

# **Transnational Memory**

---

Circulation, Articulation, Scales

Edited by  
Chiara De Cesari and Ann Rigney

**DE GRUYTER**

## Contents

Acknowledgements — v

Chiara De Cesari and Ann Rigney

Introduction — 1

### Part I Circulation

Astrid Erll

From 'District Six' to *District 9* and Back: The Plurimedial Production of Travelling Schemata — 29

Rosanne Kennedy

Moving Testimony: Human Rights, Palestinian Memory, and the Transnational Public Sphere — 51

Marie-Aude Baronian

Archive, Memory, and Loss: Constructing Images in the Armenian Diaspora — 79

Susanne K  chler

Relational Maps in the Cook Islands Transnational Communities — 99

### Part II Articulation

Michael Rothberg

Multidirectional Memory in Migratory Settings: The Case of Post-Holocaust Germany — 123

Paulla A. Ebron

Slavery and Transnational Memory: The Making of New Publics — 147

Elizabeth Edwards

Between the Local, National, and Transnational: Photographic Recording and Memorializing Desire — 169

Slawomir Kapralski

Memory, Identity, and Roma Transnational Nationalism — 195

Christina Schwenkel

**Imaging Humanity: Socialist Film and Transnational Memories of the War in Vietnam — 219**

**Part III Scales**

Chiara De Cesari

**World Heritage and the Nation-State: A View from Palestine — 247**

Stephan Feuchtwang

**Haunting Memory: The Extension of Kinship Beyond the Nation — 271**

Susan Legêne and Martijn Eickhoff

**Postwar Europe and the Colonial Past in Photographs — 287**

Gal Kirn

**Transnationalism in Reverse: From Yugoslav to Post-Yugoslav Memorial Sites — 313**

Ann Rigney

**Ongoing: Changing Memory and the European Project — 339**

Adrian Paci

***Envoi*: Centro di permanenza temporanea — 361**

**Notes on Contributors — 363**

**List of Illustrations — 367**

**Index of Names — 370**

Michael Rothberg

## Multidirectional Memory in Migratory Settings: The Case of Post-Holocaust Germany

### Immigrating into the past

On November 6, 1959, ten years after returning to West Germany in the wake of the Nazi period and Holocaust, Theodor W. Adorno addressed teachers from the Society for Christian-Jewish Cooperation with a lecture in Wiesbaden whose central question continues to echo more than a half-century later: “Was bedeutet: Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit?” – “What does working through the past mean?” In his lecture, the philosopher Adorno distinguished between different modalities for confronting the difficult history of National Socialism and argued powerfully against the desire he saw in the German society of the 1950s to “close the books on the past and, if possible, even remove it from memory” (Adorno 1998, 89; cf. Adorno 1963, 125). Much has changed in the last fifty years. Adorno’s argument that post-totalitarian justice requires “seriously working upon the past” has been affirmed globally as part of a new human rights regime, although this demand is most often honored in the breach. More locally, commemoration of National Socialism and the Holocaust has made its way to the center of the official national identity of a unified Germany, even if the path has most definitely been a twisted one and that centrality continues to be contested.

But other things have changed as well. Although Adorno could not have known it in 1959, the present in which Germany’s difficult past would be negotiated and renegotiated over the next decades was in the process of significant transformation. Although it has rarely if ever been remarked, Adorno posed his question about *Aufarbeitung* during the early years of postwar *Arbeitsmigration* or labor migration. Under the guise of the ‘guest worker program’ (1955–1973), transnational labor migration brought workers and later their families to West Germany from a number of nations, including Italy, Yugoslavia, Spain, Portugal, Morocco, and Greece; the largest number of workers came from Turkey. Turkish Germans now number close to three million in the Federal Republic and consti-

tute the nation's largest ethnic minority.<sup>1</sup> What would it mean to bring together the histories of *Aufarbeitung* and *Arbeitsmigration*, the legacies of the past and the complexities of the present?

Almost exactly thirty years after Adorno posed his famous question about working through the past, and just two months after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Turkish-German writer Zafer Şenocak penned a short essay with the Munich-based publisher Bülent Tülay, which addresses precisely this unlikely conjunction as well as the more general issue of transnational memory. In an essay titled "Germany: A Home for Turks?," they ask: "Doesn't immigrating to Germany also mean immigrating into Germany's recent past?" (Şenocak 1993, 16).<sup>2</sup> Şenocak and Tülay's challenge might be seen as a contemporary variant of Adorno's question. Set against the transnational and transcultural transformation of the German national context, they pick up where Adorno left off and put forward a double agenda. As the question about immigrating into the past suggests, they call on German Turks to engage with German history – in particular with German Jewish history and, as the phrase "recent past" implies, with Nazism and the Holocaust. But, at least as urgently, they also seek to spark the reflection of dominant German society on its own relation to difference, both historically and in the present.

Writing fifteen years after unification, Şenocak sees the problem in similar terms. In *Das Land hinter den Buchstaben*, a 2006 collection of essays addressing Islam, Turkey, and German society and culture, he restates the need for a new approach to recent German history: "It is time to connect German dealings with the National Socialist past and the questions of today. Not because sixty years of coming to terms would be enough, but rather because remembering must today become again an experience that – beyond the rituals of German *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (mastering the past) – also reaches young people and can effect an important corrective against romanticizing and archaic imaginations of identity" (Şenocak 2006, 144). Such imaginations of identity result in what Şenocak calls "ethnic labeling" [*ethnische Etikettierung*] and block the source of memory's vitality, its connection of past and present: "Those who occupy themselves with the Holocaust and its aftermath rarely arrive in the Multiethnic Republic of Germany [*Vielvölkerrepublik Deutschland*], seldom see a connection between the persecution of Jews in Nazi Germany, between the debates about German-Jewish identity in the Wilhelminian Reich, and the current discussions about double citizenship, immigration law, and questions of integration" (Şenocak 2006, 143). As these formulations suggest, Şenocak raises questions in his various essay collections – as

well as in novels like *Gefährliche Verwandschaft* (Perilous Kinship, 1998) – that parallel those discussed in contemporary memory studies about what the proper frames of reference should be for the study of remembrance. By placing immigration at the center of concern, Şenocak indicates that the field of memory studies needs to think *simultaneously* about national, transnational, transcultural, and transgenerational inflections – all of which overlap and none of which is reducible to the others.

Despite the German specificity of his approach, the issues Şenocak raises have a broader compass in an age in which movements of people across borders are ubiquitous. How *should* immigrants think about the history of the nation into which they have moved? How *does* immigration transform the relation between history and memory for those born into a national community as well as for those who move across national contexts? There are no obvious answers to such questions, but reflecting on them ought to occupy a significant place in any account of the ethics and politics of transnational memory. In Germany, as in all other countries where it has been a significant factor, migration transforms the conditions of social, communicative, and cultural memory; it brings disparate histories into contact with each other, reconfigures individual and collective subjects, and produces novel constellations of remembrance and commemoration in which heterogeneous pasts jostle each other in an unsettled present. Understanding transnational and transcultural constellations of memory – which are catalyzed by such factors as media networks, imperial projects, and global economic flows in addition to migration – entails developing new conceptual frameworks for cultural memory studies. For all their ongoing usefulness, most of the inherited frameworks either derive from methodologically nationalist presumptions or rely on assumptions of continuity, closure, and homogeneity that fail to register the impact of phenomena that break apart the borders of individual and group identity. These phenomena are not themselves new – in Germany or elsewhere – even if they are being intensified under contemporary conditions of globalization. Rather, we have lacked the conceptual vocabulary and flexibility to grasp them.

Taking a cue from Şenocak, I pursue the conjunction of migration and Holocaust remembrance as a way of thinking through the emergent transnational turn in memory studies. This conjunction also offers the opportunity for me to reflect further on my own concept of multidirectional memory, a concept meant to capture the dialogic emergence of hybrid memories in transnational and multicultural contexts. The mobility of peoples is one of the primary catalysts for such a dialogic process, yet many spheres of German public culture as well as inherited scholarly models in memory studies remain resistant to recognizing the multidirectionality of collective memory. Astrid Erll has identified a Herderian conception of "container-culture" at work in the founding theories of collective mem-

1 For a social and intellectual history of the 'guest worker' program, see Chin (2007).

2 I have slightly altered Adelson's translation in this case. Cf. Şenocak (2000, 6).

ory, which blocks recognition of transcultural dynamics. In these theories, “cultures . . . remain relatively clear-cut social formations, usually coinciding with the contours of regions, kingdoms, and nation-states;” there is, in other words, “an isomorphy between territory, social formation, mentalities, and memories” (Erl 2011, 7). Erl’s diagnosis has a particular resonance in the German context, where the Herderian legacy remains especially strong. The power of this isomorphic conception, I would add, derives from strong affective investments in an understanding of group identity as emerging from ‘organic’ and ‘natural’ forms of belonging; these forms of belonging are often imagined and lived as ethnicity. In such understandings, common in scholarly as well as popular conceptions, memory is a form of communal *property* that, in circular fashion, reconfirms the identity of the group.

In contrast to this organic conception of collective remembrance, I attempted to show in my book, *Multidirectional Memory*, that memory is not the exclusive property of particular groups but rather emerges in a dynamic process of dialogue, contestation, and exchange that renders both memories and groups hybrid, open-ended, and subject to renegotiation (Rothberg 2009). As I revealed in readings of Holocaust remembrance especially in black Atlantic and French colonial contexts, memory of the Holocaust is not simply a form of Jewish memory, just as memory of slavery or colonialism is not limited to the victims or descendants of slavery and colonialism.<sup>3</sup> Rather, the histories of these apparently autonomous memory traditions are interlaced with each other in ways that are productive, if often tense. How can this concept of multidirectional memory be translated for the German sphere? Because of the legacy of the Holocaust, among other factors, the link between memory, property, and historical responsibility has been especially strong in Germany and thus especially resistant to the recognition of multidirectional openings. Nevertheless, I argue, considering under-explored migrant engagements with the Holocaust and the National Socialist past allows us to demonstrate that German memory cultures can open themselves to a redefinition of German identity that takes into account the fundamental demographic transformations and transnational flows of the postwar period without jeopardizing German responsibility for the Holocaust. However, a new understanding of the dynamics of memory is a prerequisite for that redefinition.

Inspired by the case of migration and Holocaust memory in Germany, I argue here that the transnational turn cannot simply leave behind national memory if it

<sup>3</sup> See also Alison Landsberg’s important study of “prosthetic memory,” which suggests that in the wake of modernity and the development of the mass media, memory is no longer linked to “organic” communities but becomes available for creative adaptation and sharing across identity categories (Landsberg 2004).

is to offer a new approach, for such a move would only repeat modernity’s logic of abstraction and supersession, essential components of national memory.<sup>4</sup> Rather, the new transnational memory studies must think about how different layers and scales of memory coexist and interact in a non-teleological, non-progressive fashion (see also the Introduction to this volume). The migrant/German case also bears implications for thinking about memory’s multidirectionality; it suggests that grasping multidirectionality means not only linking different *layers* of memory – that is, different traditions and historical or cultural legacies – but also mediating between different *scales* of memory (local, national, transnational, etc.) without subordinating one to the other. Attending to the articulation between these layers and scales, I argue, also suggests the need to distinguish analytically between *transcultural* and *transnational* memory dynamics. Furthermore, such attention can help reveal the relations of power that contour practices of memory; power appears not merely as hierarchical or repressive (although it can be that), but also as productive and open to rearticulation from below. The forms of mediation and articulation between different historical legacies and scales of remembrance include diverse materials: technical media and flows of money, but also embodied practices such as touch and mobility. Before turning to a resonant example from migrant/German civil society that illustrates this process of mediation and articulation – the Berlin-based Neighborhood Mothers project – I first consider what a theory and ethics of memory might look like in a transnational age defined by mass migration. Engaging with a variety of theorists of memory and migration, I will argue that such an ethics must be *located* and attentive to the forms of *thickening* that take place in transcultural encounters without reimporting the organic visions of collectivity that often accompany imaginations of locality and community.

## A transcultural ethics of memory for an age of transnational migration

As memory studies has become increasingly institutionalized – through the establishment of research centers and journals and the publication of synthesizing and canonizing anthologies – its focus has, paradoxically, begun to move beyond

<sup>4</sup> That is, national memory seeks to create an abstracted “imagined community” that unites citizens across their differences and supersedes local and other forms of attachment that might stand in the way of that unification (although, in Hegelian fashion, some of those local attachments might also be preserved and prove useful for national identifications).

the conceptual parameters of its founding texts and methodologies. The rich and heterogeneous works that have become 'classic' in that process of institutionalization – by Maurice Halbwachs, Pierre Nora, and Jan and Aleida Assmann, among others – emphasize *milieu de mémoire* centered on small-scale groups and communicative transmission across tightly-knit family generations, on the one hand, and *lieux de mémoire* and canons of cultural memory anchoring national pasts, on the other (e.g. Halbwachs 1992; J. Assmann 1995; Nora 1996–1998; Nora 2001–2006; A. Assmann 2008). While continuing to draw on the rich legacies of this transdisciplinary heritage – itself still in the process of development, as the ongoing work of the Assmanns, especially, indicates (Assmann and Conrad 2010) – new currents in memory studies have begun to engage critically with these forebears; they have sought to move from static to dynamic, from organic to mediated, and from parochial to cosmopolitan models of memory (Rigney 2005, 2008; Levy and Sznajder 2006; Erll and Rigney 2009). This new emphasis on multidirectionality and *noeuds de mémoire* (knots of memory) – as I have called it in my own work and in collaborative projects – also tends to be transcultural and transnational (Rothberg 2009; Rothberg et al. 2010; cf. also Crownshaw 2011; Craps and Rothberg 2011).

With the new move beyond the boundaries of national culture, however, have come voices of caution. In an important intervention, Susannah Radstone draws attention to the simultaneous *institutionalization* and cross-border *expansion* of memory studies and worries that their increasing fluidity reproduces too perfectly the neoliberal utopia of a globalized, borderless world (Radstone 2011). For Radstone, “there remains something more than a little paradoxical, as well as instrumental ... about the attempt to produce a fully ‘globalizable’ version of memory studies, for memory research, like memory itself (notwithstanding possibilities for transmission and translation) is always located – it is ... specific to its site of production and practice” (113–114). Radstone warns against asserting too quickly memory’s transnational and transcultural scope by virtue of its association with new media or globalized practices of cultural consumption: “Whether we focus on the ways in which memory might ‘travel’ via the cinema, or the Internet, for instance, that travel remains only hypothetical, or an unrealized potential, until a particular individual goes to a specific website, or a particular audience watches a specific film” (117). Radstone’s emphasis on particularity corresponds to a concern with *power* in its “intellectual, economic, institutional” forms (114), which she understands as contouring the production, circulation, and consumption of cultural memory – as well as scholarship on it. Drawing attention to “the *locatedness* of memory” and memory research (114) in practices that must be “*instantiated* locally, in a specific place and at a particular time” (117) helps to ground the transnational turn in memory studies in uneven material conditions. It encour-

ages scholars to focus on the “*processes* that can be tracked within and across locations, instances, texts, narratives and events of memory” (120). As Radstone concludes, “[t]he idea that memory ‘travels,’ stands in for the articulation of these processes” (120). In making a transcultural or transnational turn, scholars should foreground located articulations of remembrance embedded in uneven relations of power and not simply celebrate what Radstone calls “‘high speed’ travels across the globe” (114).

Radstone’s foregrounding of *locatedness* as a response to the transnational and transcultural turn in memory studies should be distinguished from a return to some notion of the purely *local*. Firstly, location can never be reduced to a point in space. Indeed, as Sharon Macdonald writes in a study of a seemingly very local case – the memorial legacies and material remnants of the Nazi Party Rally Grounds in Nuremberg – the “situations and frames” of remembrance

are simultaneously local and beyond local. That is, they involve specific local conditions and actors but these never act in a vacuum, even when they are actively producing ‘locality.’ Instead ... local actions are frequently negotiated through comparisons with other places, through concepts and ideas produced elsewhere and that may even have global circulation, and through the sense of being judged by others. They are also negotiated in relation to legislation, political structures and economic considerations which are rarely exclusively local. (Macdonald 2009, 4)

Although focused predominantly on a very particular case of the instantiation and articulation of memory, Macdonald’s study of the negotiation of “difficult heritage” in Nuremberg reveals how the transnational turn can be important even for work at other, smaller scales. Secondly, Radstone’s desire to “brin[g] memory’s ‘travels’ back home” (Radstone 2011, 120) must be accomplished with care, since, as a feminist scholar like Radstone knows well, ‘home’ is a contested terrain that can easily come to serve patriarchal, nationalist, and racist ideologies. In returning to the locations of memory we should lose track neither of how nation-states seek to retain hegemony by producing purified memories of home, homeland, and *Heimat*, nor of the ways in which transnational and transcultural processes can ‘unhome’ the homogenous conceptions of local and national community that ground the founding French and German texts of memory studies.

Appeals to the realms of the transnational and transcultural do not automatically challenge the hegemonic politics of memory, however – no matter whether such a politics is enacted at the national, subnational, or supernational level. As memory studies moves into a new phase, it will be necessary to distinguish analytically between the categories of the transnational and the transcultural, for they do not refer to identical phenomena even if they often overlap. Both categories refer to the crossing of borders, but the borders to which they refer – those of nation-

states and those of cultures – are by no means strictly isomorphic. Transnational phenomena may not be transcultural – as the homogenizing effects of cultural imperialism (e.g. Hollywood cinema) illustrate. Inversely, transcultural phenomena may take place within the frame of the nation-state – for instance, in visions of domestic multiculturalism characterized by overlapping hyphenated identities (e.g. Italian Americans, Irish Americans, etc.). Although no simple formula exists, distinguishing these two axes (the national and the cultural) can help illuminate acts of remembrance and clarify when practices of memory offer alternatives to hegemonic formations and when they reproduce dominant visions. In the vocabulary I have started to develop above, transcultural memory refers to the hybridization produced by the *layering* of historical legacies that occurs in the traversal of *cultural* borders, while transnational memory refers to the *scales* of remembrance that intersect in the crossing of *geo-political* borders. Because classical memory studies tended to be both mono-cultural and nation-bound in its conception of collective memory, these distinctions have not always been visible. But both transcultural and transnational lenses are needed to provide a new orientation that does not simply rewrite hegemonic forms of belonging for a globalized age.

The movement of peoples across the globe has been a major catalyst for the production of transcultural and transnational dislocations. Yet, because memory studies scholars often share the bounded visions of national and cultural collectives, the impact of migration on local and national memory cultures often remains obscure. Sometimes, migration is even considered antithetical to remembrance. As part of his provocative argument that modernity “tends to generate cultural amnesia,” Paul Connerton proposes that “[t]he history of mass migration is part of the history of modern forgetting, and of forgetting places in particular” (Connerton 2009, 135–136). While true for certain cases (such as, arguably, turn of the twentieth-century Jewish migration from Europe to the US), Connerton’s argument does not necessarily hold true for more contemporary migrations where modernity also provides various technologies, such as the internet, satellite television, and inexpensive air travel, that help maintain – or forge new – links to the country of origin. Perhaps even more significant, linking memory and forgetting to “local roots” and “place[s] of origin” (135) also reveals that while Connerton’s lens here may be transnational (insofar as movement across national borders is said to produce amnesia about roots and origins left behind), it is definitely not transcultural. The argument linking transnational migration with forgetting leaves out the new types of *transcultural* memory that are produced *through migration*: for both migrants and “natives” in the country of destination – and for those who remain in the country of emigration and may receive not only financial remittances but also new imports of mnemonic material.

The transnational and transcultural dimensions of migration pose challenges and offer opportunities for the ethics of memory, but the most influential account of such an ethics is founded on a foreclosure of the transcultural (and underplays the transnational). Considering the limits of philosopher Avishai Margalit’s *The Ethics of Memory* will lead to the hypothesis of a new ‘setting’ for the ethics of migrant memory. Margalit asks significant, fundamental questions: whether there is an obligation to remember “people and events from the past” and whether “remembering and forgetting [are] proper subjects of moral praise or blame” (Margalit 2002, 7). His response takes the form of a series of correlated binary distinctions: between ethics and morality, thick and thin relations, and those people who are close to us and those who are strangers. Margalit argues that there is in fact an ethics of memory and an obligation to remember, but that it involves only communities that possess “thick relations” by virtue of living closely together or considering themselves part of an “imagined” collective (in Benedict Anderson’s sense). Margalit gives no definition of what thick relations are, but attempts instead to describe the situations that foster them: “Thick relations are grounded in attributes such as parent, friend, lover, fellow-countryman. Thick relations are anchored in a shared past or moored in shared memory” (7). As Margalit’s examples imply, these ethical communities vary in scale from the family to the nation, although at other times they also seem to include religiously- and ethnically-defined groups that are transnational in scale; in either case, they seem to be, by definition, mono-cultural. In contrast to this ethical terrain of memory, Margalit suggests, “there is very little morality of memory” (7), because morality concerns “thin” relations characteristic of our associations with “humanity” at large – a category so vast and abstract that it cannot easily be a subject or object of remembrance or commemoration. As with thick relations, Margalit gives no direct definition of what is thin: “Thin relations . . . are backed by the attribute of being human. Thin relations rely also on some aspects of being human, such as being a woman or being sick. . . . Thin relations are in general our relations to the stranger and the remote” (7). Margalit considers a morality of memory relevant only when the events to be remembered concern a fundamental definition of human being, such as “gross crimes against humanity” like genocide (9).

Although Margalit describes modern society as characterized by a complex division of labor, this complexity does not carry over into his understanding of communities of memory. Instead, he models his notion of the “thick relations” of community on the family: “What do we imagine when we imagine a community with whom we are supposed to have thick relations? My answer is that we imagine an extension of family relations that would include relatives we have not met” (Margalit 2002, 75). Families come in many forms, of course, but Margalit seems to have a very traditional notion in mind, as becomes clear when he moves from



the level of the family to the level of the nation: "The true issue in assessing national relations in ethical terms is whether or not, in claiming to be an extended family, they are a natural extension of the family metaphor. Not all nations pretend to be 'organic nations' with a shared myth of common origin, but those that do should be ethically scrutinized as to whether their purported thick relations are sufficiently family-like. ... The resemblance to the family tests whether the relation is really thick" (103). While Margalit's use of scare quotes around the term "organic nations" seems to indicate skepticism about claims to organic unity, his perspective on ethics ends up confirming just such a way of thinking about human communities. Rather than questioning the premises of national (or other) organic thinking, Margalit proposes instead to test whether such organically conceived entities really possess "thick" relations. At this point it becomes clear how circular Margalit's argument is: pre-given, monocultural understandings of family and nation confirm each other by reference to the predicate "thickness." Nations are like families if their relations are thick; their relations are thick if they are like those of families. Nations are not like families, however, whatever their self-conceptions suggest, and families are not organic entities but are hybrid, social-biological formations whose relations vary both within and across cultural contexts.

Margalit's monocultural and generally nation-based imagination of community and collectivity limits the usefulness of his ethics of memory for contexts marked by immigration – that is, for almost all known modern human contexts. Margalit's tendency to conceive human relations through binary models (thick vs. thin, etc.) risks reproducing homogenous and potentially nativist notions of community, which remain powerful despite long-term movements and mixings of people. In an interview published in the German-Jewish journal *Babylon* a few years before *The Ethics of Memory* appeared but when he was already trying out its argument, Margalit denies that his understanding of community is based on an assumption of homogeneity or what he calls "tribal thinking" (Margalit 1999, esp. 110–111). Yet, in the book, the commitment articulated in the interview to understanding communities of memory as composed of "multiple loyalties" and "dispute over what is important" does not manifest itself (Margalit 1999, 110–111). The binary mode of thinking in the book leads him to polarize human relations into two (and only two) camps. Making reference to "Heidegger's recognition that everyday ontology should distinguish between objects with which we are involved and those just present to us," Margalit argues for a "parallel" "distinction with regard to human beings. There are those with whom we are involved – that is, with whom we have thick relations – and others of whom we have only a thin idea of their existence. ... This distinction between the two types of humans is part of our fundamental ontology" (Margalit 2002, 142–143). Margalit's distinction all

too easily reproduces a nativist ideology of national community in which immigrants are merely "present to us" but not actually "involved" in "our" lives. Taking account of migration as a fundamental – potentially transnational and transcultural – phenomenon, and of migrants as also part of the communal "we," would reveal a much more dynamic picture of human relations than this reductive, binary understanding of ontology allows, and would thus necessitate a new ethics of memory not premised on the opposition between 'thick' and 'thin.'

While Margalit's imagination of ethical communities of memory is premised on an *a priori* exclusion of all that might disrupt the bordered world of monocultural collectives (including, especially, nations), it is also true that there is no script for the transcultural impact of transnational migration on preexisting landscapes of memory. As Radstone would rightly caution, migration is a located process involving relations of power and concrete articulations of diverse experiences and material conditions; but it is precisely the *unscripted new linkages* created by migration that characterize its locatedness and constitute its interest for rethinking practices and ethics of remembrance. Migration creates, in the words of Murat Aydemir and Alex Rotas, "migratory settings" (Aydemir and Rotas 2008). Aydemir and Rotas's concept of migratory settings provides an alternative starting point for reflecting on the mutual impact of migration and memory that is more promising than Connerton's equation of modernity and forgetting or Margalit's definition of the ethics of memory with reference to family-like thick relations. Aydemir and Rotas's notion

invites a shift in perspective from migration as movement from place to place to migration as installing movement within place. Migration not only takes place between places, but also has its effects on place, in place. In brief, we suggest a view on migration in which place is neither reified nor transcended, but "thickened" as it becomes the setting of the variegated memories, imaginations, dreams, fantasies, nightmares, anticipations, and idealizations that experiences of migration, of both migrants and native inhabitants, bring into contact with each other. Migration makes place overdetermined, turning it into the *mise-en-scène* of different histories. (Aydemir and Rotas 2008, 7)

Aydemir and Rotas's proposal that migration "thickens" place by concatenating histories, memories, and fantasies and thus rendering culture as a multidirectional setting, offers the possibility of a new ethics of memory for a transnational and transcultural age precisely because it challenges the binary between "thick" national-familial relations and "thin" relations with strangers. Their notion of thickening makes no reference to organic metaphors or genealogical understandings of collectivity; to the contrary, thickening is a process without either origin or endpoint that takes place precisely when imagined communities experience an unsettling interruption. An ethics derived from such a setting would ignore nei

ther the concreteness of location nor the (potential) effects of oblivion associated with migration, but would leave behind assumptions of cultural homogeneity that sometimes seep back into scholarship and public memory.

Starting from the experience of migration can help cultivate the multidirectional critical sensibility needed to engage ethically with the locatedness of remembrance, a locatedness expressed in the interplay of both diverse historical layers and legacies, and disparate scales and temporalities. In order to demonstrate concretely what an ethics for a migratory setting would look like, I turn in the remainder of this essay to an example from contemporary Germany – a country of immigration in which a dominant monocultural, national frame continues to inflect the work of memory but fails to limit all of its expressions.

## Neighborhood Mothers: multidirectional memory in migratory settings

In February 2009, more than two hundred immigrant and minority women – many of them wearing headscarves – filled an auditorium in Berlin's impoverished Neukölln neighborhood. They had come to listen to presentations by the Neukölln Neighborhood Mothers (*Neuköllner Stadtteilmütter*) – women from their community who work with an organization dedicated to the social welfare of immigrant families.<sup>5</sup> The projects presented by the Neighborhood Mothers did not, however, concern the issues of health, nutrition, and education that the organization had been founded to address when it was established by a church-affiliated association, the Diakonisches Werk Neukölln-Oberspree. Instead, one by one, the women spoke of their exploration of Germany's National Socialist past.

<sup>5</sup> I discuss the *Stadtteilmütter*/Neighborhood Mothers project in a somewhat different context in a joint essay, see Rothberg and Yildiz (2011). Parts of the following section are adapted from that article, but revised and expanded here. This discussion is also part of a larger, book-length study in progress of immigrants and coming to terms with the past in contemporary Germany, co-authored with Yildiz. The event, "Miteinander statt übereinander – Geschichte in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft," took place on 25 February 2009 in Berlin's Werkstatt der Kulturen. For self-presentations by the Mothers along with essays by ASF workers and scholars, see Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste (ASF) 2010. The Neighborhood Mothers have attracted some attention for their social welfare work, but their less well known historical engagement is one of the most crucial and original aspects of their program and one of the most suggestive for rethinking cultural memory in a transnational/transcultural context. See also the brief and sympathetic discussion of the project in Partridge (2010, esp. 842–844).

The women's desire to understand both the history of the country in which they live as immigrants or refugees and that country's memory culture – which they had recognized as a powerful social force in the present – had led to the creation of a project in 2006 in partnership with *Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste* (ASF: Action Reconciliation Service for Peace), a German peace and volunteer service organization. The purpose of the partnership between the ASF and the Neighborhood Mothers, which has been running ever since, was to allow the women – many of whom were not educated within the German educational system – to find out more about the Holocaust and its legacies and to create their own modes of participation in German memory culture.

At the gathering in 2009, they reported on their meetings with Jewish and Sinti survivors of Nazi genocide, their visits to memorial sites commemorating the Holocaust, and the effects that those encounters had on them. The event culminated with the screening of *Aus unserer Sicht* (From Our Perspective), a film the women had made about their recent visit to Auschwitz. This lively and emotionally charged gathering received hardly any coverage in the local press, although it showcased what conventional wisdom asserts does not exist: a group of mostly 'Muslim' immigrants who engage with the Holocaust and the German past in serious ways and become bearers and transmitters of a historical memory ostensibly not their own. The Neukölln public forum and other aspects of the project illustrate how the Neighborhood Mothers and their institutional partners help produce a 'thickening' of German memory cultures. This thickened remembrance is just one example of a larger, underappreciated phenomena in contemporary Germany: activism and cultural production that links engagement with the National Socialist and Holocaust past and the migratory dynamics of the present.<sup>6</sup>

The Neighborhood Mothers project results from a collaboration that enables the articulation of different layers and scales of memory. The interplay between layers and scales moves in multiple directions – neither simply from the 'bottom up' nor from 'top down.' That is, while the project arose out of the interests of a group of mothers in Neukölln – most of whom had a Turkish background but two of whom came from Arab countries<sup>7</sup> – it developed within a framework shaped by the ASF. The ASF is a non-profit organization founded by mainstream Protestants critical of the church's role under National Socialism and in its aftermath. It was established to take responsibility for Nazi crimes and is run almost exclusively by non-migrant Germans. Since the late 1950s, the ASF has been involved in inter-

<sup>6</sup> For a brief evocation of further examples, see Rothberg and Yildiz 2011, esp. 37–38, as well as our forthcoming collaborative book-in-progress.

<sup>7</sup> Future groups of Mothers have included women from Sri Lanka, Iraq, Algeria, Poland, and many other countries.

national exchange and contact in countries throughout Europe and in Israel and the USA as part of their effort to translate “the engagement with National Socialism and its crimes” into “concrete action in the present.”<sup>8</sup> The encounter with the Neighborhood Mothers allowed them to develop a focus on “interculturality” that they had already begun but that had not been at the center of their (nevertheless) decidedly transnational projects.<sup>9</sup> In this sense, members of the ASF have, in recent years, been engaged in addressing the deficit Zafer Şenocak indicts; that is, they have for the last decade begun seeking to bridge the gap between what they call the “obligations” of the past that come from the “recognition of guilt” and the challenges of the multicultural present.<sup>10</sup> And, of course, the very existence of the Mothers as a group with a collective identity owes a debt to the Diakonisches Werk, the charitable organization of the Protestant church. This organization also includes a commitment to intercultural work in its programming; on its homepage, it describes itself as “aspiring to intercultural opening in all services,” and states that it “regards diversity as an important societal resource.”<sup>11</sup>

The encounters and knowledge produced by the Neighborhood Mothers program – not to mention what is made of the project by the women involved, the two NGOs, and society at large – are in no way solely the effect of the ASF’s or the Diakonische’s programming; yet they have offered a necessary basis for the Mothers’ memory work. Within the space created by this interplay between grassroots actors possessing diverse local, national, and transnational personal histories, and organized NGOs with a local, national, and international scope, different layers of memory are ‘inter-activated’; personal memories of trauma and displacement from dispersed contexts interact with commemorative paradigms ‘made in Germany’ and create new forms of transmission. The result is not an additive process but a thickening of memory in which already existing, but frequently overlooked, constellations of remembrance become visible and articulate with canonical forms of commemoration.

This thickening of remembrance has both transnational and transcultural dimensions. It simultaneously arises out of, and makes visible, a quintessential migratory setting with all the ambivalences Aydemir and Rotas outline. In transcending its status as a local community-education program through forms of mediation such as film, publication, and public meetings, the Neighborhood Mothers

project becomes a vector for participation by minoritized and marginalized subjects in various public spheres where memory culture plays a significant role. At the same time, however, structural features of German public life – such as pejorative assumptions about immigrants from ‘Muslim’ countries (see Yildiz 2009; 2011) and an “ethnified” Holocaust memory culture (Diner 1998, 303) – limit the degree to which the project ‘travels’ and transforms dominant frameworks. Keeping these forms of limitation in view can grant us access to the power configurations that accompany and inflect acts of memory, albeit without preventing the unexpected from arising.

Indeed, the activities of the Neighborhood Mothers are all the more remarkable for taking place in a context that strongly correlates culture and memory with monocultural, nation-based understandings of ethnic belonging and in which, as Şenocak has already informed us, the troubles of the past remain cut off from the debates of the present. Two dominant social logics in unified Germany regulate who inherits the past and what rights and responsibilities accompany that inheritance: a *German paradox*, in which ensuring responsibility for the crimes of the recent past seems to require preservation of an ethnically homogeneous notion of German identity, even though that very notion of ethnicity was one of the sources of those crimes; and a *migrant double bind*, in which migrants are simultaneously told that the Holocaust is not part of their history because they are not ‘ethnically’ German and then castigated as unintegratable for their alleged indifference to Holocaust remembrance (see Rothberg and Yildiz 2011). In the words of Havva Jürgensen, a Neighborhood Mother and self-identified Turkish-German “guest worker child,” “we often hear that the topic of National Socialism is not for us because we’re migrants. Just as often it’s insinuated that in any case we are too antisemitic to be interested in this topic” (ASF 2010, 54). While the German paradox and the migrant double bind evoke actually existing social attitudes that powerfully shape the transmission of cultural memory and the possibilities of full citizenship for non-ethnically German immigrants, they do not exhaustively describe the social landscape of remembrance in contemporary Germany. Rather, they amount to an ideological redescription and occlusion of existing practices of memory – including innovative collaborations such as those involved in the Neighborhood Mothers project.

Precisely because of the lack of public recognition that greets most immigrant engagements of this sort, the work of memory initiated by the Mothers bears implications for theories of memory in a transnational and transcultural age. The Mothers’ engagement with National Socialism and the Nazi genocide has both rendered visible and facilitated the production and transmission of new memories – in intimate as well as public settings. For instance, Havva Jürgensen describes growing up in Berlin’s Wedding neighborhood with Jewish neighbors who gave her a copy

<sup>8</sup> See the ASF website: [www.asf-ev.de/de/ueber-uns/ueber-uns.html](http://www.asf-ev.de/de/ueber-uns/ueber-uns.html) (accessed 17 March 2014).

<sup>9</sup> For the purposes of this essay, I am considering the “intercultural” focus of the ASF and the Diakonisches Werk as roughly equivalent to what I have been calling the “transcultural.”

<sup>10</sup> Cf. [www.asf-ev.de/de/ueber-uns/ueber-uns.html](http://www.asf-ev.de/de/ueber-uns/ueber-uns.html) (accessed 17 March 2014).

<sup>11</sup> See the Diakonisches Werk website: [www.diakonisches-werk-berlin.de/](http://www.diakonisches-werk-berlin.de/) (accessed 17 March 2014).

of Anne Frank's diary as a gift. Like many Germans, this migrant subject "first concerned [herself] intensively" with the Nazi genocide through the television series *Holocaust* in the late 1970s (ASF 2010, 53). Decades later, she recounts how her involvement with the Neighborhood Mothers project has led to new forms of prosthetic, postmemorial transmission: "The impressions from the seminars often had aftereffects that lasted for days. Sometimes, as I was cooking in the evening, I still thought about the experiences of the seminar, a visit to a memorial site, a film, a conversation, a document. Then tears would roll down my face, something that my twelve-year old son would sometimes notice. Because of that I often also talked with him about the seminar" (ASF 2010, 54).<sup>12</sup> Feeling addressed by some of the most canonical popular texts of Holocaust memory, having had everyday neighborly exchanges with German Jewish survivors, taking part in dialogue with an Israeli survivor about the "possibilities for cohabitation among Jews and Arabs in Israel," and passing on a history not considered her own to her son, Havva Jürgensen is in some ways the prototype of the ethical secondary witness of traumatic history (ASF 2010, 54). Like many of the Mothers' self-portraits, her story is fascinating both for its ordinariness and for the insight it gives into the multidirectional transmission of memory that has taken place in Germany throughout the decades of the most active Holocaust remembrance, albeit with scant public awareness or official recognition. Her ethical engagement with the past derives neither from a thick and organically conceived link with a memory community, nor from a thin moral concern for humanity at large. Rather, the encounters she describes exemplify the 'thickening' produced in migratory settings; they include transnational connections to events beyond Germany (such as the Middle East conflict) facilitated by a Germany-based, internationally active organization (ASF), as well as the transcultural blurrings and identifications that result from neighborly contact and mass media products.

Not all of the mothers have had the same experience of intimate transmission as Jürgensen, yet their accounts also reveal unexpected layers of transnational memory culture nonetheless. Some of those who were educated outside of Germany bring with them the kinds of comparative perspectives on Holocaust remembrance and education that scholars in recent decades have valued. Regina Cysewski, a *Spätaussiedlerin* from Poland (an ethnic German who came to Berlin in 1981) reports having learned much about the fate of Polish Jews during WWII, but little about National Socialism as such (ASF 2010, 48). Meanwhile, Perwin Rasoul

Ahmad, a Kurd from Iraq, recounts that Jews and Hitler were topics in school, as was the "emergence of dictatorships . . . even though the Saddam-regime was itself also a dictatorship" (ASF 2010, 45). Such accounts exemplify the degree to which 'national' memory cultures are in fact assemblages of inter- and transnational exchange and highlight how attention to migration can make such exchange more visible.

Other women from the group who did not grow up in Germany confess to having known very little about National Socialism and the Holocaust before joining a Neighborhood Mothers' seminar. But even those women with little pre-existing knowledge about the past offer narratives that nonetheless provide access to aspects of postwar German life that do not always show up in the official public discourse of 'coming to terms with the past.' For instance, Binnur Babig, who came to Germany from Turkey as a twenty-five year old tourist and stayed after marrying a German man, recounts how, before the seminar, she knew "as good as nothing about the topic [of] National Socialism," except for the tales of German suffering told by her mother-in-law of "how the Russians came, how her father was taken away, and what hardship they suffered. She never mentioned that Jews had been persecuted and murdered" (ASF 2010, 43). Besides this privileged peek into the private sphere – testimony to a persistent discourse of German suffering and Holocaust relativization confirmed by scholars as well as other migrants – the women's stories also hint at continuities that mark post-National Socialist German society. Aylin Teker, born in Berlin and raised in both Germany and Turkey, describes having a history teacher in the *Oberschule* (high school) who was a "wannabe Hitler," and who "greeted us sometimes with the Hitler greeting and cursed us that we should go back to Turkey" (ASF 2010, 51).

As the experiences of these Mothers suggest, drawing attention to transcultural and transnational dynamics does not imply that memory work in migratory settings only involves harmony. To the contrary, because of the overlapping layers and scales of memory at stake, friction often results.<sup>13</sup> The form of conflict that most frequently emerges in accounts of the Neighborhood Mothers project involves the Israeli-Palestinian struggle – a flashpoint almost everywhere, but particularly charged in Germany, where support of Israel has been understood as part of the country's post-Holocaust efforts at *Wiedergutmachung* (reparation; or, literally, 'making good again').<sup>14</sup> Indeed, integral to the ASF's mission has been

<sup>12</sup> In referring to this transmission as both prosthetic and postmemorial, I draw on Landsberg (2004) and Hirsch (1997, 2008). For more on the relation of postmemory and migrant memories, see Seidel-Arapacı (2006).

<sup>13</sup> For a theory of the productivity of friction in transnational exchange, see Tsing (2005).

<sup>14</sup> Another obvious flashpoint for the predominantly Turkish-German Neighborhood Mother project is the Armenian genocide – a genocide denied by the Turkish state and much of the Turkish diaspora. For better or worse, the Armenian question has largely been kept off the Mothers

reconciliation work in Israel, which it has undertaken since 1961.<sup>15</sup> With the ASF's turn toward the inclusion of 'intercultural' projects starting in 1999, such a mission necessarily became more complicated as the organization began to work with immigrants to Germany who might have different relations to the history and politics of the Middle East, including Palestinian refugees and other people with a Muslim background.<sup>16</sup> Working not just transnationally (i.e. in other countries, such as the Netherlands or Israel) but also transculturally (i.e. with 'intercultural' difference within Germany) has shifted the kinds of memory work in which the ASF participates, as events around the February 2009 public forum in Neukölln illustrate.

The Mothers who took part in that forum were part of a group whose project on National Socialism and the Holocaust overlapped with Israel's 2008–2009 bombing of Gaza. Eike Segen, an ASF staff-member who was leading the seminar with the Neighborhood Mothers at the time, reports that there was "massive conflict" about the events in Israel/Palestine.<sup>17</sup> Yet, even despite such conflict – and perhaps, precisely, *out of* such conflict – the Neighborhood Mothers project opens up possibilities for rational political discussion. In the ASF-produced brochure that recounts the experiences of this same group of women, Emine Elçi, a religious Neighborhood Mother born in Berlin to a Kurdish family from Turkey, provides more direct access to the women's perspective. She recounts how "the time in which our seminar took place was overshadowed by the war between Palestinians and Israelis in Gaza. We talked a lot about that. When Inge Deutschkron [a Holocaust survivor] told us that she had felt accepted for the first time in Israel, we also thought of the Palestinians who suffer under Israeli occupation" (ASF 2010, 41).

agenda – and there are some signs of resistance on the mothers' part to linking that genocide to the remembrance of the Holocaust. However, the collective project with Yasemin Yildiz in which I am engaged has turned up significant, dissident memory work around the Armenian genocide in other Turkish-German circles. This memory work – which takes place in civil society as well as cultural spheres – seems to find an impetus in the productive dynamics of German Holocaust memory culture, but seeks to avoid falling into an ethnicizing 'Turkish paradox' by forging collaborations with non-Turkish actors, including immigrants of Armenian and Kurdish background.

<sup>15</sup> On their website, the ASF writes: "The work in Israel could be begun after the Eichmann Trial in 1961." [www.asf-ev.de/de/ueber-uns/geschichte/shnezeichen-ost-und-west/asf-geschichte-bundesrepublik.html](http://www.asf-ev.de/de/ueber-uns/geschichte/shnezeichen-ost-und-west/asf-geschichte-bundesrepublik.html) (accessed 17 March 2014).

<sup>16</sup> My point is by no means that immigrants with a Muslim background are 'naturally' anti-Israel – indeed, the evidence presented here shows a much more complicated picture not often represented in dominant media, which stereotypes 'Muslim immigrants' as anti-Israel and antisemitic. Rather, the point is that such immigrants have points of reference beyond the German context that allow them different – and sometimes more cosmopolitan – perspectives on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

<sup>17</sup> Interview with Eike Segen, Berlin, 11 December 2011.

At the same time, Elçi also describes how participation in the group's "engagement [*Auseinandersetzung*] with National Socialism" has made her more "sensitive" to "differentiation" within groups: "At a demonstration during the Gaza War I discovered a flyer from a Jewish group that was against the war. The flyer was signed 'Not in our name.' Earlier I wouldn't have noticed these differences" (ASF 2010, 41). A similar movement from potential conflict to emergent solidarity took place during the public forum shortly after the end of the war (but still during the blockade of Gaza), at which the Mothers' film about their trip to Auschwitz was screened.<sup>18</sup> Echoing the exchange between the Mothers and Segen in the group's preparatory meeting, a Palestinian woman rose from the audience and asserted that what was happening in Gaza was much worse than what happened to Jews during the Holocaust. Her intervention prompted a Holocaust survivor in the audience to stand up and challenge her comparison. A tense interchange followed, but led, ultimately, to an agreement between the two women to begin a Jewish/Muslim discussion group to address such competitive memories (although it is not clear whether such a group ever emerged).<sup>19</sup>

As this account of events around the 2009 public forum suggests, the memory work of the Neighborhood Mothers project involves – like all memory work – both embodied practices and multiple forms of mediation. At its most powerful, the project reveals how the combination of contact and mediation fosters the transmission of new multidirectional memories. This interaction becomes visible especially in a film made by ASF about the Mothers. While *From Our Perspective* the film about the Auschwitz trip, focuses on one particular experience (which other iterations of the project have not repeated), *Es ist auch meine Geschichte* (It's Also My History, 2011) provides an overview of the Neighborhood Mothers' project. The film follows three of the Mothers – Memduha Yağlı, Hanadi Mourad and Emine Elçi – as they visit memorial sites and a synagogue, take part in public and small group discussions, and meet Jewish Holocaust survivors as well the daughter of a Sinti survivor. In addition to the overarching media framework of film itself, various other forms of mediation are at play. For instance, the Mothers encounter memorial sites – such as the Sinti memorial in Marzahn and the well-known *Stolperstein* (Stumbling Block) project of artist Gunter Demnig – and several scenes of reading are highlighted: Elçi speaks (like Havva Jürgensen) of having read Anne Frank as a girl; Petra Rosenberg reports learning the full story

<sup>18</sup> I rely here on the field notes of Yasemin Yildiz. See also Partridge's account of this event (2010: 842–844).

<sup>19</sup> For an attempt to theorize the ethical and political valences of different types of multidirectional memory through the example of comparisons between the Holocaust and the Israeli Occupation, see Rothberg (2011).

of her father's persecution as a Sinti only from his 1998 book; and survivor Margot Friedlander reads to the Mothers from her memoirs.

Despite the foregrounding of mediation, the themes of touch and 'authentic' locations also play a significant role in this film. As Friedlander describes a Nazi raid, while the women stand together in the courtyard of her former home, the survivor and the two Mothers (who are of Turkish and Lebanese background) link arms in a moving gesture of care and solidarity. Touch, however, can also be a site of difficult transcultural translation; when Mourad and Elçi – both of whom wear headscarves and are observant Muslims – meet survivor Rolf Joseph outside of a synagogue, Elçi says she does not shake hands with men to whom she is not related, but Mourad ignores that proscription and takes Joseph's hand. Once inside the orthodox synagogue, however, Elçi also finds points of identification; observing the separation of men and women, she declares, "it's exactly like with us [*genau wie bei uns!*]" The unselfconscious solidarity that Mourad shows in her interactions with Friedlander and Joseph, meanwhile, may result not only from such transcultural identification, but also from her own transnational experiences of trauma; she describes growing up in the midst of war in Lebanon and living for eight years in a German refugee home, which she likens to having been in "prison." Throughout the Neighborhood Mothers project, diverse pasts, which may have only tenuous connections according to a historical logic, but make up the over-determined terrain of migratory settings in the present, are brought into contact.

## Conclusion: toward a new ethics of memory

The Neighborhood Mothers are not an exception, but one example of a multifaceted and underexplored memory culture that has emerged in a Germany which is simultaneously post-Holocaust and postmigrant. As the project exemplifies, the major concern of immigrant memory work is neither to respond to society's demands on them to 'integrate' nor to adhere to German cultural pieties. Rather, immigrants who address Nazism and the legacies of the Holocaust in cultural production or activism often do so in order to locate their own place in relation to a national past marked by genocidal violence towards groups considered 'other.' Working with non-immigrant partners, they develop new forms of cultural memory that are simultaneously vernacular and cosmopolitan. Even if dissensus and conflict remain ever-present possibilities, such collaboration tends to break the property-based, nation-state framework of collective memory and opens up multidirectional constellations of remembrance with a transnational scope instead.

So, what does it mean to immigrate into a history? Şenocak and Tulay's question has no single answer, but considering practices of remembrance from the perspective of migration has the potential to reframe theories of cultural memory at a moment when inherited models are being called into question. The Neighborhood Mothers project – which includes small-scale seminars and encounters, public forums, publications, and other forms of publicity, such as their film – displays how both immediacy and mediation facilitate contact between past and present between local and distant histories, between familiar and allegedly foreign cultures. Such contact can produce solidarity, but it also sometimes leads to tension or even conflict. Memory in migratory settings is simultaneously multidirectional and thickened. There are no guarantees that it will also be ethical, but the Neighborhood Mothers project demonstrates that we can only begin to think seriously about an ethics of memory once we acknowledge the interweaving of different scales and layers of the past in the conflicts of the present.

## References

- Adorno, Theodor W. *Eingriffe: Neun kritische Modelle*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Adorno, Theodor W. *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords*. Ed. and trans. Henry Pickford. New York: Columbia UP, 1998.
- Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste (ASF), *Neuköllner Stadtteilmütter und ihre Auseinandersetzung mit der Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin: Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste, e.V., 2010.
- Assmann, Aleida. "Canon and Archive." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Eds. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning. New York: De Gruyter, 2008. 97–107.
- Assmann, Aleida and Sebastian Conrad, eds. *Memory in a Global Age*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Assmann, Jan. "Collective memory and Cultural Identity." Trans. John Czaplicka, *New German Critique* 65 (1995): 125–133.
- Aus unserer Sicht*. Berlin: Kiezfilme, 2009.
- Aydemir, Murat and Alex Rotas, eds. *Migratory Settings*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008.
- Chin, Rita. *The Guest Worker Question in Postwar Germany*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Connerton, Paul. *How Modernity Forgets*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2009.
- Craps, Stef and Michael Rothberg, eds. *Transcultural Negotiations of Holocaust Memory*. Special Issue of *Criticism* 53.4 (2011).
- Crownshaw, Richard, ed. *Transcultural Memory*. Special Issue of *Parallax* 17.4 (2011).
- Diner, Dan. "Nation, Migration, and Memory: On Historical Concepts of Citizenship." *Constellations* 4.3 (1998): 293–306.
- Erll, Astrid. "Travelling Memory." *Transcultural Memory*. Ed. Rick Crownshaw. Special Issue *Parallax* 17.4 (2011): 4–18.



- Erll, Astrid and Ann Rigney, eds. *Mediation, Remediation, and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009.
- "Es ist auch meine Geschichte": *Stadtteilmütter auf den Spuren des Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin: ASF, 2011.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Trans. Lewis Cosner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Hirsch, Marianne. *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative, and Postmemory*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997.
- Hirsch, Marianne. "The Generation of Postmemory." *Poetics Today* 29.1 (2008): 103–128.
- Landsberg, Alison. *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*. New York: Columbia UP, 2004.
- Levy, Daniel and Natan Sznaider. *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*. Trans. Assenka Oksiloff. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 2006.
- Macdonald, Sharon. *Difficult Heritage: Negotiating the Nazi Past in Nuremberg and Beyond*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Margalit, Avishai. "'Es ist leichter, Erdbeeren zu verändern als Nationen': Gespräch mit Avishai Margalit." *Babylon: Beiträge zur jüdischen Gegenwart* 19 (December 1999): 106–118.
- Margalit, Avishai. *The Ethics of Memory*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2002.
- Nora, Pierre, ed. *Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past*. Ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. New York: Columbia UP, 1996–1998. 3 vols.
- Nora, Pierre, ed. *Rethinking France*. Trans. Mary Trouille. 4 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001–2010.
- Partridge, Damani. "Holocaust *Mahnmal* (Memorial): Monumental Memory amidst Contemporary Race." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 52.4 (2010): 820–850.
- Radstone, Susannah. "What Place is This? Transcultural Memory and the Locations of Memory Studies." *Transcultural Memory*. Ed. Rick Crownshaw. Special Issue *Parallax* 17.4 (2011): 109–123.
- Rigney, Ann. "Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation of Cultural Memory." *Journal of European Studies* 35.1 (2005): 11–28.
- Rigney, Ann. "The Dynamics of Remembrance: Texts between Monumentality and Morphing." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Eds. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning. New York: De Gruyter, 2008. 345–353.
- Rothberg, Michael. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2009.
- Rothberg, Michael. "From Gaza to Warsaw: Mapping Multidirectional Memory." *Transcultural Negotiations of Holocaust Memory*. Special Issue of *Criticism* 53.4 (2011): 523–548.
- Rothberg, Michael, Debarati Sanyal, and Max Silverman, eds. *Noeuds de mémoire: Multidirectional Memory in French and Francophone Culture*. Special issue of *Yale French Studies* 118/119 (2010).
- Rothberg, Michael and Yasemin Yildiz. "Memory Citizenship: Migrant Archives of Holocaust Remembrance in Contemporary Germany." *Transcultural Memory*. Ed. Rick Crownshaw. Special Issue *Parallax* 17.4 (2011): 32–48.
- Seidel-Arapaci, Annette. "National Memory's Schlüsselkinder: Migration, Pedagogy, and German Remembrance Culture." *German Culture, Politics, and Literature into the Twenty-First Century: Beyond Normalization*. Eds. Stuart Taberner and Paul Cooke. Rochester: Camden House, 2006. 105–119.
- Şenocak, Zafer. *Atlas des tropischen Deutschland*. Munich: Babel Verlag, 1993.

- Şenocak, Zafer. *Gefährliche Verwandtschaft*. Munich: Babel, 1998.
- Şenocak, Zafer. *Atlas of a Tropical Germany: Essays on Politics and Culture, 1990–1998*. Trans. and ed. Leslie A. Adelson. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000.
- Şenocak, Zafer. *Das Land hinter den Buchstaben*. Munich: Babel Verlag, 2006.
- Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005.
- Yildiz, Yasemin. "Turkish Girls, Allah's Daughters, and the Contemporary German Subject: Itinerary of a Figure." *German Life and Letters* 62.3 (2009): 465–481.
- Yildiz, Yasemin. "Governing European Subjects: Tolerance and Guilt in the Discourse of 'Muslim Women.'" *Cultural Critique* 77.1 (2011): 70–101.