global* (Hilden/Zavadski 2024).

9 The quotations in this section come from the 287 anonymous surveys conducted in the Humboldt Forum between 28 July and 29 August 2021, and from the 15 in-depth interviews with selected survey participants that took place 3–5 weeks after the surveys and that we have chosen to anonymize too. For details, see Zavadski/Hilden 2023.

10 This is a point made by Gayatri C. Spivak (1999) in her original usage of the term (the working title of *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason* was *Don't Call Me Postcolonial*). See Yegenoglu/Mutman 2001.

11 See also Bock/Macdonald 2019a and Thiemeyer 2019 for discussions of these developments, and Wilhelm 2016 for a wide range of cases concerning migration and memory in Germany, including the commemoration or lack of commemoration of it. Relevant here too is the ›long summer of migration‹ and ›refugee crisis‹ of 2015–16, which also brought to the fore in public debate questions of the postmigrant society, particularly in relation to Islam (Bock/Macdonald 2019b; Shatanawi/Macdonald/Puzon 2021; see also Hess et al. 2017).

12 See also Lierke/Perinelli 2020, who bring in migrant and Jewish perspectives on the fall of the Berlin Wall as well as on postsocialist and postmigrant society in general but use the concept of multidirectionality (rather than intersectionality).

13 For detailed overviews, see Fulbrooke 1999; Niven 2001; Assmann 2006.

14 Langenbacher bases his discussion of the memory trends on an overview of relevant primary and secondary sources, conducting a quantitative keyword analysis of the German National Library's holdings in order to substantiate his conclusions. He looks at the number of published books that can be found in the library by using such keywords as *Holocaust*, *Vertreibung*, *GDR*, and others, demonstrating a marked rise of publications in the early and mid 1980s and a subsequent decline. He notes: »Although these data speak specifically only to trends in book publication and the purchasing choices of the German library of record, they also illuminate the evolution of interest among the scholarly and/or writing communities, as well as the reading public and/or book market because of the presumable (if only partial) correlation between publishers' supply and readers' (elite or mass) demand« (Langenbacher 2010, 61, see 57–61 for the whole section).

15 See, however, Straughn (2021, 8), who argues that »what is most salient about the ›Wall in the head‹ motif is its performative force as a form of counter-memory.«

16 Examples of such more detailed studies include Ten Dyke 2001; Mandel 2008; Berdahl 2010; James 2012; Gallinat 2016; Kendzia 2017; Özyürek 2023.

17 For commentary on this development, see Bach 2019; Thiemeyer 2019; Macdonald 2022a.

18 The street name is usually translated as ›Moor Street‹. We use the ›crossed out‹ formatting to make it visually clear that we reject further use of the derogatory and discriminatory term. See also https://www.euroethno.hu-berlin.de/de/forschung-1/labore/faq, accessed on 26.3.2024.

19 See *Dokumentationszentrum und Museum über die Migration in Deutschland*: https://domid.org/en/house-of-immigration-society/, accessed on 12.2.2024.

20 See *Dokumentationszentrum Flucht, Vertreibung, Versöhnung*: https://www.flucht-vertreibung-versoehnung.de/en/get-to-know/topic, accessed on 12.2.2024.

21 Frank Biess (2023) compiled an interesting discussion forum entitled *Holocaust Memory and Postcolonialism: Transatlantic Perspectives on the Debate*, in which historians and memory scholars such as

Anne Berg, Wolf Gruner, Damani J. Partridge, Mark Roseman, Dirk Rupnow, and Stefanie Schüler-Springorum participated and which was published in Vol. 56/2 of *Central European History*.

22 In this thoughtful piece, Abdelwahab El-Affendi discusses the contributions to a discussion forum entitled *Israel-Palestine: Atrocity Crimes and the Crisis of Holocaust and Genocide Studies* and published in the *Journal of Genocide Research* in Janury 2024. Among the Holocaust and Genocide Studies scholars who participated in the forum in addition to El-Affendi himself were Shmuel Lederman, Mark Levene, Zoé Samudzi, Elyse Semerdjian, Martin Shaw, and Uğur Ümit Üngör: https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/cjgr20/0/0, accessed on 16.4.2024. Since then, more texts have been published by the journal as part of the debate.

23 See also recent statements on academic freedom in Germany put out by the German Association of Social and Cultural Anthropology (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Sozial- und Kulturanthropologie*), including with regard to the disinvitation of Nancy Fraser from Cologne University: https://www.dgska.de/en/statement-on-academic-freedom-in-germany/, accessed on 16.4.2024. Ouma 2024 argues that evident, too, is a growing wider restriction on invoking postcolonial perspectives in relation to Israel.

24 See, for instance, a talk titled *The Middle Eastern Conflict and Us* by Saba-Nur Cheema and Meron Mendel: https://www.fu-berlin.de/campusleben/campus/2024/240205—mendel-cheema-lecture/index.html, accessed on 27.3.2024.

Bibliography

Adler, Tal/Sharon Macdonald (Eds.) (2024): Artistic Provenance Research. Bielefeld.

Aikins, Joshua Kwesi (2012): Berlin Remix. Straßenumbenennungen als postkoloniale Perspektivumkehr. In: Kien Nghi Ha (ed.): Asiatische Deutsche. Vietnamesische Diaspora and Beyond. Hamburg, 288—304.

Antweiler, Katrin (2023a): Why collective memory can never be pluriversal: a case for contradiction and abolitionist thinking in memory studies. In: Memory Studies 16/6, 1529—1545.

Antweiler, Katrin (2023b): Memorialising the Holocaust in Human Rights Museums. Berlin/Boston.

Art, David (2014): Making room for November 9, 1989? The fall of the Berlin Wall in German politics and memory. In: Michael H. Bernhard/Jan Kubik (eds.): Twenty Years after Communism: The Politics of Memory and Commemoration. Oxford/New York, 195—212.

Assmann, Aleida (2006): Der lange Schatten der Vergangenheit. Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik. München.

Assmann, Aleida (2013): Das neue Unbehagen an der Erinnerungskultur. Eine Intervention. München.

Bach, Jonathan (2017): What Remains. Everyday Encounters with the Socialist Past in Germany. New York.

Bach, Jonathan (2019): Colonial pasts in Germany's present. In: German Politics & Society 37/4, 58—73.

Banditt, Christopher/Nadine Jenke/Sophie Lange (Eds.) (2023): DDR im Plural. Ostdeutsche Vergangenheiten und ihre Gegenwart. Berlin.

Bartov, Omer/Christopher R. Browning/Jane Caplan/Debórah Dwork/Michael Rothberg, et al. (2023): An open letter on the misuse of Holocaust memory. In: The New York Review of Books, 20.11.2023. https://www.nybooks.com/online/2023/11/20/an-open-letter-on-the-misuse-of-holocaust-memory/, accessed on 27.3.2024.

Basu, Paul (2013): Memoryscapes and multi-sited methods. In: Emily Keightley/Michael Pickering (eds.): Research Methods for Memory Studies. Edinburgh, 115—131.

Berdahl, Daphne (1999): ›(N)ostalgie‹ for the present: memory, longing, and East German things. In: Ethnos 64/2, 192—211.

Berdahl, Daphne (2010): On the Social Life of Postsocialism. Memory, Consumption, Germany. Bloomington.

Berger, Stefan/Wulf Kansteiner (Eds.) (2021): Agonistic Memory and the Legacy of 20th Century Wars in Europe. Cham.

Biess, Frank (2023): Holocaust memory and postcolonialism: transatlantic perspectives on the debate (a discussion forum). In: Central European History 56/2, 270—272.

Bock, Jan-Jonathan/Sharon Macdonald (2019a): Introduction: making, experiencing and managing difference in a changing Germany. In: Jan-Jonathan Bock/Sharon Macdonald (eds.): Refugees Welcome? Difference and Diversity in a Changing Germany. Oxford, 1—38.

Bock, Jan-Jonathan/Sharon Macdonald (Eds.) (2019b): Refugees Welcome? Difference and Diversity in a Changing Germany, Oxford.

Bojadžijev, Manuela/Regina Römhild (2014): Was kommt nach dem ›transnational turn‹? Perspektiven für eine kritische Migrationsforschung. In: Labor Migration (ed.): Vom Rand ins Zentrum: Perspektiven einer kritischen Migrationsforschung. Berlin, 10 — 24.

Brusius, Mirjam S. (2022): Memory cultures 2.0: from *Opferkonkurrenz* to solidarity. Introduction. In: Mirjam S. Brusius (ed.): Memory Culture 2.0: from *Opferkonkurrenz* to solidarity. German Historical Institute London Bulletin XLIV/2, 3 — 20.

Cento Bull, Anna/Hans L. Hansen (2016): On agonistic memory. In: Memory Studies 9/4, 390 — 404.

Cento Bull, Anna/Hans L. Hansen/Wulf Kansteiner/Nina Parish (2019): War museums as agonistic spaces: possibilities, opportunities and constraints. In: International Journal of Heritage Studies 25/6, 611 — 625.

Chari, Sharad/Katherine Verdery (2009): Thinking between the posts: postcolonialism, postsocialism, and ethnography after the Cold War. In: Comparative Studies in Society and History 51/1, 6 — 34.

Červinková, Hana (2012): Postcolonialism, postsocialism and the anthropology of East-Central Europe. In: Journal of Postcolonial Writing 48/2, 155 — 163.

El Affendi, Abdelwahab (2024): Gaza and the dilemmas of genocide scholars. In: Al Jazeera, 3.2.2024. https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2024/2/3/gaza-and-the-dilemmas-of-genocide-scholars, accessed on 16.4.2024.

El-Tayeb, Fatima (2016): Undeutsch: Die Konstruktion des Anderen in der postmigrantischen Gesellschaft. Bielefeld.

Farago, Jason (2024): Berlin was a beacon of artistic freedom. Gaza changed everything. In: The New York Times, 6.4.2024. https://www.nytimes.com/2024/04/06/arts/design/berlin-israel-gaza-art-scene.html?unlocked_article_code=1.ik0.G_tU.KwjrHP6UAclw&smid=nytcore-ios-share&referringSource=articleShare&ugrp=m&sgrp=c-cb, accessed on 17.4.2024.

Foroutan, Naika/Juliane Karakayali/Riem Spielhaus (Eds.) (2018): Postmigrantische Perspektiven: Ordnungssysteme, Repräsentationen, Kritik. Frankfurt am Main.

Foroutan, Naika (2019): The post-migrant paradigm. In: Jan-Jonathan Bock/Sharon Macdonald (eds.): Refugees Welcome? Difference and Diversity in a Changing Germany. Oxford, 142 — 167.

Fraser, Nancy (1997): Justice Interruptus. Critical Reflections on the Postsocialist Condition. London.

Fretter, Carina/Klara Nagel (2022): Living in the post — Einleitende Überlegungen zu den Potentialen und Grenzen postsozialistisch-ethnographischen Forschens. In: Carina Fretter/Klara Nagel (eds.): Living in the post. Ethnographische Perspektiven auf Postsozialismus und Erinnerung. Berliner Blätter 85, 5 — 18.

Fulbrooke, Mary (1999): German National Identity after 1945. Oxford.

Gallinat, Anselma (2016): Narratives in the Making. Writing the East German Past in the democratic Present. New York.

Gerbich, Christine (2022): Exploring the futurabilities of museums. Making differences with the Museum Divan at the Museum for Islamic Art in Berlin. In: Sharon Macdonald (ed.): Doing Diversity in Museums and Heritage. A Berlin Ethnography. Bielefeld, 229 — 246.

Gessen, Masha (2023): In the shadow of the Holocaust. How the politics of memory in Europe obscures what we see in Israel and Gaza today. In: The New Yorker, 9.12.2023. https://www.newyorker.com/news/the-weekend-essay/in-the-shadow-of-the-holocaust, accessed on 16.4.2024.

Giesecke, Dana/Harald Welzer (2012): Das Menschenmögliche. Zur Renovierung der deutschen Erinnerungskultur. Hamburg.

Hann, Chris/Caroline Humphrey/Katherine Verdery (2001): Introduction. Postsocialism as a topic of anthropological investigation. In: Chris Hann (ed.): Postsocialism. Ideals, Ideologies and Practices in Eurasia. London, 1 — 21.

Herf, Jeffrey (1997): Divided Memory. The Nazi past in the two Germanys. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Hess, Sabine/Bernd Kasparek/Stefanie Kron/Mathias Rodatz/Maria Schwertl/Simon Sontowski (Eds.) (2017): Der lange Sommer der Migration. 2nd Edition. Berlin.

Hilden, Irene/Harriet Merrow/Andrei Zavadski (2021): Present imperfect, future intense: the opening of the Humboldt Forum. https:// www.carmah.berlin/reflections/present-imperfect-future-intense, accessed on 27.3.2024.

Hilden, Irene/Andrei Zavadski (2024): Museum participation as labor. In: Curator: The Museum Journal, 1 — 20. https://doi.org/10.1111/cura.12617.

Hilmar, Till (2021): ›Economic memories‹ of the aftermath of the 1989 revolutions in East Germany and the Czech Republic. In: East European Politics and Societies (EEPS) 35/1, 89 — 112.

Hilmar, Till (2023): Deserved. Economic Memories after the Fall of the Iron Curtain. New York.

James, Jason (2012): Preservation and National Belonging in Eastern Germany. Heritage Fetishism and Redeeming Germanness. Basingstoke.

Jethro, Duane (2018): Decolonising Berlin's streets. https://carmah.berlin/reflections/decolonising-berlins-streets/, accessed on 27.3.2024.

Jethro, Duane (2020): Cross and cupola: religious matters at the Berlin Stadtschloss. https://carmah.berlin/reflections/religious-matters-stadtschloss/, accessed on 27.3.2024.
Jethro, Duane (2022): Changing street names. Decolonisation and toponymic reinscription for doing diversity in Berlin. In: Sharon Macdonald (ed.): Doing Diversity in Museums and Heritage. A Berlin Ethnography. Bielefeld, 137 – 156.
Jethro, Duane/Sharon Macdonald (2024): Difficult heritage at the door. Doing heritage research in precarious times. In: Nick Shepherd (ed.): Resilient Heritage: Rethinking Heritage in Precarious Times. London, 204 – 218.
Kansteiner, Wulf (2006): In Pursuit of German Memory. History, Television, and Politics after Auschwitz. Athens, Ohio.
Kendzia, Victoria Bishop (2017): Visitors to the House of Memory. Identity and Political Education at the Jewish Museum Berlin. New York.
Langenbacher, Eric (2010): The mastered past? The impact of collective memories on contemporary German political culture and public opinion. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1668917.
Lettrari, Adriana/Christian Nestler/Nadja Troi-Boeck (Eds.) (2016): Die Generation der Wendekinder. Elaboration eines Forschungsfeldes. Wiesbaden.
Levy, Daniel/Natan Sznaider (2006): Memory unbound: the Holocaust and the formation of cosmopolitan memory. In: European Journal of Social Theory 5/1, 87 – 106.
Lierke, Lydia/Massimo Perinelli (Eds.) (2020): Erinnern stören. Der Mauerfall aus migrantischer und jüdischer Perspektive. Berlin.
Macdonald, Sharon (2009): Difficult Heritage. Negotiating the Nazi Past in Nuremberg and Beyond. London.
Macdonald, Sharon (2016): New constellations of difference in Europe's 21st century museumscape. In: Museum Anthropology 39/1, 4 – 19.
Macdonald, Sharon (2019): Das Leben der Dinge im Ethnologischen Museum. In: Bernd Scherer/Olga von Schubert/Stefan Aue (eds.): Wörterbuch der Gegenwart. 100 Years of Now. Berlin, 175 – 187.
Macdonald, Sharon (2022a): Doing diversity, making differences. Multi-researcher ethnography in museums and heritage in Berlin. In: Sharon Macdonald (ed.): Doing Diversity in Museums and Heritage. A Berlin Ethnography. Bielefeld, 13 – 56.
Macdonald, Sharon (Ed.) (2022b): Doing Diversity in Museums and Heritage. A Berlin Ethnography, Bielefeld.
Macdonald, Sharon (2022c): Diversity max*: multiple differences in exhibition-making in Berlin Global in the Humboldt Forum. In: Sharon Macdonald (ed.): Doing Diversity in Museums and Heritage. A Berlin Ethnography. Bielefeld, 173 – 192.
Macdonald, Sharon (2023): National showing off and telling off: reflections from the Ethnological Museum in Germany's Humboldt Forum. In: Museum Worlds: Advances in Research 11/1, 1 – 18. https://doi.org/10.3167/armw.2023.110102.
Macdonald, Sharon (2024): Perspectivity and anthropological engagements in heritage-making. Challenges from the Humboldt Forum, Berlin. In: Emma Gilberthorpe (ed.): Anthropological Perspectives on Global Challenges. London, 64 – 82.
Macdonald, Sharon/Christine Gerbich/Margareta von Oswald (2018): No museum is an island: ethnography beyond methodological containerism. In: Museum and Society 16/2, 138 – 156.
Mandel, Ruth (2008): Cosmopolitan Anxieties. Turkish Challenges to Citizenship and Belonging in Germany. Durham, North Carolina.
Morat, Daniel (2019): Katalysator wider Willen. Das Humboldt Forum in Berlin und die deutsche Kolonialvergangenheit. In: Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History 16/1, 140 – 153.
Moses, Dirk (2021): The German catechism. In: Geschichte der Gegenwart. https://geschichtedergegenwart.ch/the-german-catechism/, accessed on 27.3.2024.
Müller, Martin (2019): Goodbye, postsocialism! In: Europe-Asia Studies 71/4, 533 – 550.
Neller, Katja (2006): DDR-Nostalgie: Dimensionen der Orientierungen der Ostdeutschen gegenüber der ehemaligen DDR, ihre Ursachen und politischen Konnotationen. Wiesbaden.
Neumann, Klaus (2000): Shifting Memories. The Nazi Past in the New Germany. Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Niven, Bill (2001): Facing the Nazi Past. United Germany and the Legacy of the Third Reich. London.
Oltermann, Philip (2024): »Free speech is a facade«: how Gaza war has deepened divisions in German arts world. In: The Guardian, 25.3.2024. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2024/mar/25/free-speech-is-a-facade-how-gaza-war-has-deepened-divisions-in-german-arts-world, taccessed on 16.4.2024.
Onuoha, Nnenna (2022): Beyond compare. Juxtaposition, enunciation and African art in Berlin museums. In: Sharon Macdonald (ed.): Doing Diversity in Museums and Heritage. A Berlin Ethnography. Bielefeld, 97 – 116.

Ouma, Stefan (2024): Revanchistischer Kulturkampf. In: taz.de, 6.4.2024. https://taz.de/Kritik-an-Postkolonialen-Theorien/!6000114/, accessed on 16.4.2024.
Özyürek, Esra (2023): Subcontractors of Guilt. Holocaust Memory and Muslim Belonging in Germany. Stanford.
Radstone, Susannah/Katharine Hodgkin (2003): Regimes of memory: an introduction. In: Susannah Radstone/Katharine Hodgkin (eds.): Regimes of Memory. London, 1 – 22.
Ringel, Felix (2022): The time of post-socialism: on the future of an anthropological concept. In: Critique of Anthropology 42/2, 191 – 208.
Rothberg, Michael (2009): Multidirectional Memory. Remembering the Holocaust in an Age of Decolonization. Stanford.
Rothberg, Michael (2014): Multidirectional memory in migratory settings. The case of post-Holocaust Germany. In: Chiara de Cesari/Anne Rigney (eds.): Transnational Memory. Circulation, Articulation, Scales. Berlin, 123 – 146.
Rothberg, Michael (2021a): Multidirektionale Erinnerung. Holocaustgedenken im Zeitalter der Dekolonisierung. Berlin.
Rothberg, Michael (2021b): We need to re-center the new Historikerstreit. Dealing with the Holocaust. In: Zeit Online, 24.7.2021. https://www.zeit.de/kultur/2021 – 07/dealing-with-the-holocaust-historikerstreit-controversy-genocide-english, accessed on 28.3.2024.
Rothberg, Michael (2022): Lived multidirectionality: ›Historikerstreit 2.0‹ and the politics of Holocaust memory. In: Memory Studies 15/6, 1316 – 1329.
Shatanawi, Mirjam/Sharon Macdonald/Katarzyna Puzon (2021): Heritage, Islam, Europe: entanglements and directions: an introduction. In: Katarzyna Puzon/Sharon Macdonald/Mirjam Shatanawi (eds.): Heritage and Islam in Europe. Abingdon, 1 – 28.
Sieg, Kathrin (2021): Decolonizing German and European History at the Museum. Ann Arbor.
Spivak, Gayatri C. (1999): A Critique of Postcolonial Reason. Toward a History of the Vanishing Present. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Straughn, Jeremy (2021): How Memory Divides. The Search for Identity in Eastern Germany. Abingdon.
Ten Dyke, Elizabeth A. (2001): Dresden. Paradoxes of Memory in History. Abingdon.
Thiemeyer, Thomas (2019): Cosmopolitanizing colonial memories in Germany. In: Critical Inquiry 45/4, 967 – 990.
Tinius, Jonas (2020): Porous membranes: alterity, hospitality, and difference in a Berlin district gallery. In: Jonas Tinius/Margareta von Oswald (eds.): Across Anthropology: Troubling Colonial Legacies, Museums, and the Curatorial. Leuven, 255 – 276.
Tinius, Jonas/Sharon Macdonald (2020): The recursivity of the curatorial. In: Roger Sansi (ed.): The Anthropologist as Curator. London, 35 – 57.
Tlostanova, Madina (2012): Postsocialist ≠ postcolonial? On post-Soviet imaginary and global coloniality. In: Journal of Postcolonial Writing 48/2, 130 – 142.
von Bieberstein, Alice (2016): Not a German past to be reckoned with: negotiating migrant subjectivities between *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* and the nationalization of history. In: Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 22/4, 902 – 919.
von Oswald, Margareta (2020): Troubling colonial epistemologies in Berlin's Ethnologisches Museum. Provenance research and the Humboldt Forum. In: Margareta von Oswald/Jonas Tinius (eds.): Across Anthropology. Troubling Colonial Legacies, Museums, and the Colonial. Leuven, 106 – 129.
von Oswald, Margareta (2022a): Working Through Colonial Collections. An Ethnography of the Ethnological Museum in Berlin. Leuven.
von Oswald, Margareta (2022b): Being affected. Shifting positions at the Ethnological Museum of Berlin. In: Sharon Macdonald (ed.): Doing Diversity in Museums and Heritage. A Berlin Ethnography. Bielefeld, 77 – 96.
Wiedemann, Charlotte (2022): Den Schmerz der Anderen begreifen. Holocaust und Weltgedächtnis. Berlin.
Wilhelm, Cornelia (Ed.) (2016): Migration, Memory, and Diversity. Germany from 1945 to the Present. Oxford.
Wolfgram, Mark A. (2010): Getting History Right: East and West German Collective Memories of the Holocaust and War. Washington D.C..
Yegenoglu, Meyda/Mahmut Mutman (2001): Mapping the present: interview with Gayatri Spivak. In: New Formations 45, 9 – 23.
Zavadski, Andrei/Irene Hilden (2023): The museum as a choir: visitor reactions to the multivocality at the Humboldt Forum's Berlin Global exhibition. In: Museum and Society 21/3, 57 – 77.