

MARCUS HAWEL

REMEMBRANCE WORK IN REGIONS OF CRISIS AND CONFLICT

ON THE DECONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION OF COLLECTIVE IDENTITIES

The following thoughts developed out of the question as to which challenges face political educational and cultural activities in regions of crisis and conflict. Generally, in such regions, “identity master narratives” are dominant. On the one hand, these narratives fulfil the need for a homogeneous, collective identity; and on the other, orient hostile collectives ideologically and arrange public discourses according to one-sided power interests. I will make the point that we must scrutinise the dominant discourses to uncover underlying interests and deconstruct the overarching master narratives; the goal thereby being to establish unified narratives that allow for mutual understanding and ultimately the resolution of conflict.

“The contempt for life and the brutality against human beings reveal mankind’s capacity for inhumanity. It cannot be and must not remain a means of resolving any sort of conflict.”

Rosa Luxemburg

FUNCTIONS OF MASTER NARRATIVES

The term “master narrative” stems from the realm of literary criticism and “describes in history the large, coherent and generally nation-state oriented versions of history, from which schools of thought within the field of history not only derive but which also become publicly dominant”.¹ In this way, master narratives define debates. “Once a master narrative develops and gains social and cultural legitimacy, it becomes extremely difficult to make those involved consciously aware of its nature as an invention or construction.”² But it is through master narratives that history retrospectively acquires meaning, the instrumental and constructed character of which is defined by current political interests.

Master narratives are spread by the culture industry or propagandistically. It is current legitimacy requirements and not academic questions that are their main concern. By using a limited narrative, i. e. a popularly simplified pattern that can be told and transmitted more smoothly for commercial and ideological means, history becomes streamlined according to current political interests and serves the need for a collective identity.³ In this sense, the master narrative is an invention of tradition.⁴ It is dangerously close to ideology, it focusses on a single central concept, it subsumes under this concept the general context, thereby simplifying complex social constellations. The central concept structures the pattern of the narrative. It then becomes possible,

for example, to speak of a German *sonderweg* (special path) or of a “delayed” or “normalised” nation.

Historiographic methods – reducing the diversity of events, interest-guided referencing, focusing on a single, central concept, subsuming diversity under the central concept, instrumentalising history for current needs – all point to an understanding of history as a construct. This is true as much for an affirmative as well as for a critical science of history, and only becomes problematic when such a history is instrumentalised for the requirements of power and the creation of legitimacy and carries an ideological message.

THE ORDER OF DISCOURSES: DISCURSIVATION

A master narrative’s power rests on a cultural and academic political hegemony that ensures analytical and interpretational autonomy. Such hegemonies order public discourse by including professional and opportune voices which are granted privileged access to the mediated public, as well as by excluding dissenting critical opinions. Questions of power hereby play a great role at all levels.⁵ Discourses therefore must not be understood as free discussions, where controversies over certain issues publicly develop. Even in democratic societies, and despite what the concept of freedom of opinion would suggest, not everybody can participate in a discourse, or can make him or herself heard or receive the same amount of attention. First, recognition as a speaking subject must be granted by those guarding the door. At the moment recognition is granted, the speaking subject recognises the “house rules”, that is, the rules of what can be said within a defined discourse.

Discursivation in this sense does not mean the establishment of a debate. Rather, it is the implementation of exclusive rules within a debate to control the production of knowledge and perception. Uncovering the truth becomes a game of power, and truth itself a ball within this game of interests onto which the discourse is modelled with a certain goal in mind. Within these cartels of truth, knowledge production is not egalitarian. Discursivation therefore implies an ideological channeling and orientation of the production of knowledge in line with a dominant doctrine, which manifests itself through the master narrative, thus creating the framework for the so-called labelling of the state-funded promotion of cultural and educational work.

The order of discourse, that is, the underlying power structures, is a constituent element for the production and the power of a master narrative that is spread by the cultural industry. Hegemony produces its own infrastructure and networks, which influence public opinion – in the sense of ordered discourse – through published opinions in newspapers, television as well as in museums, at memorials, in theatres or in school textbooks. Places where such master narratives spread easily point to an advanced expropriation of a democratic public sphere – or to a situation where such a public sphere has not yet been democratised.

FRAGMENTATION AND PARCELLING AS GOVERNANCE PRACTICES

A public sphere can be understood as the organisational form of public experience,⁶ at the centre of which stand competing interests and in which oppositional minority experiences become excluded. The organisational principle of the public sphere systematically blocks the development of context and relations. This form of fragmentation of the social whole leads to reified spheres that – even when they are explicitly established as spaces for coming to terms with the past and memory politics – promote unconscious forms of history and forgetting. “All reification is a forgetting,” claimed Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*.⁷ Fragmentation and parcelling is a practice aimed at conserving power.

Uncovering actual interconnectedness (defragmentation) is a process of reconstruction. Consciously showing the existence of links is a fundamental precondition for any possibility of developing a commons-oriented solidarity between individuals – whether within a class, in relation to the whole of society or between hostile collectives. It is only when overarching interests or mutual dependency become visible that class-specific interests or interests of particular groups in society can begin to become generalised and organised, and conflicts overcome. Interconnectedness is the *sine qua no* for a unified, solidarity (emancipation)-oriented consciousness that can create – or take away – a political community's legitimacy (recognition).

COUNTERPUBLIC

The principle of counterpublic can be summarised in four points: 1) Exposure of the functioning of the public sphere and the master narratives, that is, tracing of the underlying interests in the form of an ideology-critical deconstruction; 2) building of links (pulling together and universalising of experiences) in the form of a defragmentation; 3) emphasis on substantive (life-sustaining) interests over interests of economic production or state rule in the form of a focus on

a humane form of existence and needs; and 4) an expanded reconstruction of dominant narratives to create new interconnections and, in particular, expanded collective identities that can profit from the development of mutual solidarity as an act of unifying emancipation interests (transformation of competition-based distribution conflicts and identity politics based on exclusion). It will not be possible to completely dissolve group-specific narratives. At least for as long as they are loaded with affect, this would provoke resistance. Therefore the aim must only be to achieve a dialectical dissolution, i. e. a dissolution that is at the same time a form of preservation.

The principle of counterpublic is in accordance with the central assumptions of communitarianism. Here, man is construed as a social being, and society and social life lie at the centre: 1) The individual depends on society. Personal individual development is a responsibility of society and should only be allowed to expand to the point where it is socially acceptable. Such development should also not be imposed at the cost of the liberty of others. 2) A human being can only sense and ensure the working of the fundamental principles of justice for as long as he or she is embedded and can participate in a society's public sphere through language, culture, religion etc. 3) In every society, the ethical fundamentals are influenced by factors that are both universal and specific to that society. In any collective group, specific concepts of value and morality are shared and held within a self-referential framework (autopoiesis). 4) Such moral concepts are the only basis on which sensible forms of living together in society can develop.

Counterpublic (counter-construction) is then the project for a communitarian civil society against a big-brother state or civil war parties.

HUMAN BEINGS AS “FREE RADICALS”

Identity is a difficult enterprise. It is a continuous processing of contradictions and cannot be brought to a standstill. As a social being, man is a kind of “free radical”: an instable molecule entering into new, unforeseen constellations by releasing energy and therefore constantly changing through external factors. As a counterweight, identity is then a construction with the goal of isolating the “free radicals”, and making them predictable and governable. Identification therefore implies an uncoupling and halting of processes by means of isolation to create stability within this dynamic process.

Seen from a critical point of view, collective identity in particular is a fiction (imagined community), which nonetheless holds true power⁸ precisely because there is a general need for such a construct out of a widespread fear of overly heterogeneous close social ties (for example, multi-cultural societies or diversity). Identity is directly correlated to the individual wish of many people for homogeneity and conformism, with their promise of security, and is simultaneously in the interests of power and dominance. Identity is therefore an ideology;⁹ it makes the non-identical identical, that is, it smoothes out the contradictions or decouples them. During this process, the dynamic becomes static, because it is the contradictions that drive processes forward and effect change. Such a halting of the process only creates order when a monopoly of force exists that may be internally recognised but is questioned from the outside. Internal peace comes at the price of the exclusion of the non-identical, which is now seen as an external threat and fulfils its function as an enemy by reinforcing internal cohesion.

DEFENCE AGAINST REALANGST (REAL ANXIETY)

The experience and non-treatment of open violence can lead to particularly reified identities. Psychoanalytically oriented social psychology therefore speaks of “character armour”. This armour consists of the mechanisms of defence against threatening impulses accumulated by a person over the years.¹⁰ Depending on how strong the impulse (the experienced violence) is (for example, rape or war), this can lead to psychosis and exceed the limit of what a person can reflect and deconstruct.

Even less intense experiences of violence can reduce a person’s mental openness. Not being psychotic does not mean we are healthy; rather, we are caught up in the psychopathology of everyday life. Examples of such violence include feelings of inferiority, confrontation with resentment, humiliation, abasement, lack of or withdrawal of recognition, and unequal distribution of access to power and wealth. Bilked elites and hungry masses can equally drive collective and individual identity politics and lead to fundamentalism.

As the ego possesses the necessary defence mechanisms required for survival, it is also responsible for the development of a reified identity. Necessarily, the ego must reject all-too-strong drives that could create a realangst of the external world or of one’s own moral pretensions (the superego). Anna Freud describes the rejection of affects on the part of the ego as: “In the case of a rejection of a drive [the ego’s] next task is always to confront these affects. Love, desire, jealousy, humiliation, pain and grief as companions of sexual desire, hatred, anger and rage as companions of aggression must, if the drive they belong to is rejected, endure all forms of coping by the ego, that is, all kinds of transformations.”¹¹ The usual techniques of defence are: repression, reversal into the opposite, reaction formation, undoing, regression, isolation, projection, introjection, turning against one’s own person and sublimation. Sublimation should be understood in a general manner as the cultural work of the ego. It is a targeted shifting of impulses, that is, the translation of aggressive energies resulting from suppression, disappointment, frustration, humiliation etc. into cultural forms, i. e. forms of expression within discursively permitted limits.

But cultural and educational work (sublimation) is never one hundred percent pure. Cultural achievements are not safeguarded against the reproduction of resentments and affects. Other defence mechanisms come into play and are also written into the framework of discourses as well as into the culture industry’s entire means of production. When an entire social collective is affected by realangst, identity master narratives develop in the public sphere that become instrumentalised politically, that is, they are used to justify actions in the name of the collective that could not be justified rationally. Israeli society or former Yugoslavia are examples of how narrative ideologies are meant to ensure social cohesion (generally in the form of nationalism), and ethnicization either threatens or creates further cohesion. Master narratives are, then, ideological justifications for shortcomings, conflicts and violence; they are the arenas in which communication between increasingly hostile groups becomes extremely difficult: the identity master narrative acts as a defence against realangst.¹²

Political or cultural educational work should therefore be guided by the goal of reducing affects and enabling communication, whereby the focus should lie on the constitu-

ent master narratives at the basis of the irreconcilable divide between the collectives in question. In many cases though – and mainly among younger generations – there exists a hybrid form of avant-garde subculture of a “third space” in which a more concrete – that is, a generalising – narrative for a collective mixed identity is already developing. This hybrid identity needs to be nurtured because of its promise for communication and sustained peace.

What is required is a democratic, pluralistic, non-ethnizing ideology of integration based on a non-identity, or non-homogeneous, concept of identity that can be mutually recognised by all sides. This is because democracy depends on mutual recognition. Deconstruction and defragmentation aim at pushing individuals within collectives to create new dynamic movement within their frozen collective identities. The goal is to reduce the realangst of the other, to end the spiral of violence and to undo experiences of violence.

FORGETTING AS PACIFICATION?

Undoing should not be equated with forgetting. Repeatedly, so-called nation building goes hand in hand with forgetting. But whether forgetting is a solution or even at all possible is highly questionable. The Frenchman Ernest Renan is often considered to have fathered a simple strategy of forgetting. Renan is remembered for his modern-sounding definition of the nation as a plebiscitary union of fate: “A nation is therefore a large-scale solidarity, constituted by the feeling of the sacrifices that one has made in the past and of those that one is prepared to make in the future. It presupposes a past; it is summarized, however, in the present by a tangible fact, namely, consent, the clearly expressed desire to continue a common life. A nation’s existence is, if you will pardon the metaphor, a daily plebiscite, just as an individual’s existence is a perpetual affirmation of life”.¹³ In his lecture “What is a Nation?” given at the Sorbonne in 1882, he states that the decision to forget past episodes of violence is an important prerequisite for any national identity. Every French man and woman must necessarily have forgotten the massacre of St. Bartholomew’s Day or at least be indifferent to the events, because otherwise older affective bonds – such as confessional bonds – would resurface and prove their potential to divide the nation. Directed at historic research, Renan writes: “Forgetting [...] is a crucial factor in the creation of a nation, which is why progress in historical studies often constitutes a danger for [the principle of] nationality.”¹⁴

It is surprising when historians, even today, promote forgetting and thereby put their discipline’s very fundamentals into question. The historian Christian Meier answers the question as to how far public memory of excessively violent events as a part of remembrance stands in the way of reconciliation: “When parts of society actively recall suffered injustices, this deals a blow to the vitality of the community. This can get to the point where only either alternative justice or peace is possible.”¹⁵ Memory, he argues, could create the urge for vengeance and precisely for this reason launch a spiral of violence. It sounds as if he were paraphrasing Renan, when Meier illustratively adds: “Bad things sometimes repeat themselves precisely because people choose to remember them. [...] Out of memory arises something resembling a necessity to repeat past issues. What suffering the peoples of the Balkans and Europe could have been spared, had the Serbs only forgotten the Battle of Kosovo and Turk rulership!”¹⁶

Without a doubt, forgetting can be beneficial. But it does not come without conditions, and cannot be a solution, neither for an individual nor for a collective unless these conditions are fulfilled. A pre-condition for forgetting is a working through of the past. However, remembering and working through cannot be demanded of the victim. This must remain a free, individual decision. On the other hand though, a person cannot freely opt to forget. Events can only be forgotten if they have been fully dealt with, their related affects have been freed, they have become part of collective memory, they have been suffered and overcome and in this broad sense been worked through. That is why the only alternative to memory is repression. From psychoanalysis we know that all that is repressed strives to resurface and does this through shifting symptoms. Repression places huge demands of energy on the psychological system, and generally has a powerful negative impact on a person's everyday life. Potentially this can make it necessary to treat for neurosis and trauma. But below this pathological level, there are everyday neuroses and everyday pathologies which are basically normal and in which repression, too, is normal. Repression is a defence mechanism of the ego, and in this sense fundamental to survival.

But once in the public sphere, any such concerns become political. In the public and political sphere, memory is a social duty required to produce or maintain the stability of society and to structurally overcome the pre-conditions conducive to the use of excessive violence. That is, one is compelled to draw practical consequences out of the past. For nation building, it would therefore not be a good idea to build on forgetting. Forgetting promotes an invention of tradition (Eric Hobsbawm) – and thereby an ideological legitimacy for new conflicts and the excessive use of violence. Remembering and working through the past aims at the neutralisation of affects and the disenchantment of revanchist master narratives (objectification and de-emotionalisation), and not at keeping them alive.

MEMORY, WORKING THROUGH, SUFFERING

In educational and cultural work, this is achieved mainly through remembering, coming to terms with and working through issues – and suffering them. “How much suffering there is to get through!” This sentence by Rainer Maria Rilke touches on a seldom-recognised but nonetheless central aspect in the treating of memory: mimetic and cathartic suffering is a central element in coming to terms with the past.¹⁷ Something can only be forgotten once it has been suffered through and dealt with, the victims are ready to forgive the perpetrators and there is no longer anything pushing to the surface.¹⁸ History is similar, and only persists in an endless circle for as long as the compressed desires driving the circle from within remain suppressed, or at least unexpressed and held alive. Memory is tied to this and not a capriciousness of a subject that could freely opt to stop remembering. On the contrary: memory drives itself on for as long as the repressed and not-dealt-with issue drives to resurface and to realise itself.¹⁹ It resurfaces in ever-new symptoms, at least if the order of public discourse does not allow for true memory. The ruling elite hold the interpretational and normative power. The subterranean suppressed instincts and desires (Adorno/Horkheimer) renew themselves in distorted forms, also because they serve political goals and must therefore adapt to changing and changeable circumstances and interests.

Emancipative educational and cultural activities should aim for a climate within society that allows for a working through of the past by the whole of society and facilitates a greater acceptance of the dynamics and the openness of collective identities. Required, therefore, is a reduction in fear, particularly in the public sphere, through politically understood cultural activities, whether in the form of journalistic work in the media, policies for artistically elaborated memorials, academic working through of the past by means of museum exhibitions or pedagogic activities in schools and universities. In all of these fields, Sigmund Freud's dictum for psychoanalysis should always be taken into account: remembrance, coming to terms with, and working through, that is, meta-reflection. Cultural and educational activities understood in this way can make the lines of conflict conscious, create reflection on the meta-level, show that behind conflict rest different interests, highlight universal values and expose purely individual interests, show the consequences and emphasize visions held by both sides and thereby limit conflict.

Deconstruction in this sense should always be understood as a destruction of narratives, the dismantling of all past relations into their individual parts and their tracing back to individual interests so as to open the way for new perspectives and viewpoints.

CONFLICT AS A MOTOR FOR CHANGE

It does not always make sense to avoid conflicts or even to want to “pacify” them. Often enough, conflicts are productive impulses for more encompassing solutions. Fighting out a conflict can set knowledge free. It is always when the conditions have become frozen due to power interests that needs, as a rule, become permanent and can only be resolved through conflict.

Particularly when a conflict hovers over a society like a thunder cloud, creating a close atmosphere, but without the thunder required to clear it ever breaking out, then it can be important for politically understood cultural work to speak out about virulent social conflicts and make the lines of conflict visible. Conflicts should not always be seen as negative. In heterogeneous and antagonistic societies, they are actually the rule. In such societies, conflict is then frequently the only possibility for change and progress. Conflicts aim for a solution and allow for conclusions about underlying imbalances. The more one tries to keep the lid on such conflicts, the more explosively and potentially violently they will eventually erupt and leave the purely political sphere.

Conflicts though are only productive for as long as they stay within the political sphere. Politics is a strong and slow boring of hard boards (Max Weber) – this requires patience and endurance. It thrives in an intact cultural practice of mutual recognition, the main ingredients of which are the democratic virtues of capability for consensus and compromise, as well as tolerance and anti-discrimination. In some situations, however, there is no time for endurance. These are situations of violent conflict where thinking in friend-enemy categories (Carl Schmitt) destroys the political. Identity politics comes before this; it already enunciates civil war in thinking: the continuation of politics by other means.²⁰

For two antagonistically opposed or hostile collectives, educational and cultural work needs to create a joint public sphere, a space for understanding. The lines of conflict can be made conscious in very different ways: on a stage,

through discussion, in art and photography exhibitions, public readings etc. A dialogue aimed at understanding requires two equal partners willing to talk to each other. Mutual tolerance and the willingness to open oneself to the other side so as to learn from each other are the indispensable signs of a dialogue and equally the pre-condition for the liveliness of any culture. Cultures depend on such exchange and the interaction with other cultures if they do not want to freeze. Moreover, openness and tolerance are elements of any modern culture that distinguishes itself from fundamentalist traditionalism.²¹

CREATING CONNECTIONS AND RECONSTRUCTION

If it is the goal in crisis and conflict-ridden regions to establish, for two hostile collectives that in principle depend on each other, a democratic, pluralistic, non-ethnicizing ideology of integration based on a concept of non-identical, non-homogeneous identities that can be recognised equally by all sides, then such an approach must seek to defuse the dominant master narratives that the two collectives either use against each other or that separate them.

For greater relativity of political positions built on affective bonds and to establish concretions (interrelatedness), the affects contained therein must be laid bare. Therefore, the focus must not be only on material interests but also on psychological factors. These factors, it must be recognised, influence the way issues are perceived and thereby unconsciously limit the scope of political positions. Reflecting on these psychological factors should enable a less biased approach and open up opportunities for new political positions.

A pre-condition for leading a potentially violent conflict back within productive boundaries is a critical self-reflection of the socio-psychological, social and historic complex of conditions that constitute a person as a speaking subject. If the requirement for self-reflection is adhered to (reflection takes into account a standpoint's temporal and spatial aspects), then concretions can take place. That which is isolated from the total context: the abstract on the contrary offers only a single path to truth. This could be a maxim for any cultural work: to reconstruct context.

Concretions develop when an actor's theoretical approach and actions can be traced back to interests. Testing the legitimacy of certain interests can lead to an understanding of how the other side thinks – for example between two previously hostile groups in a conflict. Conflicts in the thinking and the actions of people can then more easily be assigned to the situations in which they find themselves rather than to particular people themselves. The question "Whose fault was it?" is a natural question for people continuously hoping to remember and work through experiences of violence. But the idea is not to simply dump individual responsibility and personal guilt. Nonetheless, if actions – even ethically condemnable ones – are contextualised more within the framework of the overall social conditions, rather than simply by pointing at the "devilish" or "barbaric" nature of the human being, then understanding for the behaviour that created suffering begins to grow. Hostility can then be reduced to the level of political difference. Compromises and joint actions aiming to change social conditions then become possible. This method provides for a way back into the political sphere. At the centre, therefore, must stand the concept of recogni-

tion. Because rule and compromises rest on mutual recognition, which, so much is clear, is impossible to force upon others through violence. Otherwise rule provokes counter-violence, which is a sign of non-recognition and eventually erodes rule.

This way, the insight could take hold that the solution to political conflicts is not possible without practical political compromises and it is only possible without military or militant violence. That is, within a concrete situation with a set of options one must search out those groups ready to compromise and leave behind dogmatic and one-sided positions. Solutions are only possible when their approaches can be equally accepted by both conflicting parties. This requires at least recognition; it is the basis on which any consensus must be built.

Dr. Marcus Hawel is a research associate at the Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung.

The present paper is based on his German text "Politische Bildungsarbeit zu Konfliktzonen", available as Standpunkte 12/2011.

1 Cultural glossary of the University of Trier, search term "master narrative" (Meistererzählung): www.uni-trier.de/kulturglossar. Also see Konrad H. Jarausch, Martin Sabrow (ed): Die historische Meistererzählung. Deutungslinien der deutschen Nationalgeschichte nach 1945, Göttingen 2002. **2** Ibid. **3** Cf. Jörn Rüsen, et al. (ed): Die Vielfalt der Kulturen. Erinnerung, Geschichte, Identität, Frankfurt am Main 1998, p. 23. **4** Cf. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger: The Invention of Tradition, Cambridge 1983. **5** Michel Foucault: Die Ordnung des Diskurses, Frankfurt am Main 1991, p. 26. **6** See Oskar Negt, Alexander Kluge: Öffentlichkeit und Erfahrung. Zur Organisationsanalyse von bürgerlicher und proletarischer Öffentlichkeit, Frankfurt am Main 1972. **7** Theodor W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer: Dialektik der Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente, in: Th. W. Adorno: Gesammelte Schriften, Darmstadt 1998, Volume 3, p. 263. **8** Cf. Benedict Anderson: Die Erfindung der Nation. Zur Karriere eines folgenreichen Konzepts, Berlin 1998. **9** In Negative Dialectics Adorno writes: "Identity is the primal form of ideology. [...] Identity becomes the authority for a doctrine of adjustment, in which the object – which the subject is supposed to go by – repays the subject for what the subject has done to it." Theodor W. Adorno: Negative Dialektik, Frankfurt am Main 1975, p. 151. **10** Cf. W. Reich: Charakteranalyse, Technik und Grundlagen für studierende und praktizierende Analytiker, Wien 1933. **11** Anna Freud: Das Ich und die Abwehrmechanismen, Frankfurt am Main 1984, p. 40. **12** More concretely and in practice this methodology critical of ideology to deconstruct master narratives was applied in other instances taking the conflict in the Middle East as an example. See Marcus Hawel, Moritz Blanke (ed): Der Nahostkonflikt. Befindlichkeiten der deutschen Linken, Berlin 2010. **13** Ernest Renan: "Was ist eine Nation?", in: Ders.: Was ist eine Nation? Und andere politische Schriften, translated by Henning Ritter, Wien, Bozen 1995, p. 45. **14** Ibid. **15** Der Spiegel, 30/2010. **16** Ibid. **17** See Victor E. Frankl: ... trotzdem Ja zum Leben sagen. Ein Psychologe erlebt das Konzentrationslager, München 1982, p. 127. **18** Pardonning becomes much more complicated when the shame that would have to be suffered is, in the face of the monstrosity of the crimes committed, so great that the unavoidable recognition of guilt is repelled and turned into its opposite, that is, becomes a source for new animosity. This fact led the Israeli psychoanalyst Zwi Rex to make his famous statement that "the Germans will never forgive the Jews for Auschwitz". This is a secondary anti-Semitism, not in spite of Auschwitz but precisely because of Auschwitz. **19** Cf. Marcus Hawel: "Fluchtpuren der Geschichte. Verhängnis, Fluch und Erlösung. Anmerkungen zu Walter Benjamins Geschichtsphilosophie", in: sopus 11/2010, www.sopus.org/aufsaeetze/4cce2ff24c770/1.phtml. **20** Cf. Marcus Hawel: "Identitätspolitik und die Kultur der Moderne. Kritische Anmerkungen zu Samuel Huntingtons 'Kampf der Kulturen'", in: vorgänge, Zeitschrift für Bürgerrechte und Gesellschaftspolitik, No. 174, June 2006, pp. 115–129. **21** Cf. Marcus Hawel: "Durch das Nadelöhr der Kultur – Überlegungen zu einer politisch verstandenen Kulturarbeit", website of the Goethe Institute: <http://www.goethe.de>.

IMPRINT

POLICY PAPER is published by the Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung
 Responsible: Henning Heine
 Franz-Mehring-Platz 1 · 10243 Berlin, Germany · www.rosalux.de
 ISSN 1867-3163 (Print), ISSN 1867-3171 (Internet)
 Editorial deadline: January 2014
 Translation: Linguatransfair, Berlin
 Setting/Production: MediaService GmbH Druck und Kommunikation
 Printed on Circleoffset Premium White, 100% recycled paper

POLICY PAPER

08/2013

YOUNAS A. CHOWDHRY

Pakistan's new Democratic Space

A Left Perspective on the Post Election Scenario

07/2013

MILDRED NGESA

Kenya: Voting for our own

The Dynamics of Tribal Politics in
the Eastern African State

06/2013

MANUEL PALZ

A Bumpy Road for Myanmar

Challenges and Opportunities for a Social and
Equitable Future in this Southeast Asian Country

05/2013

CORNELIA HILDEBRANDT /

HORST KAHRS / HARALD PÄTZOLT

After eight years of Merkel: No trouble?

The Political Climate in Germany in the Summer
before the Election

04/2013

PETER DAHLGREN

Do Social Media Enhance Democratic Participation?

The Importance – and Difficulty – of being “Realistic”

03/2013

ERHARD CROME

Germany in Europe

A New Role after the Financial Crisis?

02/2013

ULRICH BRAND / ULLA LÖTZER /

MICHAEL MÜLLER / MICHAEL POPP

Big Business Emissions Trading

Against the Financialization of Nature

JUTTA KILL

Active Climate Protection means Abolishing

EU Emissions Trading

01/2013

PETER SCHÄFER

Our Help as a Threat

A Contribution Concerning the Effect of “Development Aid”
and “Democracy Promotion” in the Arab World

STANDPUNKTE INTERNATIONAL 2013

14/2013

JULIO C. GAMBINA

Viele Ungewissheiten

13/2013

TORGE LÖDING

Traum von einer linken Präsidentin in Honduras

12/2013

YOUNAS A. CHOWDHRY

Neuer demokratischer Spielraum in Pakistan

11/2013

MICHAEL GLASS

«Lieber rot als schwul?»

10/2013

ANTONIO MARTINS

Brasilianischer Frühling oder Putsch von rechts?

09/2013

MANUEL PALZ

Steiniger Weg in Myanmar

08/2013

TORGE LÖDING

Wachsende Unzufriedenheit in Costa Rica

07/2013

PHILIPP GERBER

**Europäische Unternehmen erzwingen das grüne Geschäft
mit dem Wind in kolonialem Stil**

06/2013

CLAUS-DIETER KÖNIG

Mali: Vom «Hoffnungsträger» zum «Krisenstaat»

05/2013

JULIAN MARIOULAS

Verantwortung in der Krise

04/2013

BOAVENTURA DE SOUSA SANTOS

Chávez: Vermächtnis und Herausforderungen

03/2013

ALICE B. M. VADROT

Bedrohtes Wissen, bedrohtes Leben

02/2013

AFRIQUE-EUROPE-INTERACT

Krieg in Mali

01/2013

JORGE LEÓN TRUJILLO

Wahlen in Ecuador: Perspektiven des Correa-Systems