

Jie-Hyun Lim and Eve Rosenhaft, eds.
Mnemonic Solidarity: Global Interventions.
Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. 2021. ISBN
9783030576684. 135 pp.

Shaoyu Yang (University of Warwick)

With the influence of globalization, a global memory space in which historical and collective memories of different nations have become entangled across borders, cultures, races, and languages has emerged since the late twentieth century. Outside of Europe, memorial practices and memory contests have also developed. Memories of past trauma in Asia, Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, and the spaces which connect them are being shaped not only through interactions among the subjects of their own histories but also via conversations with the memories of others around the world. More and more voices of the Global South are heard, and in this context, scholars Jie-Hyun Lim and Eve Rosenhaft launched a new book series *Entangled Memories in the Global South* to explore the past and present of global memory formation in the Global South. *Mnemonic Solidarity: Global Interventions* is the first outcome of this series published in 2021. We can quickly gain a sense of what this volume explores: how to ensure shared and harmonious grounds for memories of different nations and communities that are the opposite of competition, conflict, discrimination, hegemony, and hierarchy in memory space. This is evident from the word “solidarity” in the title, and the subtitle “global interventions” also makes us aware that memories are not merely vernacular and national but have been internationally interwoven and the solidarity between different memories is being promoted or impeded by global forces.

From the beginning of the twenty-first century, “cosmopolitan memory,” “multidirectional memory,” “transcultural memory,” “traveling memory,” “prosthetic

memory,” “transnational memory,” and “entangled memory”¹ are proposed to investigate and reflect on the interconnection, contest, and reconciliation among memories of European and American historical violence and trauma. On this basis, this mnemonic solidarity project is a comprehensive study of a new model of global memory formation. It provides critical discussions on previous models in memory studies and memory practice and pays critical attention to specific memory actors and material processes. It also rethinks the way in which particular memories and memory practices form and may be appropriated by cultural or national memories, and thus exploited in disputes and competitions. In the reading, we can find penetrating insights into the mnemonic solidarity as well as the specific role of the entanglement of memories in memory formation and memory practices. We might be also inspired by those intriguing findings of the changes in global memory formation. The volume suggests new strategies to cope with problems in memory practice such as hierarchies of victimhood and nationalistic and political manipulations of victimhood memory. The volume consists of five chapters in which five scholars investigate the facets, causes, changes, and implications of global memory formation in not only Europe and the US but East Asia and Africa from a variety of interdisciplinary and regional perspectives.

In the first chapter, Lim and Rosenhaft elaborate the differences in the terms “Global South” and “global memory formation” of which they write in this volume. They point out the liquidity and historical construction of the “North” and “South” in global interactions and emphasize the processes and dynamics, rather than the structures, of global memory formation (3). This type of formation co-constructs national memories in the “self- and other-identities of perpetrator and victim nations,” rather than simply and casually heaping up the national memories of each person (10). Meanwhile, the formation depends on the interactions between national

1 Daniel Levy and Natan Sznajder, ‘Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory’, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5 (2002), 87-106; Daniel Levy and Natan Sznajder, *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*, trans. by Assenka Oksilloff (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006); Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009); Astrid Erll, ‘Travelling Memory’, *Parallax*, 17 (2011), 4-18; Astrid Erll, *Memory in Culture*, trans. by Sara B. Young (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Alison Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004); *Transnational Memory: Circulation, Articulation, Scales*, ed. by Chiara de Cesari and Ann Rigney (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2014); Gregor Feindt, Félix Krawatzek and others, ‘Entangled Memory: Toward a Third Wave in Memory Studies’, *History and Theory*, 53 (2014), 24-44; *Entangled memories: Remembering the Holocaust in a Global Age*, ed. by Maruis Henderson and Julia Lange (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2017).

and local memories, official and vernacular memories (10). Lim and Rosenhaft insist on two defining features of global memory formation to assist us in understanding this new model. The first is the complex interplay between the de-territorialization and re-territorialization of memories, and the second is the ongoing decentralization of European experience in global articulations of trauma (4, 7). We could first gain simple sense of de-territorialization and re-territorialization through “a degree of randomness” and “discursive nexus” in the way different pasts are remembered, and “heightened competition among the parties to contending national memories” which Lim and Rosenhaft succinctly explain here (4). We then could have a simple understanding of the background of the European experience and the possibility of its continuing decentralization before going deep into each scholar’s chapter later.

In Chapter 2, Jie-Hyun Lim amplifies the re-visioning of Holocaust memory which has been increasingly used as a model in worldwide memory practices as well as in the articulation of historical trauma. He explores the global mnemonic confluence and entanglement and the possibilities for mnemonic solidarity from a postcolonial perspective through three historic traumas: the Holocaust, colonial genocide, and the Stalinist terror. He specifically examines the interaction of the (post)colonial and the Holocaust memory of Poles, Jews, and Blacks, the connection between Auschwitz’s and Hiroshima’s victimhood, and the transpacific migration of the memory of Korean comfort women. Lim argues that the entanglement of victimhood claims creates a global memory formation and emphasizes the dynamic process of that entanglement (18). We can see the specific interactions between the global mnemonic pattern and vernacular mnemonic subtleties, for instance, the competition between collective guilt for antisemitism and colonial innocence to offer a narrative template for post-communist collective memory revealed in the debate over the refugee question in Poland, or the continuity of the spirit of solidarity between African Americans and Jews shown in the Yiddish version of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* and the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and thus understand how the global memory is forming or being formed. Besides the entanglement mentioned above, the memory of Korean comfort women has migrated into the global memory space, specifically interwoven with other East Asian memories in the US. This globalization of the comfort women relates to mnemonic solidarity. Nevertheless, what we should notice is the vulnerability of mnemonic solidarity, which can be dominated by the anguish of competition and be battered by nationalistic, political manipulation (37-38). Lim also found the complexity of the Auschwitz-Hiroshima connection indicated in, for example, the nearly opposite opinions of two Japanese memory

agents, Nakatani Takeshi, and Hirano Yumie, on the mnemonic connectivity and historical comparability of these two places. In addition to this, another instance is the implicit comparison between Auschwitz and Nagasaki and the reappearance of redemptive discourse which has occurred in the African diaspora's invocation of the Jewish exodus in Nagai Takashi's funeral oration for Catholic *hibakusha* in A-bomb. However, following Lim's critical analysis of the nationalist appropriation and ideological instrumentalization of Holocaust memory in Japan and Poland, we might need to rethink the concept of "cosmopolitan memory" that connects Auschwitz and Hiroshima (31). At the end of the chapter, Lim puts forward "critical relativization" and "radical juxtaposition" as remedies for the political instrumentalization of memories, mnemonic nationalism, the hegemony and centrality of universal memories, and the hierarchies of victimhood (19). These strategies would protect the outcomes of mnemonic solidarity and urge us to reflect on the relationship between other victims and our own victimhood.

Chapter 3 turns to the Global North. Eve Rosenhaft investigates how the discourses of human rights, racism, and antisemitism that appeared in Europe and the US after the end of the Second World War have been affected by memory conflicts in the twenty-first century (46). In response to the competition, animosity, stagnation of mnemonic solidarity, and many other challenges in multicultural Europe, Rosenhaft proposes "post-Holocaust" and "post-imperial" melancholia, and argues that these two forms of nostalgia are the fusion of the current memory wars (47). For example, as Rosenhaft suggests in her discussions of "white Christian Europe" and antisemitism, the Eastern European rejection of refugees might be explained as a kind of post-imperial melancholia, and post-Holocaust melancholia could inflame diasporic Jewish anxieties about antisemitism (64, 68). As the changes in mobilization of diasporas bring new interactions between memory communities, Rosenhaft goes on to suggest that "this unpicking of the materiality of cultural memory is key to understanding the prospects for mnemonic solidarity" (47-48). Rosenhaft then explores the reconfiguration of Afro-diasporic memory space and its results through three Black Holocaust fictions: John A. Williams' *Clifford's Blues*, Esi Edugyan's *Half-Blood Blues*, and Bernice McFadden's *The Book of Harlan*, as well as conversations among African-Americans, Africans, Afropeans and other non-American Blacks. She found that the Black writers and filmmakers inside and outside the United States all use some of the same "morphemes of memory" such as jazz and concentration camp in their works, but their use has different effects (50). African-American writers place African-American men in Nazi concentration camps and the African-American perspective still remains central, which weakens

the reality of Black victimhood in Nazi Germany although the relationship between the narratives of Afro-diaspora and the Holocaust has been built, and a pessimistic vision of Black community is shown in their novels. However, Black writers outside the US place Black Europeans in Holocaust history and reflect on the issues of race and identity specific to themselves, and give optimistic ends to their novels. Rosenhaft proposes that the creation of those fictions is associated with the shifting balance between optimism and pessimism in Black memory communities (50). What might give us a more straightforward sense of antisemitism and memory conflicts is Rosenhaft's own encounters with two accusations of antisemitism leveled against the exhibitions which she curated. However, the face-to-face conversation between Jewish and Roman survivors organized by Rosenhaft, and its positive effects in mutual recognition and cooperation still make us aware of the importance of a shared knowledge and mutual understanding of different pasts and offer an optimistic view of mnemonic solidarity among different memory communities which usually compete for victimhood status.

Chapter 4 shifts our attention back to the comfort women issue previously discussed in the third section of Lim's chapter. Compared to Lim's focus on the transpacific migration of the memory of comfort women, Carol Gluck moves to examine this issue from different aspects in her chapter. Gluck makes a transtemporal and transregional comparison and clearly demonstrates to readers how the ideas, norms, and practices of public memory increasingly changed in the process of the visibility and audibility of the comfort women's figures and voices on global, social platforms. She analyzes the changes in five dimensions of "global memory culture": law, testimony, rights, politics, and responsibilities (76). We can first comprehend the alteration in the legal and judicial courses coping with past injustice in national courts, international laws and legal tribunals, and civil trails via the trial of the Class A war criminals in Tokyo as well as the 1991 class-action lawsuit filed by three Korean former comfort women. Gluck then demonstrates to us the role of witness and the changes in victim's claims through the testimony of Kim Hak-sun who is the first Korean comfort woman to publicly narrate her story as well as the claims for recognition, education, and public apologies in the testimonies of other former comfort women. Regarding the alterations in geopolitical practices in treating past wrongs as well as in the responsibility of states, societies, and individuals for traumatic pasts, we might grasp these two dimensions through the statements and actions of the leaderships and nationalistic memory politics in China, South Korea, and Japan, as well as the attitudes and reactions of young people in these three countries to Japan's colonial rule and aggression

in the past. Aided by the abundant cases and instances provided by Gluck here, we can thoroughly perceive how public memory changed. Gluck concludes that what bring the comfort women issue to global vision are “the civil courage of the former comfort women” and “the norms and practices of the global memory” (103). When reading the last words of the chapter, we could not but reflect on what our own nations, societies, and individuals should do for the former comfort women to prevent similar injustice, and we could still be positive to expect a “maltreated women against a maltreating world” (104).

In the final chapter, Lauren van der Rede and Aidan Erasmus use two “mnemonically disobedient objects” in Africa as cases to discuss how the Europe-centered memory and trauma templates are affected and how to democratize a global mnemoscape (108). One is the Red Terror in Ethiopia, and another is States of Emergency during Apartheid in South Africa. In the case of the Red Terror, van der Rede and Erasmus demonstrate the difference between the definitions of “genocide” and “terror” which was not very explicit in the Genocide Convention and the Roman Statute but was clearly elaborated in the Ethiopian Penal Code of 1957 afterwards. From the case of South Africa, we might be able to grasp a temporality of state violence and the ways in which the small wars of empire which form the “total war” in South Africa are remembered (122). Considering these two examples, van der Rede and Erasmus point out that the need for mnemonic solidarity can be “a call for the democratization of the global mnemoscape” (107). If we intend to commence the process of this democratization, we must pay attention to and cope with the “punctures” which might disillusion the people who seek discourse of memory that might embrace the world via a different type of solidarity (107). Besides, van der Rede and Erasmus regard Africa as a concept and methodology rather than a cartographic and geological position, and propose aurality, “hearing and listening,” as a way to memory studies to criticize the liberal universalism in memory studies (115). They explain that aurality can complicate any universal relation to the past and the listening that the legal hearing enables is a potential for admitting and accepting mnemonic legacies of violence (116-117). Responding to the call for mnemonic solidarity means that we must have be able to hear of and listen to the people who have been influenced by the global mnemoscape (107). What these two examples uncover to us is that approaching mnemonic solidarity might require us to focus on “the notion of the apparatus: juridical, imperial, mnemonic, disciplinary, technological, or otherwise” (128). We need to explore and reflect on the mnemonic subjects which are not included into the global mnemoscape, such as the Ethiopian Red Terror, which is being forgotten by the discourse of genocide (128).

This volume is well-structured and internally coherent. The authors of different chapters refer to one another to demonstrate their ideas or complement the analysis of the relevant memory practices and disputes, which reflects both the mnemonic entanglement of different nations and regions and the academic interrelation in memory studies. This assists readers to understand some historical memory issues, references, or authorial arguments that are unfamiliar to them more clearly, deeply, and critically. The readers who are concerned about, active in, or studying issues of memory in the Global South will learn more about the development and theory of memory studies as well as the details of those previously suppressed and inaudible memories and the changes in the mnemonic interactions among Asia, Africa, and the world from numerous citations and careful inclusion of various cases and instances in the book. *Mnemonic Solidarity* deserves a wider readership and will prove to be equally beneficial to other academic fields apart from memory studies such as history, politics, sociology, law, and literature.

Works Cited:

- de Cesari, Chiara, and Ann Rigney. *Transnational Memory: Circulation, Articulation, Scales*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2014. Print.
- Erll, Astrid. *Memory in Culture*. Trans. Sara B. Young. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print.
- _____. "Travelling Memory." *Parallax* 17.4 (2011): 4-18. Web. 10 Nov. 2021.
- Feindt, Gregor, et al. "Entangled Memory: Toward a Third Wave in Memory Studies." *History and Theory* 53.1 (2014): 24-44. Web. 30 Oct. 2021.
- Henderson, Maruis, and Julia Lange, eds. *Entangled memories: Remembering the Holocaust in a Global Age*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2017. Print.
- Landsberg, Alison. *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004. Print.
- Levy, Daniel, and Natan Sznaider. "Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5.1 (2002): 87-106. Web. 30 Oct. 2021.
- _____. *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*. Trans. Assenka Oksilloff. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006. Print.
- Lim, Jie-Hyun, and Eve Rosenhaft, eds. *Mnemonic Solidarity: Global Interventions*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021. Print.
- Rothberg, Michael. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009. Print.

Author Profile:

Shaoyu Yang is a PhD candidate in Translation and Transcultural Studies at the University of Warwick. Her research interests include translation studies, memory studies, literary trauma theory, and contemporary Chinese literature. Her doctoral project investigates the reconstruction and transmission of the memories of the Nanjing Massacre through Chinese diasporic literary works and their translations. Email: shaoyu.yang@warwick.ac.uk