

Abstracts & Bios

Aftermaths: Repression, Participation, and Retribution in East Central Europe February 19–20, 2016, Columbia University

I. **WORLD WAR TWO: OCCUPATION AND AFTERMATH (February 19, 9:45 AM–12:15 PM)**

I.1 **Elidor Mehilli** (Hunter, History)

“The Uses of War, 1939–1949”

My contribution frames the years 1939–1949 as a period of uninterrupted confrontation in the Balkans. When we look past the 1944/1945 divide, certain continuities emerge in the way inhabitants in a country like Albania made sense of violence, expropriations, and the intervention of foreign ideas and planning models in their daily lives. I will specifically address Italian-Yugoslav-Albanian encounters in this period and discuss how those encounters (of armies, economic planners, bureaucrats) set the stage for a Communist alternative in the aftermath of war.

Elidor Mëhilli's research interests include modern Europe, authoritarian regimes, globalization, integration and disintegration, and the politics of development. At Hunter, he teaches courses on nineteenth- and twentieth-century European history, international history, and dictatorships. He is currently writing a book on socialist globalization through the angle of Albania under Yugoslav, Soviet, Eastern bloc, and Chinese patronage, based on extensive archival research in Tirana, Berlin, London, Moscow, Rome, and Washington. He received a PhD from Princeton University and held a postdoctoral fellowship at Columbia University's Harriman Institute (2011-2012) and a Mellon fellowship at the University of Pennsylvania's Humanities Forum (2012-2013). His research has been published in the *Journal of Cold War Studies*, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, *International History Review*, and a number of edited volumes. He also regularly publishes commentary on contemporary issues in the Albanian press.

I.2 **Jadwiga Biskupska** (Sam Houston, History)

“Institution Building as Elite Response to Nazi Persecution: Warsaw”

Emerging out of my larger manuscript on the Warsaw intelligentsia under Nazi occupation, I examine two Polish institutions built in Warsaw, the Polish underground paramilitary (what became known as the *Armia Krajowa*(AK)) and the underground or “flying” University of Warsaw, to compare and contrast their effectiveness as Polish responses to Nazi persecution. Situated against the better-studied paramilitary activities, I aim to demonstrate that the operations of the underground university more directly combated Nazi policy against the Poles, and that the two projects of education and paramilitary existence, while they interacted considerably, may have been fundamentally at odds with one another and the growth of the Polish paramilitaries undermined educational projects. To build this narrative I use a number of sources from the German civilian administration in Warsaw, the records of the underground university, and memoir and AK documentation.

Jadwiga Biskupska is currently an assistant professor of history at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, TX, where she focuses on the Second World War in her teaching. Before moving to Texas, she was a fellow at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and the Woodrow Wilson Center. She finished her PhD in December 2013 at Yale University under the supervision of Timothy Snyder with a project on the fate of the Warsaw intelligentsia under Nazi occupation, and is currently polishing that project into a book manuscript.

I.3 Louisa McClintock (Columbia, Harriman Institute)

“With Us, Against Us, Never Part of Us: The Punishment of Nazi Collaborators in Postwar Poland, 1944–1948”

This study uses the trials of Nazi collaborators in postwar Polish courts of law to frame how large-scale projects of political transformation and nation-building intersect with efforts of local communities shaken by war and mass atrocity to repair and reaffirm the boundaries of “social belongingness.” An analysis of 198 cases of suspected Nazi collaborators investigated by Prosecutors’ Offices for the Łódź, Lublin, and Warsaw *special criminal courts* between 1944–1946 finds that ethnic tensions between Volksdeutsche, Poles, and Jews became the basis for forging ties of solidarity and belongingness at both the local and the national level.

Louisa McClintock completed a Ph.D in Sociology at the University of Chicago in 2015 and is currently a post-doctoral fellow at the Harriman Institute. Her research focuses on how local, national and international communities have sought and seek to address “difficult pasts” characterized by political violence and mass atrocities, with a special emphasis on 20th century Germany, Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union. Her dissertation, *Projects of Punishment in Post-War Poland: War Criminals, Collaborators, Traitors, and the Re-Construction of the Nation* analyzes how the development of “technologies” of retribution designed by socialist elites and legal personnel inherited from the pre-war period intersected with the larger project of socialist regime transition in post-war Poland.

II.4 László Karsai (Szeged University, History)

“People’s Courts and Revolutionary Justice in Hungary after World War II”

After World War II, the Hungarian “people’s courts” pronounced sentences on approximately 27,000 persons for war crimes, crimes against the state, or crimes against humanity. By March 1, 1948, the verdicts included 322 death sentences; of these, 146 executions were carried out. The so-called “democratic” parties wanted to “prove” that the Hungarian people was innocent, that only the leaders of the previous regime were guilty. With some well-selected trials, I argue, that in 1946–1947—during the gradual but irresistible communist take-over—not only the real “great” war criminals but also simple civil servants, clerks, police and gendarme officers were condemned.

László Karsai:

Professional positions: Professor of History, University of Szeged, Chair of the Department of Modern History; Head of the Yad Vashem Archives Hungarian Research Group (1994–); scientific adviser of Holocaust Documentation Center, (2003-2006.)

Education: M. A., History, University Eötvös Loránd, 1978 (*Marx and Engels on the National Question*); Ph.d., History, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1992 (*The Gypsy Problem in Hungary 1919–1945: Toward the Gypsy Holocaust in Hungary*).

Teaching: history of Europe in the twentieth c., of Nazism, Fascism, Bolshevism, history of the Roma and Jewish Holocaust, history of Anti-semitism.

Publications: 7 books, c. 100 studies/articles in English, Hebrew, German, French. In preparation: political biography of Arrow Cross leader Ferenc Szálasi

II. THE SOVIET DIMENSION (February 19, 1:30 PM–3:45 PM)

II.1 Polly Jones (University College Oxford)

“Forgetting Terror, Remembering Revolution: Soviet Memory Politics under Brezhnev”

My paper examines the ways in which Stalinist repression was both remembered and forgotten in Soviet literature in the Brezhnev era; I thus argue against the commonly held view that the theme

disappeared from Soviet culture altogether in late socialism. Beginning with a brief discussion of the already limited confrontation of Stalinist terror in Soviet literature even at the height of official de-Stalinization in the 1950s and early 1960s, I will then examine the ways in which memories of the ‘cult of personality’ (the Soviet euphemism for terror) were routinized and sanitized in the Brezhnev era. This was achieved both through intensifying censorship and through various narrative techniques aiming to defuse and redeem its traumatic impact. However, as an ongoing preoccupation of the Soviet intelligentsia, especially the liberal wing closest to the emerging dissident movement, the theme did not entirely disappear from published literature. Instead, authors became more adept at writing about it in more concealed and ambiguous ways. I will analyse as examples of this more complex late socialist poetics of terror the work of Mikhail Shatrov, Anatolii Gladilin, Iurii Trifonov and Chingiz Aitmatov. All these authors used allegory and polyphonic, open-ended narration as a means to evade the censor (and avoid straightforwardly subversive readings of their texts) and to provoke audiences to continuing reflection on questions of responsibility, guilt and retribution. This kept memories of terror at least partly alive in ‘official’ culture and Soviet reading practices, providing a fragile continuity between the thaw and glasnost

Polly Jones is Schrecker-Barbour Fellow and Associate Professor in Russian at University College, University of Oxford. She is the author of *Myth Memory Trauma: Rethinking the Stalinist Past in the Soviet Union, 1953-70* (Yale, 2013) and *The Dilemmas of De-Stalinization* (Routledge, 2006), as well as a number of articles about post-Stalinist literature and cultural politics. She is currently working on a monograph about the *Fiery Revolutionaries* biographical series (1968-90), which analyses it as an experiment in new types of propaganda in the Brezhnev era, but also as a ‘niche’ for marginal writers and subversive historical writing during late socialism.

II.2 Theodore Weeks (Southern Illinois, Carbondale, History) “Remembering the Holocaust after 1945 and 1990 in Lithuania”

After 1945 and after 1990 different narrative strategies were adopted to explain – and limit and sanitize– the participation of Lithuanians in the murder of thousands of their Jewish neighbors. In the Soviet years, the primary strategy was simple silence, reducing Jewish specificity in the Holocaust to “the suffering endured by Soviet citizens.” There was also, however, by the 1960s, an attempt to recognize that Jews had been singled out by the Nazis, but the (rare!) Lithuanian collaborators were generally identified with reactionary movements and, not by chance, their present location in the USA was often stated explicitly.

After 1990, along with sincere efforts to recognize the extent of Lithuanian collaboration in the years 1941–1944, one may also discern strategies to exculpate the “Lithuanian nation” from accusations of collaboration and out-and-out murder of Jews. I will leave aside the absurd and disgusting “theory” of “dual genocide” as literally beneath criticism.

Theodore R. Weeks is Professor of History at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. He has published three monographs, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia: Nationalism and Russification on the Western Frontier*, 1996, *From Assimilation to Antisemitism: the “Jewish Question” in Poland, 1850-1914* (2006), and *Vilnius between Nations 1795-2000* (2015). He is the author of a textbook of Russian history, *Across the Revolutionary Divide: Russia 1861-1945* (2010) and a co-author of *Making Europe: People, Politics and Culture*, a Western Civilization textbook that went into its second edition in 2013. His research interests include nationalism, antisemitism, history of empires and imperialism, urban history, and the history of interethnic relations. He has recently begun a new project on the beginnings of Polish radio in the interwar period which he hopes to expand into a world history of early radio, 1920s-1940s.

II.3 Jared McBride (US Holocaust Memorial Museum, Post-Doctoral Fellow)
“Unmasking Traitors: Soviet Propaganda Literature and War Criminals in the West during the Cold War”

This paper looks at a sampling of Soviet “propaganda” literature—pamphlets and books from the 1950s through 1980s that identified war criminals living in the West. The paper discusses the genesis of these works, their ideological orientation and construction, and the veracity of their claims, while situating them in a larger discourse during the Cold War about World War II.

Jared McBride completed his Ph.D. in history at UCLA in Fall 2014. His work specializes in the regions of Russia, Ukraine, and Eastern Europe in the 20th century and research interests include borderlands studies, nationalist movements, mass violence and genocide, the Holocaust, inter-ethnic conflict, and war crimes prosecution. He has forthcoming articles appearing in *The Carl Beck Papers*, *Slavic Review*, and *Kritika*. McBride has held four post-doctoral positions. In winter 2015, he was the first ever Margee and Douglas Greenberg Fellow at the USC Shoah Foundation. In spring 2015, he was a visiting assistant professor in the history department at Columbia University. This past summer, he was a Title VIII visiting scholar at the Wilson Center’s Kennan Institute and he is currently the Ben and Zelda Cohen Fellow at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. McBride is completing a book manuscript, “Killing Neighbors: The Undoing of Multi-Ethnic Western Ukraine in World War II.” He will be a lecturer at UCLA starting in fall 2016

II.4 Franziska Exeler (Freie Universität Berlin / Magdalene College Cambridge, Centre for History & Economics) “Ghosts of War. Personal Responses to the Aftermath of Nazi Occupation in Post-1944 Soviet Belorussia”

My paper examines how individuals in post-Nazi occupation Soviet Belorussia investigated, addressed and evaluated the issue of someone else’s wartime behavior, including the different ways in which people tried to seek what they perceived as justice and retribution. The focus is on the 1940s and 1950s.

Franziska Exeler is a lecturer/assistant professor of history at Free University Berlin and a Mellon postdoctoral research fellow at the Centre for History and Economics, Magdalene College, University of Cambridge. Her research interests include the history of Stalinism and the Soviet Union; World War II and its legacies in Europe and Asia; legal history, transitional justice and social reconstruction; and empire, space and migration. She received her Ph.D. from Princeton University in 2013

III. CRIMES, MEMORY, AND RE-IMAGINING (February 20, 9:45 AM–12:15 PM)

III.1 Steven Barnes (George Mason, History & Art History) <sbarnes3@gmu.edu>
“Remembering the Gulag in Post-Soviet Kazakhstan”

Based on an analysis of two government-supported museums opened in the last decade in Kazakhstan and dedicated to the history of the Soviet Gulag, this paper seeks to understand how a former Soviet republic packages the history of Soviet state violence and repression for a contemporary audience. The papers shows how the history of Soviet repression can be mobilized for developing national identity and for justifying post-Soviet state violence and repression while also considering whether the museums hold out any hope for reappropriation by society with the aim of challenging essentialist identities and state control of the historical narrative. The paper also considers the challenges the history of atrocity presents for contemporary experiential museum practice.

Steven Barnes is Associate Professor of Russian and Soviet History at George Mason University. He is the author of *Death and Redemption: The Gulag and the Shaping of Soviet Society* (Princeton, 2011) and is currently working on *The Wives' Gulag: Family, Gender, and Survival in Stalin's Terror*.

III.2 **Attila Pók** (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of History) “Communist and Anti-Communist Symbolic Retribution in Context”

The paper compares how Hungarian communists in 1947–1950 and anti-communists in the aftermath of the collapse of the Soviet bloc used changes of symbols of collective identity (names of public spaces, monuments, holidays, flags, etc.) for the ‘collective punishment’ of their respective enemies. These practices will also be compared to a few East and West European examples. The argument is twofold. First: this symbolic retribution fails if it does not pay attention to the great variety of individual, local, sectional and regional differences in the collective identities of a society. Second: these symbolic retributions are meant to contribute to the establishment of the legitimacy of new power-holders.

Attila Pók is deputy director of the Institute of History at the Research Centre for Humanities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Budapest, vice-president of the Hungarian Historical Association, between 1999 and 2013 spent 10 semesters as Visiting Professor of History at Columbia University in New York. His publications and courses cover three major fields: 19th-20th century European political and intellectual history, history of modern European historiography with special regard to political uses of history and theory and methodology of history. His most important books include: **Klios Schuld, Klios Sühne. Historie und Politik im Karpatenbecken**. MTA BTK TTI, Budapest, 2014. 182 p., editor with Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maiguashca: **The Oxford History of Historical Writing, Vol. 4**. Oxford University Press, 2011., **A haladás hitele**. (The Credibility of Progress) Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 2010. 368 p., **The Politics of Hatred in the Middle of Europe. Scapegoating in Twentieth Century Hungary: History and Historiography**. Savaria Books on Politics, Culture and Society. Savaria University Press, Szombathely, 2009., editor with Randolph L. Braham: **The Hungarian Holocaust after Fifty Years**. Columbia University Press, New York, 1997. **A Selected Bibliography of Modern Historiography** (*Bibliographies & Indexes in World History, Number 24*) Greenwood Press, New York-Westport, Connecticut–London, 1992.

III.3 **David Marples** (Alberta, History & Classics) “Decommunization & Retribution in Contemporary Ukraine”

The de-communization laws introduced into the Ukrainian parliament in the spring of 2015 were notable for two aspects in particular: the elevation of “fighters for Ukrainian independence” and the de-Communization of society, beginning with a ban on Communist flags and symbols, leading to a ban on the existence of the Communist Party of Ukraine and changing names of cities, towns, streets, and buildings bearing the names of Communist leaders. The paper examines the legacies in Ukraine of the Soviet past and evolution of the post-Maidan ideology, with particular focus on culture (monuments, museums, historical writing) and the role of the media. It seeks to answer the following questions: how accurate and objective are current portrayals of the Soviet period and that of Stalin (1928–53) in particular? Has the focus on the Holodomor as the defining event of Ukrainian identity contributed to the portrayal of Russia as ‘the other’. Does it signify that Ukrainian-Russian relations must inevitably suffer as a result? To what extent is the vilification of all aspects of the Communist past justified and what are its limitations? Can a unified Ukraine emerge as a result of de-Communization or is a divided country the more likely outcome? Is Ukraine unique or typical in its retributory policies of 2014–15?

David R. Marples is Distinguished University Professor and Chair, Department of History & Classics, University of Alberta. He holds a PhD in Economic and Social History from the University of Sheffield (1985). In 2014-15 he was Visiting Fellow at the Slavic and Eurasian Research Center, Hokkaido University, Japan. He is author of fifteen single-authored books and three edited books on topics ranging from 20th Century Russia, Stalinism, contemporary Belarus, contemporary Ukraine, and the Chernobyl disaster. His recent books include *Our Glorious Past: Lukashenka's Belarus and the Great Patriotic War* (Stuttgart: Ibidem Verlag, 2014), *Heroes and Villains: Creating National History in Contemporary Ukraine* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2008), and *The Lukashenka Phenomenon* (Trondheim, 2007). He is also the co-editor of *Ukraine's Euromaidan: Analyses of a Civil Revolution* (Stuttgart: Ibidem Verlag, 2015). He has written more than 200 scholarly articles in refereed journals and his speaking engagements have included the universities of Toronto, London, Tokyo, Hokkaido, Harvard, Stanford, Western Australia, and the Lazarski University in Warsaw, Poland. His chief areas of interest are Belarus and Ukraine, and he is the former Director of the Stasiuk Program on Contemporary Ukraine at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta (2004-14).

III.4 Jennifer Allen (Yale, History)

"A Masterable Future? Utopian Practices in Three Germanys, 1980–2000"

This talk picks up a melancholic thread in contemporary assessments of the end of the Cold War, when the gradual triumph of liberal democracy and capitalism over "really existing socialism" led academics and public intellectuals to pronounce the end of ideology, history, and utopian ambitions. Bundled neatly in Margaret Thatcher's pronouncement that "there is no alternative," this sense of surrender appeared to hit West Germany hard. Facing the ostensible dissipation of radical social and political alternatives after the collapse of the century's two biggest experiments in social engineering—Nazism and state socialism—a motley group of ordinary West Germans, however, chose to dismiss this logic. Rather than adopting a narrative of political disenfranchisement, social alienation, and cultural impotence, they opted to reconceptualize the idea of utopia and the kinds of practices that could realize it. They initiated a series of small, localized, grassroots cultural projects that tackled various aspects of West German academic, political, and aesthetic life. Though the purviews of these projects were modest, they aimed for nothing less than the radical restructuring of their respective jurisdictions. At the same time as a vociferous collection of historians took the spotlight to debate the status of Germany's attempts to "master" its Nazi past, these ordinary Germans concentrated their energies on reworking West Germany's future. In doing so, they reclaimed utopian hope from the dustbin of historical ideas.

My remarks will take on three tasks. First, I will trace the growth of this radical grassroots milieu in West Germany the last decade of the Cold War. Second, I will explore the extent to which these projects, practices, and attitudes made it across the Wall into East Germany. Finally, I will chart the fate of this utopian inclination in the wake of Germany's reunification. While my talk clearly takes up the aftermath of the Cold War, it considers another to be equally significant, namely the intellectual aftermath of the collapse of radical political programs. I aim to destabilize our contemporary tendency to adopt what I call "ending myths" when analyzing the late twentieth century. I will make a case for tempering this tendency by reassessing the vitality of utopian thought and, by extension, the alternative futures that Germans have been increasingly willing to imagine in a post-socialist era.

Jennifer Allen (Assistant Professor, Yale) is a historian of modern Germany with a particular interest in late twentieth-century cultural practices. She is currently working on a book manuscript titled *In Pursuit of Sustainable Utopia: Art, Political Culture, and Historical Practice in Germany, 1980-2000*. In it, she charts the history of Germany's relatively recent efforts to revitalize the concept of utopia after the wholesale collapse of Europe's violent utopian social engineering

projects by the end of the twentieth century. She argues that, contrary to popular accounts, German interest in radical alternatives to existing society had not diminished. By braiding together case studies from three different milieux—the Berlin History Workshop, the German Green Party, and a loose collection of artists of public space—Allen demonstrates that Germans chose to resist an increasing sense of political disenfranchisement, social alienation, and cultural impotence in the 1980s and 90s. Instead, they pursued the radical democratization of politics and culture in everyday life through a series of grassroots cultural projects. These groups not only envisioned a new German utopia but attempted to enact their vision. In doing so, they reclaimed utopian hope from the dustbin of historical ideas.

Allen received her B.A. (2006) in political and social thought from the University of Virginia and her M.A. (2010) and Ph.D. (2015) in history from the University of California, Berkeley. At Yale, she teaches undergraduate and graduate courses on modern German history and historiography, the theories and practices of memory in modern Europe, and the history of the Holocaust. Her work has been funded by the German Academic Exchange Service, the Institute for International, Comparative and Area Studies at UC San Diego with support from the Thyssen Foundation, and the Institutes for European Studies and International Studies at UC Berkeley.

IV. COMMUNICATING RESPONSES: CULTURE AND MEDIA (February 20, 1:30 PM–3:45 PM)

IV.1 Tarik Amar (Columbia, History)

“Kapitan Kloss: Collaboration, Treason, and Resistance in Post-war Poland’s Favorite Spy Series”

The 1960s Polish TV series “Stawka większa niż życie” recounted the World War II missions of a young Pole who infiltrates German military intelligence as captain Hans Kloss. In reality working for Soviet intelligence, he helps Poles resist the occupation and sabotages the Germans. Together with the 1966–1970 serial “Cztery pancerni i pies” (Four Tankers and a Dog), “Stawka” firmly established the viability of films made for TV, as opposed to cinema, and coincided with a massive expansion of national TV use. “Stawka” evoked an exceptionally strong public response. It was, in fact, the first Polish TV production that was also a national public event. “Stawka” was made for entertainment, rich in action, comedic, and romantic elements. Yet it also reflected and facilitated the articulation of a Polish public memory of World War Two, which is the focus of this paper.

Tarik Cyril Amar, Department of History and the Harriman Institute, Columbia University (formerly director of the Center for Urban History of East Central Europe in Lviv, Ukraine). His book *The Paradox of Ukrainian Lviv. A Borderland City between Stalinists, Nazis, and Nationalists* was published by Cornell University Press in 2015. He is now working on a political and cultural history of, mutatis mutandis, the “James Bond” stories of the “other side” under the preliminary title *Spies unlike Us: The Social Imaginary of Secrecy and Espionage in the Soviet Union, Russia, and Eastern Europe c. 1964 to 2010*.

IV.2 Anicia Timberlake (Williams College, Music)

“Music Pedagogy and Fascist Legacies in the German Democratic Republic”

Immediately following World War II, the Soviet Military Administration enacted a series of reforms in East German schools meant to ensure a break with fascism: all teachers who had been members of the Nazi party were dismissed, the newly trained teachers were to use Soviet pedagogical methods, and all subjects were to teach the principles of Marxism-Leninism. To this end, one teacher proposed a ban on the technique of solfège (notes sung to syllables, with associated hand signs), arguing that this method promoted fascist tendencies in children. Examining the controversy surrounding this ban, I show that a stubborn Romantic belief that music

was by nature apolitical hampered a complete break from the pedagogies—and, by extension, ideologies—of the recent past, and was also used to exonerate a number of musicians with unsavory political allegiances. The example provided by music education suggests that what many consider to be a total and effective Soviet “occupation” of German schools was in fact characterized by a greater continuity between fascist and socialist Germany than any of the individual actors would have been willing to admit.

Anicia C. Timberlake (Postdoctoral Fellow in Music, Williams College) received her Ph.D. in History and Literature of Music from UC Berkeley in 2015. Her dissertation, “The Politics and Practice of Children’s Music Education in the German Democratic Republic (1949-1989),” investigates music pedagogy in socialist Germany beyond state-mandated propaganda songs, showing how music teachers, musicologists, and composers used non-texted forms of music to shape children to their own ideals of the socialist citizen. Anicia’s other research interests include Schlager (a German pop genre) and child stars in contemporary America.

IV.3 Angelo Mitchievici (Contesta, Faculty of Letters) “The Myth of the New Man, the Revolution and the New World Order in Romania”

The communist project, from the very beginning, aimed the dual goal of a radical transformation of society through the total transformation of the subjects that make it up. The new man formed the revolutionary project that was claimed by the communist utopia and fed by the systematic misrepresentation of historical fact. This project unforgettably marks what was called the “obsessive decade”, the decade of the instauration of the communist regime in Romania, and which engraved in the collective memory, a trauma that is impossible to heal. The literature and cinematography of the following decades, under the dictatorship of Nicolae Ceausescu, mapped an answer in concord with the new politics of the Party, but at the same time also with a relative liberalization of the regime. The comparison becomes relevant for the relationship between the revolutionary condition and the new man, this project being the source of communist culture and civilization in socialist Romania.

Angelo Nicolae Mitchievici is Professor at Faculty of Letters, University “Ovidius” of Constanta, where he teaches comparative literature. In 2008 he obtained his PhD in Philology with a *Summa cum Laude* distinction at the University of Bucharest.

Co-authored of three volumes in the series *Explorations into Romanian Communism and A Disappeared World*. Author: *The Shadows of Paradise. Romanian and French Writers in Soviet Union* (2011) Director, “Ideology and Culture” Department of IICCMRE (*The Institute for the Investigation of Communist Crimes and the Memory of the Romanian Exile*) 2010–12). Syndicated columnist, film critic, and assistant editor, *România literară*. Award: the “Ion Cantacuzino” Award of The Romanian Filmmakers Union (2008). Research interests: intellectual history, film theory, literary theory, and visual representations during and after communism. Member, FIPRESCI (The International Federation of Film Critics, 2008—); RAAS (Romanian Association for American Studies)

IV.4 Snježana Milivojević (University of Belgrade, Faculty of Political Sciences)
“Peace without Reconciliation: Media Encounters with the Past in Post-conflict Serbia”

This paper deals with political communication in Serbia after 2000, when both the regime changed and conflicts in ex-Yugoslavia ended. Through selected media cases, it examines the politics of denial regarding conflicts and the war legacies from the 1990s, coupled with delayed anti-communism (“correcting” communist injustices after World War II). Such framing of post-conflict communication provides a political context for building “peace without reconciliation” in the region and “transfer of blame” without responsibility within Serbia.

Snježana Milivojević is Professor of Public Opinion and Media Studies at the Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Belgrade, founding Chair of the Center for Media Research and Academic Board member at the Center for Gender Studies.

She is the author of *Media, Ideology and Culture* (Belgrade, 2015), *Television Across Europe - Serbia* (Budapest, 2005) *Media Monitoring Manual* (London, 2003) and editor or co-author in several other volumes.

She led and participated in numerous international research projects in media studies as well as policy or consultancy projects for international organizations (UNESCO, UNICEF, UNDP, COE, OSCE, IREX, OSI). Her main academic interest is in media and democracy, political communication, cultural and gender studies and media and public memory.

Snježana Milivojević was Chevning Scholar at St. Anthony’s College, Oxford (2001), Fulbright Visiting Scholar at Columbia School of Journalism (2012/13) and visiting lecturer at several European and American universities