# CHRONICLE

## A Digital Approach to East Central Europe's Great War? Possibilities offered by the CENDARI Project*

Fragmentation has long been one of the principal themes of East Central European history during the Great War. From the vantage point of the multinational Habsburg Empire and its cosmopolitan elites – along with their many admirers – this story has been told in the tragic register, often conjuring a lost Vienna-centred world of elegance, high culture, and ethnic diversity. Viewed from within the post-1918 national historiographies that have most influenced our understanding of the conflict in this region, the fragmentation and collapse of empire figured as a moment of social and national rebirth. However mixed the record of the "Wilsonian Moment's" progeny in the interwar period and subsequently (viz. Yugoslavia and its demise), the opportunity for national self-determination has been seen in a largely positive light.[1] Yet fragmentation also applied to the less politically divisive (or at any rate, less publicized) domain of documentary evidence on the Great War. It has been difficult to study the 'seminal catastrophe' of the twentieth century in transnational or comparative perspective in order to appreciate how shared dynamics shaped East Central Europe during the conflict and after, or, indeed, how the region fits into a broader European and global context. Powerful institutional pressures on scholars to produce a steady flow of national histories compounded the practical difficulties of access to archives and language proficiency. (Such pressures not confined to the eastern half of the continent, of course.)

This article explores the possibility of a digital methodological intervention to surmount some of these challenges. In particular, it assesses the potential of the CENDARI project (Collaborate European Digital Archival Infrastructure: http://www.cendari.eu/) to achieve this. It argues that digital practices and methods, viewed in the proper light, can indeed facilitate new approaches to East Central European history in the era of the First World War, particularly by allowing new questions to be asked. By channelling

[1] Cf. Erez Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism* (Oxford, 2007).

scholarly efforts towards making cross-border connections and comparisons, CENDARI has made some important strides in this regard.

From its inception in 2011, the CENDARI project took a novel approach to the construction of a large-scale digital research infrastructure. Instead of aspiring to become the online space for all historians doing all things digital, it focused on two pilot areas – medieval culture and the First World War – and on the current debates and problems within those fields.[2] Furthermore, instead of telling these well-established groups of humanities scholars what digital practices should mean to them and how they should exploit them, it asked them what they expected, or hoped to expect, from an online research platform. The advantages of a 'user-centred' approach have attracted increasing attention among designers of digital humanities tools.[3] From two distinct, but  complementary starting points, project staff ascertained what historians wanted. First, software developers primarily based at INRIA (*Institut national pour recherche en informatique et en automatique*) in Paris devised 'participatory design sessions' in which historians broke their research practices down into discrete tasks, which could then be translated into technical functionalities. All the while, participants reflected on how their current practices might differ from how they *would like* to conduct research. Second, project historians working out of the University of Birmingham surveyed colleagues in the field with similar questions and organized workshops, seminars, and summer schools that brought historians (and other collaborators) together for targeted discussions on the potential of digital methods for advancing scholarship in the two pilot areas. On the basis of these activities, project partners were able to identify core areas of interest – for instance: increased access across national borders to digital sources as well as information about the sources (metadata), tools for collecting and comparing digital objects in diverse formats and languages, and tools for visualizing research data across time and space – as well as ways in which an online infrastructure could support them. For each pilot area, project historians conceived concrete research scenarios that illustrated to the technical partners how all the requirements that were gathered might be integrated in practice.

What is the result? For historians of the First World War, the CENDARI platform launched in January 2016 features three primary components of

---

[2] On the pitfalls of large, unfocused digital research infrastructures, see Joris van Zundert, 'If you build it, will we come? Large scale digital infrastructures as a dead end for digital humanities', *Historical Social Research – Historische Sozialforschung*, xxxvii, 3 (2012), 165–86.

[3] Fred Gibbs and Trevor Owens, 'Building Better Digital Humanities Tools: Toward Broader Audiences and User–User Centered Design', *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, vi, 2 (2012), <http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/6/2/000136/000136.html>[Accessed: May 28, 2016].

interest. Firstly, it is a repository of relevant library and archival metadata (basic information summarizing and categorizing data according to various criteria and standards) from across Europe and beyond. It is not an aggregator of digitized objects. While historians are uniformly excited about the advent of online digitized sources, the proportion of primary sources currently digitized, particularly for the modern era, is extremely limited – a state of affairs that will not change substantially in the foreseeable future. Metadata gives a much more comprehensive overview of what is 'out there,' a critical advantage for the kind of early-stage research that CENDARI aims to facilitate. Acquiring metadata from the archives and libraries that produced it was another matter. The complex, nationally specific legal arrangements that govern such information threw up a number of practical and legal problems. Some state-level archive agencies proved willing to share large datasets with the project, such as the German Bundesarchiv and the Czech Archives Administration. In other cases, CENDARI researchers manually created metadata records for collections and record groups of particular interest. For the First World War, they prioritized repositories in Eastern and Southeastern Europe, many of which are 'hidden' due to a lack of digital presence. Although the digital repository's coverage remains patchy, it contains metadata on sources in over 1,000 cultural heritage institutions with a preponderance in East Central Europe. This is a notable achievement in itself and will hopefully benefit further from user traffic, since users can add metadata records themselves.

Secondly, the platform encourages users to think transnationally and comparatively about the connections between the sources exposed in the repository. So-called 'Archival Research Guides' provide thematic connective tissue, steering users of the platform toward questions that look beyond national borders. Many of these, on topics such as 'injury and disease' or 'workers and workers' movements', use broad pan-European themes to integrate East Central Europe into a continental framework. Others, for instance on the reconstruction of the post-Habsburg space or the 'Jewish question' in Eastern Europe, are region-specific. These research guides, by exposing links between scattered or fragmentary sources, point in the direction of new research and approaches rather than presenting new research in and of themselves. They are flexible enough to be enriched by further users and broad enough to aggregate the interests of scholars pursuing narrower queries. For these reasons, Archival Research Guides could become powerful sites of collaboration for historians, but also for librarians and archivists seeking to reassemble dispersed collections or place the sources they curate into broader context.

Thirdly, the CENDARI infrastructure provides 'Working Spaces' for individual users, or groups of users, to take notes and to collect, store, analyse, and display research data. This data may appear in various formats which are all supported – typed notes, uploaded Pdf files, MS Word documents, and jpeg/jpg image files. One of the most powerful tools available in these spaces

is 'Named Entity Recognition' (NER). On a basic level, this allows a researcher to tag a 'named entity' (person, place, organization, event) and then highlight that entity wherever it appears in his/her notes and research data – and in the archival repository. A mapping tool allows places to be visualized; a timeline tool orders events. Wherever possible, such entities can be linked to existing data on the web (Wikipedia or DBpedia). The automatic NER tool currently being implemented will instantly display all (potentially) relevant entities for which web-based data already exists (e.g., General Brusilov, Isonzo Front); the challenge is distinguishing relevance from the 'noise' of innumerable other entities. The rich web of knowledge emerging from the links between named entities, and between them and the repository, has the potential to illuminate previously unseen historical connections. It can also point a CENDARI user toward collaboration with a different user who may be studying similar entities; unless disabled, entities are by default visible across projects, while other research data (notes, images, etc.) are by default private.

In light of recent historiography on the Great War in East Central Europe, these component parts hold significant promise. This subfield is arguably experiencing a renaissance. Regional scholars, rejecting the triumphalist and teleological narratives of national emancipation, have produced detailed empirical studies underscoring the contingencies of the war and its unforesee-able outcome.[4] Some historians have examined Austro-Hungarian wartime society using innovative approaches from social history and gender history, thus moving beyond ideologically charged histories of particular political camps.[5] The survival chances of the Habsburg Monarchy before 1914 now look rather rosier, which has prompted ambitious projects aimed at under-standing the bigger dynamics that ultimately did lead to a breakdown of state and society.[6] More broadly, the region appears increasingly central to a general understanding of the war. This is particularly the case when looking at the conflicts drawn-out settlement and aftermath. The most original research has concentrated on how violence shaped East Central European societies in the aftermath of war, whether in the form of continued conventional warfare between belligerent states or in the form of paramilitary groups emerging in

[4] For example: Ivan Šedivý, Češi, české země, a Velká válka 1914–*1918* (Praha, 2001).

[5] Maureen Healy, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire: Total War and Every-day Life in World War I* (Cambridge MA, 2004); Rudolf Kučera, *Život na příděl. Válečná každodennost a politiky dělnické třídy v českých zemích 1914–1918* (Prague, 2013); English translation available as: *Rationed Life: Science, Everyday Life, and Working-Class Politics in the Bohemian Lands, 1914–1918* (New York and Oxford, 2016).

[6] Jonathan E. Gumz, *The Resurrection and Collapse of Empire in Habsburg Serbia, 1914–1918* (Cambridge MA, 2009); John Deak, 'The Great War and the Forgotten Realm: The Habsburg Monarchy and the First World War', *Journal of Modern History*, lxxxvi, 2 (2014), 336–80.

'cultures of defeat'.[7] All of this recovers the region's crucial place in what is increasingly recognized as a global conflict.[8]

The new scholarship also underscores just how much work remains to be done. The launching of CENDARI, then, comes at an opportune time. The component parts of the infrastructure were conceived expressly to foster new histories on the basis of materials fragmented and sequestered into national institutional 'siloes'. With metadata from a multinational swathe of cultural heritage institutions all in one place, we can see connections between primary sources that were previously invisible. With Archival Research Guides as a model, the infrastructure facilitates thinking about these connections in terms of transnational themes. In online Working Spaces, researchers can gather, describe, scrutinize, and visualize their data in a systematic and self-reflective way. While users will find some digital objects/digitized sources through the infrastructure (particularly via open access to online repositories like Europeana), and can upload such objects themselves, the exposure of metadata affords a more complete view on available primary sources and highlights the limits of digitization. This is particularly helpful for a region like East Central Europe, where digitization initiatives are often in their infancy, if they have begun at all.

On a fundamental level, the approach of the CENDARI platform is intended to give some coherence and structure to the ways in which a majority of historians currently use digital methods. While more sophisticated tools for text mining and complex data analytics have received much attention in the digital humanities, it is unlikely that most historians can benefit from such innovations in the near future. For one thing, we rarely begin with a corpus of well-known, digitized texts (as some literary scholars do), which can then be subjected to various digital analytics. The discovery of a crucial document (usually undigitized when found) is likelier to come rather later in our research trajectories. We generally build our own datasets – if we build them at all – rather than summon them at the outset in order to analyse or visualize them in complex and original ways. This does not mean that sophisticated digital methodologies are irrelevant for historians. But they are unlikely to transform research practices and results for more than a narrow subset of our colleagues.

---

[7] Robert Gerwarth and John Horne (eds.), *War in Peace: Paramilitary Violence in Europe after the Great War* (Oxford, 2012); Jochen Böhler, 'Enduring Violence: The Postwar Struggles in East-Central Europe, 1917–21', *Journal of Contemporary History*, l, 1 (2015), 58–77.

[8] Hew Strachan, *The First World War: A New Illustrated History* (London, 2003); Oliver Janz, *14 – Der große Krieg* (Frankfurt, 2013); Robert Gerwarth and Ezra Manela, 'The Great War as a Global War: Imperial Conflict and the Reconfiguration of World Order, 1911–1923', *Diplomatic History*, xxxviii, 4 (2014), 786–800.

Instead, an enhanced peripheral vision seems the greatest advantage of digital technologies for historians. As the historian Lara Putnam suggests, most of our work consists of 'finding and finding out' and this has been radically accelerated through the 'side-glancing' and 'term-searching' that web-based research allows.[9] This accelerated pace, she argues, has major implications for the kind of projects we pursue. With the ability to instantly query certain search terms (names, organizations, events, places, etc.) from tens of millions of pages of online machine-readable text using Google Books or other platforms, we can discern connections that might have otherwise taken lifetimes of research to discover. At the same time, our queries highlight unexpected associations that lead us in new directions at dizzying speed. Such connections and associations are transnational as never before. Questions that would have previously seemed unanswerable and projects that would have been unfeasible now enter the realm of possibility.

In my own research on the end of the First World War in the Austro-Hungarian countryside, I have benefited immensely from side-glancing and term-searching. I became interested in so-called 'Green Cadres' – armed bands of 'k.u.k.' army deserters and radicalized peasants – that terrorized the authorities in a number of smaller regions – including parts of con-temporary Czech Republic, Croatia, Hungary, Poland, Serbia, and Slovenia – from 1917 to 1918 and then led short-lived attempts at social revolution during the collapse of the monarchy. Some of the older secondary literature on the collapse of Austria-Hungary mentioned the Green Cadres in passing, portraying them as a rural curiosity in a society increasingly shaped by rival visions of national self-determination and Bolshevik revolution.[10] A number of online searches produced a rather different picture. Not only was I able to find numerous press articles about them in online newspaper databases hosted by the Austrian and Czech national libraries, but online library catalogues revealed at least eight novels written about them in the 1920s in four different languages. Archival search engines also pointed in the direction of some tantalizing and dispersed record groups in different countries. What initially looked like a rather eccentric case of military indiscipline now appeared to be a phenomenon rooted during in early twentieth-century East Central European rural society and culture.[11]

---

[9] See her forthcoming article 'The Transnational and the Text-Searchable: Digitized Sources and the Shadows They Cast', *The American Historical Review*, cxxi, 2 (2016), 377–402. I am very grateful to Professor Putnam for sharing this with me.

[10] See especially Richard Plaschka, Horst Haselsteiner, and Arnold Suppan, *Innere Front. Militärassistenz, Widerstand und Umsturz in der Donaumonarchie 1918*, ii: *Umsturz* (München, 1974), 81–9.

[11] For my initial findings on this project, see Jakub Beneš, '"Zelené kádry" jako radikální alternativa pro venkov na západním Slovensku a ve středovýchodní Evropě

My term-searching and side-glancing, it should be noted, required rather more initial knowledge than a basic Google search. I knew about online national archival search engines and library databases as well as about the Archives Portal Europe project (http://www.archivesportaleurope. net/). The CENDARI platform, by integrating large quantities of archival metadata and library records from various national search engines (albeit focused on the First World War), offers a rather more informed and structured starting point than the search box on your internet browser. For the most part, the user must still know the languages in which he/she would like to conduct research. Indeed, automated ways to term-search and use the NER processes referred to above without language knowledge are still only in the development phase. Blind spots persist in the patchiness of the data that has so far been integrated, but also in that, despite the project's efforts to expose 'hidden' archives and collections, many such repositories remain hidden because their metadata does not yet exist in any digital format. Yet these shortcomings are arguably less worrisome than the telescoping effect of digitized objects, which focuses scholarly attention increasingly on texts that can be searched and read online. The tendency for digitization projects to privilege canonical texts, prominent newspapers, and recognizably important official documents may render the lives of already underrepresented groups even less visible.[12] Putnam sounds a warning note in describing the recent tendency of transnational historians to exploit decontextualized online research data without the place-based knowledge that produced the locally sensitive, multi-causal studies in the past.[13] To an extent, CENDARI counters this trend by providing contextual information on the repositories whose data it exposes (addresses, opening hours, contacts, etc.). This encourages users to visit these national, regional, and local archives or, at the very least, to be aware of them. Historians using the platform are better equipped to think about how the local interacts with the national and the transnational – a sensitivity to scale that is increasingly important for considering the bigger questions of East Central European history in the era of the First World War. New and innovative questions may emerge from the sort of peripheral vision that CENDARI enhances. Not least, this platform contributes to an important

---

1917–1920', *Forum Historiae*, ix, 2 (2015), 20–35, and 'Upori na podeželju ob propadu Avstro-Ogrske: zeleni kader v čeških deželah leta 1918', in Igor Grdina (ed.), *Velika Vojna in Mali Ljudje* (Ljubljana, 2015).

[12] Putnam, 'The Transnational and the Text-Searchable'; and, from a literary studies and digital humanities perspective, Claire Warwick, 'The lowest canonical denominator: Electronic literary texts, and the role of the information professional', *Information Research*, v, 2 (2000), <http://informationr.net/ir/5-2/paper71.html> [Accessed: May 28, 2016].

[13] Putnam, 'The Transnational and the Text-Searchable'.

conversation on how a transnational history of a nationalizing, fragmenting conflict can and should be written.

*Jakub S. Beneš*

### Suppressed Historiography – Erased Memory? The Perception of the Shoah in East Central Europe during Socialist Rule, Halle, 30 November – 1 December 2015

Late 2015 the Aleksander Brückner Center for Polish Studies at the Martin Luther University in Halle hosted the workshop during which an international group of senior and junior scholars from Europe and United States gathered to discuss the historiography and memory about the Shoah in East Central Europe under socialism. The workshop was organised in cooperation with the Jewish Museum in Prague. The idea behind the workshop, also strongly reflected in its title, was to take a closer look at the dynamic and multidimensional processes of remembering the Shoah during socialist rule. Accordingly, all invited speakers have convincingly exposed that the local involvement in narrating and remembering the Shoah during socialism was a dynamic and multi-layered process, involving diverse individuals and social groups, who often successfully transgressed restrictions defined by socialist politics of history and were able to create parallel 'counter history' or *Gegengeschichte*.[1]

In his opening remarks, Stephan Stach drew attention to the recent shift in Holocaust research that exposed a more complex and multifaceted view on the presence (rather than absence) of the Shoah in socialist discourses. The idea that the memory of the Shoah was completely tabooed and silenced in the Soviet Union and its Eastern European communist counterparts is a long-held thesis in academia, that only recently has been reassessed. Stach highlighted, among others, the well-researched study by Laura Jockush dealing with the pioneers of Holocaust research during the first decades of the Cold War in her *Collect and Record! Jewish Holocaust Documentation in Early Postwar Europe*. One should also name here the valuable contribution by Thomas C. Fox, 'The Holocaust under Communism' published in Dan Stone's volume on *The Historiography of the Holocaust* (2004).[2]

---

[1] This term is central to the work of Stephan Stach, the initiator of the workshop and one of the editors of a volume on a related topic. See Peter Hallama and Stephan Stach, *Gegengeschichte. Zweiter Weltkrieg und Holocaust im ostmitteleuropäischen Dissens* (Leipzig, 2015). It was this project that inspired Stach to explore the rich variety of counter narratives on the Shoah during the post-war period in East Central Europe, and not only in dissident circles.

[2] Thomas C. Fox, 'The Holocaust under Communism', in Dan Stone (ed.), *The Historiography of the Holocaust* (New York, 2004), 420–39, <https://www.

Stach identified four factors that influenced the formation of Shoah memory in state socialist countries: i) official anti-fascist ideology, ii) national narratives of the war, iii) Cold War antagonisms, and iv) the agency of individuals and groups. He emphasised that all these factors changed over time, which warrants a closer look at the formation of Shoah memory. By stressing the relevance of a transnational and comparative approach to better understand perceptions of the Shoah under socialism, Stach pointed out the two main objectives of the workshop: i) to find out to what extent one could speak about common socialist memory of the Shoah in East Central Europe, and ii) what similarities and differences can be found between societies that had directly witnessed crimes and those who had not.

Eighteen paper presentations in total were spread over two days and thematically organised in six sessions exploring three main aspects: i) the role of individuals (historians and non-historians) in challenging the socialist master narrative; ii) the representations of the Shoah in literature and visual arts; and last but not least, iii) the variety of commemoration practices and its impact on Jewish and non-Jewish population.

The gathering got off with a session devoted to 'Socialist Shoah Histo-riography' and explored the role of historians in dealing with limitations of socialist politics of history. All papers in this panel focused on three Jewish historians and survivors. Speakers explored individual strategies involved in maintaining professional autonomy by historians who worked within and for the regime. Gabriel N. Finder (University of Virginia, Charlottesville) exposed a rather surprising ideological and methodological metamorphosis in the work of Bernard Mark, the head of the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw between 1949–66. Finder argued that Mark's transformation from regime historian to a Jewish historian was reinforced by his growing disappointment with the communist regime, and his embracing of Israel as a true 'spiritual home' on the one hand, and by his discovery of the so called scrolls of Auschwitz – diaries kept by one of the members of Sonderkommando on the other. A more biographical take on the work of Shoah historians characterised the paper delivered by Estera Flieger (University of Łódź). She talked about Artur Eisenbach who followed Mark as a director at the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw (1966–8) and authored the first Polish monograph on the extermination of Jews (*Hitlerowska polityka eksterminacji Żydów w latach 1939–45*), published in 1953.[3] Flieger showed how Eisenbach's own experiences under the occupation shaped his writing about the Shoah and the Jewish past in Poland. The paper presented by Peter Hallama (independent

---

uvt.ro/files/6f3e12eadfe63b9c3f9e39857579255ed4b06355/> [Accessed: May 28, 2016].

[3] Artur Eisenbach, *Hitlerowska polityka eksterminacji Żydów w latach 1939–45 jako jeden z przejawów imperializmu niemieckiego* (Warszawa, 1953).

scholar, Strasbourg) looked at survivor and Shoah researcher Miroslav Karný whose work is characterised by a more hybrid approach towards communist politics of history in relation to the Shoah. Hallama's paper challenged two often repeated myths: by analysing Karný's research activity throughout the whole communist period he demonstrated that i) a taboo on the Shoah in Czechoslovakia was never fully implemented, and that ii) non-conformity to the dominant communist ideology did not always mean dissidence.

The ideological restrictions posed on historiography during the socialist period were furthermore challenged by (Jewish) non-historians. Alexander Walther (Europäisches Kolleg, Jena) explored different narrative strategies to disclose forgotten or officially silenced aspects within the historical writing of the Jewish past in the GDR. Walther's paper provided insight into the role popular literature and press publications played in triggering public memory about the Shoah. Another speaker in the panel entitled 'Discourses around the Shoah', Richard S. Esbenshade (University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign), reflected on the 'explosion' of literary accounts (often authored by survivors) in Hungary. He argued that Holocaust discussion, even if it was forced into an anti-fascist framework, should not be dismissed as invalid because it still did reflect a variety of standpoints. Anja Tippner (University of Hamburg) presented her work in the panel 'Shoah Representations in Film and Literature'. She showed how literary fiction contributed to the overall knowledge on the  Shoah in the Soviet Union. She looked at Anatolii Ryba-kov's novel *Тяжёлый Песок* [*Heavy Sand*], and his practice to weave hitherto undisclosed facts about Jewish persecution into his fiction. Michala Lônčíková (Comenius University, Bratislava) also focused on artistic texts and their role in channelling the memory of the Shoah. She analysed Slovak and Czech responses after the publication of two novels in 1960: Rudolf Jašík's *Námestie sv Alžbety* [St Elisabeth's Square] and Ladislav Grosman's *Obchod na korze* [The Shop on Main Street] and their cinematic adaptations from 1965. By zooming on everyday life and cohabitation between Jewish minority and their Slovak neighbour, these texts triggered – often contested – reflections about the responsibility, failures and antisemitism of Slovak wartime society. The paper by Aránzazu Calderón Puerta's (Warsaw University) concentrated on films from the 1950s and 1960s that elaborated on the image of Polish-Jewish cohabitation and the issue of the (not necessarily innocent) eyewitness. The paper delivered by Hannah Maischein (City Museum, Munich) also dealt with non-Jewish bystanders, and their visual representations in the complex Polish-Jewish memory landscape. By looking at various examples in which Polish eye-witnessing was visualised and conceptualised, Maischen showed the tensions between private memories and politics of history; as well as between Jewish memories and the desired Polish self-image of the innocent bystander (which was strongly supported by the communist regime in the 1960s). All these papers emphasised that not only historians challenged the socialist

states' politics of history across the Eastern bloc. However, Tomasz Żukowski (Polish Academy of Science, Warsaw) showed some literary or cinematic texts, which were used to reinforce state propaganda. Żukowski looked closely at the category of Polish Righteous and their representations in popular publications and films. He argued that this category was used to level discomforting narratives and became a key notion in political (anti-Jewish) propaganda.

The unique role of Yiddish publications in transmitting the 'counter history' of the Shoah, already referred to in Finder's presentation, received more attention during the panel on 'Shoah Remembrance in the Jewish & non-Jewish Sphere'. Miriam Schulz (Columbia University, New York) analysed the coverage of Shoah commemorations in *Sovetish Heymland*, a Yiddish language paper that appeared in the Soviet Union since 1961. Schulz showed that Shoah memorialization was far from clandestine and although initiated by the Jewish (and Yiddish speaking) community, it also attracted non-Jewish local participants. Joanna Nalewajko-Kulikov (Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw) delivered a paper on the art of censorship in publications on the Shoah available in communist Poland in Polish and Yiddish. She compared various versions of Emanuel Ringelblum's ghetto diary (the original and three published versions). Nalewajko-Kulikov demonstrated that the Yiddish version published in the 1960s was more complete even in comparison with the Polish version published in 1983. Consequently, she concluded that censors' interventions were not only shaped by the particular political situation, but also by the expected readership that could be reached by a certain publication. Yiddish publications were often less censored than their Polish counterparts. Those papers demonstrated the particular power of Yiddish publications in cultivating the memory of the Shoah under socialist rule.

Katarzyna Person (Jewish Historical Institute, Warsaw) examined the role of the Ringelblum Archive within the post-war commemoration landscape in Poland. She analysed how it became a unique symbol for various groups: Jewish historians and activists gathered around the Central Jewish Historical Commission and later on the Jewish Historical Institute for whom the archive became a symbol of heroic Jewish resistance. In contrast, non-Jewish, communist opinion makers framed the archive within the antifascist and anti-imperialist narrative. Person's paper put forward that the Polish memory landscape after 1945 cannot be reduced to a single narrative and that even such important landmarks of public memory as the discovery of Ringelblum Archive have been constantly renegotiated by various social groups and institutions. The early institutionalization of a site of memory was analysed by Gintarė Malinauskaitė (Humboldt University, Berlin) in the panel 'Socialist Shoah Memorials & Jewish Sites of Memory'. She looked at Soviet Lithuania and the 9th Fortress in Kaunas which opened in 1958 and pointed out the diversity of narratives constructed around this memory site. Imke Hansen (The Hugo Valentine Centre, Uppsala) studied another important landmark

of the Shoah memory: the concentration camp in Auschwitz and the hetero-geneous commemorative practices and variety of meanings attached to it by former Polish and Jewish inmates during the first decade after the Second World War. The paper delivered by Yechiel Weizman (University of Haifa) disclosed another layer of the rich Polish post-war memory landscape by analysing the ambivalent meaning of the ruins of Jewish cemeteries and syna-gogues under socialist rule. He showed how the presence of abandoned Jewish sites mediated a certain alternative Holocaust discussion on the local level.

The disparity between Jewish and non-Jewish memory of the Shoah, and the way it continued to challenge the official, state-guarded memory remained central in the panel on 'Eye-Witness & Their Role in Socialist Commemoration'. Kata Bohus (Lichtenberg-Kolleg, Göttingen) compared the reception and publication history in communist Hungary of two diaries written by young Jewish female authors under Nazi occupation: the world famous diary of Anne Frank and its Hungarian counterpart, the diary of Éva Heyman. Bohus argued that the diary of Anne Frank was ideologically accept-able and could be easily framed within the antifascist discourse promoted by the communist party. Heyman's diary, however, touched upon sensitive issues like antisemitism among Hungarian population and their collaboration with the Nazis and their lack of support for the communist movement. That was the reason why it was never published during the communist period. Jakub Mlynář (Charles University, Prague) analysed a sample of oral history interviews from the USC Shoah Foundation's Visual History Archive. His analysis featured Jewish survivors born in the Czech lands, and attempted to uncover their motivations for (not) sharing their story with the others. Mlynář also pointed out how these motives changed during the subsequent decades, and how this resulted in the growing importance of oral history and the role of witnesses in shaping commemorating practices.

The concluding remarks were prepared by Audrey Kichelewski (University of Strasbourg) and András Lénárt (National Széchényi Library, Budapest) and followed by a general discussion. Both Lénárt and Kichelewski pointed towards the title of the conference in which words 'suppressed' and 'erased' were highlighted and agreed with the premise of this workshop that the implied power of socialist rule in suppressing the memory of the Shoah has for a long time been overestimated. Kichelewski also stressed that it indeed seems more accurate to speak about marginalisation of the Shoah and in some cases about distortion of the historical truth. The presented papers showed that throughout the whole Cold War era, there have been multiple memories, rather than just the one master narrative of a socialist state. However, one cannot deny obvious attempts of socialist politics of history to marginalise or even silence the memory of the Shoah. The practice of silencing was most successfully imposed on official historiography yet, as this workshop has shown, other types of publications, artistic expressions and

commemorative practices channelled a variety of voices and memories. That did not mean, however, that every subject could be openly disclosed: talking about antisemitism, collaboration often remained taboo also because those taboos were, as demonstrated in several papers, supported by the non-Jewish public who were reluctant to face a negative self-image. Thus, the deformation of memory of the Shoah under socialist rule was not only facilitated by ideological restrictions, but often also stimulated by the wider population's inability to confront the negative self-image.

The final discussions raised the issue of similarities and differences between various socialist countries and their relation towards the history of the Shoah. Hopefully, those aspects will be studied further, since this intensive two-day workshop showed a potential for more comparative and transnational research. Such studies could help us understand the common features of the memory of the Shoah in the countries of the former Eastern bloc, and compare the development of early perceptions of the Shoah on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Such an approach could investigate the role of transnational historians (Jewish and non-Jewish émigrés) as well. All in all, the scholarly event organised in Halle demonstrated that a transnational study on the Shoah might inspire new international academic research transgressing the boundaries between East and West.

*Iwona Guść*