

## **Transnational Memory**

# **Media and Cultural Memory/ Medien und kulturelle Erinnerung**

---

**Edited by  
Astrid Erll · Ansgar Nünning**

Editorial Board

Aleida Assmann · Mieke Bal · Vita Fortunati · Richard Grusin · Udo Hebel  
Andrew Hoskins · Wulf Kansteiner · Alison Landsberg · Claus Leggewie  
Jeffrey Olick · Susannah Radstone · Ann Rigney · Michael Rothberg  
Werner Sollors · Frederik Tygstrup · Harald Welzer

## **Volume 19**

# Transnational Memory



Circulation, Articulation, Scales

Edited by  
Chiara De Cesari and Ann Rigney

**DE GRUYTER**

ISBN 978-3-11-035902-2  
e-ISBN 978-3-11-035910-7  
ISSN 1613-8961

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

**Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2014 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Cover image: Adrian Paci, *The Column*, 2013 production shot. Courtesy of the artist and Kaufmann Repetto, Milan.

Typesetting: le-tex publishing services GmbH, Leipzig

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

♻️ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

[www.degruyter.com](http://www.degruyter.com)

## Acknowledgements

This collection was made possible by the input and support of many individuals and institutions. In the first place, we are happy to acknowledge the support of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) through their funding of the Network in Transnational Memory Studies (NITMES). The idea of putting together a collection on this topic originated in the Transnational Memory initiative of Utrecht University's Research Area Cultures and Identities, for whose generous financial and logistical support we are grateful. We would also like to thank Amsterdam University's Institute of Culture and History, which provided support in the initial editing stage. Ann Rigney is also grateful for the hospitality of the University of Toronto in the Spring of 2014, which certainly contributed both to the pleasure and the pace of the final editing.

An earlier version of Chiara De Cesari's chapter appeared in the *Journal of Social Archaeology* 10.3 (2010), and an earlier version of Ann Rigney's chapter in *New Literary History* 43.4 (2012). We would like to thank the editors of these journals for permission to re-use these materials.

To Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning we owe the honour of publishing this volume in their Media and Cultural Memory series, but also many wise editorial suggestions along the way. Stella Diedrich, Manuela Gerlof, and Angelika Hermann at De Gruyter were models of patience; we thank them in particular for their endless readiness to answer our questions and their willingness to cope with shifting deadlines. We are also grateful to Lori Allen for her generous advice and suggestions. A special word of thanks is owed to Tessa Super who helped us in the initial stages of this editorial process and, especially, to Sophie van den Elzen, whose quiet and efficient editorial support in the prolonged final phases was invaluable. Finally, we would like to express our gratitude to Adrian Paci and the Kaufmann Repetto gallery, Milan for their generous cooperation and the permission to use two stills from Paci's videos for our cover photo and our envoi.

Chiara De Cesari and Ann Rigney

# Contents

Acknowledgements — v

Chiara De Cesari and Ann Rigney

**Introduction — 1**

## Part I Circulation

Astrid Erll

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

Rosanne Kennedy

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

Marie-Aude Baronian

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

Susanne K uchler

**Relational Maps in the Cook Islands Transnational Communities — 99**

## Part II Articulation

Michael Rothberg

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

Paulla A. Ebron

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

Elizabeth Edwards

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

Slawomir Kapralski

**Memory, Identity, and Roma Transnational Nationalism — 195**

Christina Schwenkel

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

**Part III Scales**

Chiara De Cesari

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

Stephan Feuchtwang

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

Susan Legêne and Martijn Eickhoff

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

Gal Kirn

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

Ann Rigney

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

Adrian Paci

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

Notes on Contributors — 363

List of Illustrations — 367

Index of Names — 370

Chiara De Cesari and Ann Rigney

## Introduction

### Beyond methodological nationalism

By now there is a vast literature demonstrating how collective memory is crucial for identity formation and how, particularly in the modern period, the self-reflexive cultivation of the past has played into the formation of imagined communities (Anderson 1991; Assmann 1995). A large proportion of this scholarship has been governed, however, like so much social science and humanities research, by a methodological nationalism that posits the nation as “the natural social and political form of the modern world” (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002; see also Beck 2000). In the case of memory studies, this has meant assuming that the nation-state is the natural container, curator, and telos of collective memory. This book offers an alternative approach.

The primacy of the national frame is not in itself surprising, of course, given the co-emergence of nationalism and historicism in the nineteenth century, and the subsequent importance of heritage, canonicity, narratives of liberation, and commemorative rituals to the very working and legitimization of the modern nation-state (Gillis 1994), which in turn provided the blueprint for emerging research taxonomies. Memory institutions and the cultivation of the past have been cornerstones of ethnic nationalism in line with the principle that nations are “grand solidarities” based both on a commitment to a shared future and identification with a shared past (Renan 1882). The intensification of interest in memory and the emergence of memory studies in the last decades have most often been explained by a crisis of remembrance occasioned by the horrors of WWII, decolonization, and the growth of identity politics (see Olick et al. 2012). It should also be tied, however, to an increasing awareness of nationalism as a specifically historical formation based on a questionable congruence between cultural, political, and territorial borders that was articulated through the cultivation of the past. The imagined community constitutive of modern ‘nationalized’ France, for example, as Pierre Nora’s influential *Lieux de mémoire* (1984–1992) argued, was shaped around the shared knowledge of a limited number of highly invested and highly mediated memory sites that served as common points of reference across the national territory. A quarter of a century after its first publication, Nora’s project and the comparable work it inspired in other countries now appears in a double



light: on the one hand, as the production of a new canon as a way of bulwarking (ethnocentric and racialized) national traditions in face of postcolonial diversity (see Rothberg 2010; Stoler 2011); on the other hand, as a symptom of an emerging ‘post-national’ awareness of the contingency of nationalism. In retrospect, it can be seen that Hobsbawm and Ranger’s *Invention of Tradition* (1983) and Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* (1983), appearing just a year earlier, were dancing to the same intellectual tune.

Thirty years on, the time is ripe to move memory studies itself beyond methodological nationalism. Globalized communication and time-space compression, post-coloniality, transnational capitalism, large-scale migration, and regional integration: all of these mean that national frames are no longer the self-evident ones they used to be in daily life and identity formation. As a result, the national has also ceased to be the inevitable or preeminent scale for the study of collective remembrance. By now, in the second decade of the twenty-first century, it has become a matter of urgency for scholars in the field of memory studies to develop new theoretical frameworks, invent new methodological tools, and identify new sites and archival resources for studying collective remembrance beyond the nation-state. Building on emerging discussions, the present volume aims to contribute to this long-term goal.

Without claiming to be exhaustive, we nevertheless hope to have identified some of the key issues at stake in the further development of memory studies and provided a pathway to their further exploration. What new frames of collective remembrance have been emerging as alternatives to the nation? And how do new media technologies affect practices of remembrance both in local and in transnational arenas? What are the mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion that govern even seemingly all-inclusive transnational memory cultures in the digital age? Looking back, does the historical formation of national memories provide a blueprint for understanding the larger-scale processes of integration currently taking place across the world, including Europe? Do the memory cultures among migrant communities replicate those of nationalism, or work in a different way? How do memory narratives interact transnationally, specifically along the fault lines created by colonialism? Does the weakening of nationalized memory mark the beginnings of the end of historical identity (and ‘roots’) as the principal marker of citizenship and belonging?

## Why transnational?

It might be going too far to speak already of a transnational turn in memory studies, but there are stirrings in that direction. In that sense, the present volume can build on earlier discussions of some specific issues as well as on more general surveys. Most notable among the latter are several recent collections that thematize the idea of a global memory culture deeply connected to the propagation of human rights and respect for the memory of the Holocaust as a moral benchmark in a new world order. Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider have spoken in this regard in Kantian terms of a “global memory imperative” based on the Holocaust; conceived as a “universal code” the memory of the Holocaust, they argue, now underpins a global concern for human rights that changes the nature of national sovereignty and indeed the very idea of an autonomous “bounded nation” (Levy and Sznaider 2006; 2010). In their *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories* (2010), Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad, while less centered than Levy and Sznaider on the Holocaust as benchmark, show a similar concern with identifying icons or narratives that have a global, universalist reach in an increasingly convergent world – the mnemonic equivalent of UNESCO World Heritage, as it were.

The present volume echoes these studies in proposing to focus on “nation-transcending idioms, spanning territorial and national borders” (Levy and Sznaider 2010, 6). However, where Levy and Sznaider and others have highlighted the ways in which “global concerns become part of local experiences” (Levy and Sznaider 2002, 87) and advance a human rights consensus that is potentially world-wide, the present volume will pay more attention to the multivocality that is brought into play in the interlocking social fields connecting the ‘local,’ the ‘national,’ and the ‘global’ that are as often sites of dissensus and differentiation, of productive if unequal encounters – what Anna Tsing has called “frictions” (Tsing 2005) – as they are of convergence and agreement.

What to call this new mnemonic arena? Terms like “global memory” or “cosmopolitan memory” and “world conscience” (Beck et al. 2009) carry the risk of homogenization and of implying misleadingly that the movement of memory is uniform, unidirectional, and teleological. The term “transcultural memory” (Crownshaw 2011) resonates with many of our concerns here and is also fruitfully deployed on occasion in some of the essays which follow (see in particular Rothberg’s discussion of the relative value of the terms ‘transnational’ and ‘transcultural’). The ‘transcultural’ also marks a desire to move beyond traditional configurations of the field of research along the lines of discrete, nationally-defined ‘container cultures.’ As Astrid Erll puts it in a valuable survey article, transcultur-

ality offers a “research perspective” that is “directed towards mnemonic processes unfolding *across* and *beyond* cultures” (Erl 2011, 9). It allows one to highlight the way cultures can transcend national borders per se (as in the case, for example, of ‘Anglo-American’ culture). Even more crucially, it highlights the way narratives, images, and models of remembrance “travel” and circulate widely with the help of media. In this way, the concept of transcultural memory helps us to a better understanding of how certain ways of looking and recalling can actually become shared by groups at different locations across the world. While “the existence and variable permeability of borders” (Erl 2011, 14) is acknowledged, transculturality has been applied above all to the study of mobility and flows rather than the social and political factors, as well as cultural ones, that may impede them.

It is precisely on the issue of borders that transculturality seems to lose some of its analytical purchase; an approach “across and beyond cultures” invokes the idea of cultures as bounded containers at the same time as it suggests that it is the very nature of cultural production to work across such boundaries. This volume will attempt precisely to tease out more fully, theoretically as well as empirically, the nature and role of borders in cultural remembrance. This means that, while it takes on board the principle that memory ‘travels’ and that it does so increasingly in our age of globalized communication, it recognizes the dialectical role played by national borders (which are not just imagined, but also legally defined) in memory practices and in memory studies.

In light of these considerations, among others, we concluded that the term ‘transnational,’ although not without its own shortcomings (see Vertovec 2009, 17), seemed best suited to approach the multi-layered, multi-sited, and multi-directional dynamic that we are hoping to capture. ‘Transnationalism’ recognizes the significance of national frameworks alongside the potential of cultural production both to reinforce and to transcend them. Crucially, it opens new possibilities for examining the interplay and tensions between culture and institutions, and hence for developing a new dialogue between those approaching the field from the Humanities and those approaching it from the Social Sciences. Since nation-states in principle have hard and fast, legal boundaries, the combination of ‘transnational’ and ‘memory’ opens up an analytic space to consider the interplay between social formations and cultural practices, or between state-operated institutions of memory and the flow of mediated narratives within and across state borders. It makes it possible to move to the centre of analysis the material presence of borders in the ‘flows’ of globalized memories; these may be non-hierarchical and deeply democratic in appearance, but may well themselves be the sites of hegemonic and governmental processes in ways that both reproduce and alter those of older national memory forms. In this way, ‘transnationalism’ proves better suited than more homogenizing cognates to highlight the frictions

at play at the interfaces between different social formations and cultural imaginaries, and the varieties of currents and cross-currents at work in the exchange and appropriations of travelling narratives and mnemonic forms in a world that is not seamless. Finally, it helps open up the crucial question of how practices of remembrance themselves participate in the making of hard and fast borders: for example, how does the current flurry of institutional activities geared toward the production of a new European memory relate to the hardening of Fortress Europe?

In essence, then, a transnational approach directs attention to all kinds of “sustained, cross-borders relationships spanning nation-states” (Vertovec 2009, 1) and to those phenomena not neatly captured within the borders of the latter. At an even more fundamental methodological level, transnationalism problematizes “container thinking” as such (Beck 2000; Amelina et al. 2012; cf. Gupta and Ferguson 1997) and forces us to question our ingrained understanding of appropriate spatial units of analysis. As Sanjeev Khagram and Peggy Levitt (2008, 5) have put it:

In contrast to traditional perspectives, which see transnational phenomena and dynamics as a subset of those occurring somewhere between the national and the global, [Transnational Studies] includes another, in some cases, more productive option. What are assumed to be bounded and bordered social units are understood as transnationally constituted, embedded and influenced social arenas that interact with one another. From this perspective, the world consists of multiple sets of dynamically overlapping and interacting transnational social fields that create and shape seemingly bordered and bounded structures, actors and processes. . . . By transnational, we propose an optics or gaze that begins with a world without borders, empirically examines the boundaries and borders that emerge at particular historical moments, and explores their relationship to unbounded arenas and processes.

As this passage suggests, the critique of container thinking leads into an even more fundamental critique: of the idea of scale and of the unspoken hierarchies of scale implicit in our research practices. Transnationalism allows us to grasp the *multi-scalarity* of socio-cultural processes and the fundamental “mutual construction of the local, national and global” in the contemporary world (Glick Schiller 2012, 23); as well as the proximity of the intimate and the global (Pratt and Rosner 2012). Palestinian cultural heritage preservation organizations offer a case in point (see De Cesari, this volume); they produce a form of institutionalized and materialized memory, Palestinian heritage, which can be considered simultaneously locally rooted and markedly globalized thanks to the appropriation of a globally circulating language of heritage to repurpose the local vernacular past in the service of national liberation (see also De Cesari 2010).

Crucially, rethinking scale also means rethinking the spatial imaginaries and imagined topographies of verticality (Ferguson 2004) that have shaped research

practices in memory studies. Consider, for example, the common scholarly representation of ‘local’ or ‘grassroots’ memories as opposed to ‘national’ and ‘global’ memories. The former, no matter how far they reach out towards the world, are always imagined as being small-scale in scope and extremely localized, akin to a point on a map, and, most importantly, as situated below the broader configurations of national or global memory that are thought of as containing and subsuming them. Moreover, we tend to imagine ‘the global’ in terms of a homogeneous and steadily expanding spread across the globe (usually from a Western location) at the expense of the older mosaic pattern of national memories – and this imaginary, in fact both spatial and temporal, has also been at the core of recent theorizing of memory in relation to globalization. The transnational optics adopted in this volume allows memory to be visualized differently: not as a horizontal spread or as points or regions on a map but as a dynamic operating at multiple, interlocking scales and involving conduits, intersections, circuits, and articulations. With its rethinking of scales and how they operate, transnationalism has fundamental methodological implications that go beyond the new attention it brings to bear, for example, on diasporic communities (Creet and Kitzmann 2011; Hirsch and Miller 2011; Glynn and Kleist 2012; Quayson and Daswani 2013).

It will be clear by now that transnationalism is not used here in a teleological sense, as synonym for an ever-widening of the frameworks of memory within some homogeneously conceived space. There is no necessary or linear ‘progress’ from the familial, to local, to national to global memories, because not only do we encounter movements or developments in reverse, but also different, non-linear configurations and constellations. Indeed, the term transnational itself crucially serves here as a reminder of the fact that even in a so-called post-national age, ‘the national’ as a framework for identity and memory-making is still a powerful one, indeed one that may be reinforced in response to calls for new types of confederation and integration. As a number of our chapters illustrate, the transnational dynamics of memory production operate in conjunction with the continuous presence and agency of the national, with which it thus remains deeply entangled (witness the harnessing of national rights to human rights; see Kennedy, De Cesari). Just as post-coloniality constitutes a break with colonialism that cannot transcend its enduring legacy, so too does post-nationality – or better, transnationality (Glick Schiller 2012) – continue to respond to national meanings and values. In some cases indeed, the globalization of memory practices has paradoxically helped reinforce the nation as the social framework par excellence for identity and solidarity, suggesting that the latest phase of globalization and transnational capitalism has not led to the disappearance of the national, but rather its transformation and reconfiguration (see Gupta and Ferguson 2002; Ferguson 2006). Arguably, the unstable, tense, and discontinuous social fields of diaspora may be the most im-

portant site of national memory today (see also Khalili 2005; De Cesari 2012a). A complex feedback from the transnational to the ethnic-national, with nationalism fostered in interaction with transnational discourses, is brought out here in several chapters: most notably in Gal Kirn's analysis of post-Yugoslav memory, Christina Schwenkel's account of the deep entanglement of the national and the transnational in the celebratory internationalist-socialist remembrance of anti-colonial nationalism, and Chiara De Cesari's analysis of the work of Palestinian heritage organizations and their relations to UNESCO.

In line with a commitment to exploring such non-linear trajectories and complex temporalities, this volume does not assume that transnationalism is a recent phenomenon particular to the latest phase of globalization. As Benedict Anderson already argued, nationalism has always been transnationally constituted, because it is the very possibility of its "being transplanted" (1991, 4) into always new contexts and travelling across multiple borders that allowed for its worldwide success (as explored, for example, in the comparative study of "viral nationalisms" in Europe by Leerssen 2006; 2011). Transnationalism in memory studies helps in casting retrospective light on transnational cross-currents which were operative at the height of nationalism but which were subsequently written out of national narratives. These cross-currents included the transnational character of nationalism itself: while each nation proclaimed itself unique, the fact that they did so along remarkably similar lines has tended to be forgotten (Edwards, this volume; also Leerssen and Rigney 2014). Crucially, transnational cross-currents were also at the heart of colonialism, slavery, and other forms of exploitation by globalized capital involving the violent asymmetrical entanglement of racialized communities; this shadow side of national progress has been largely occluded from memory (Ebron, this volume; see also Stoler 2011). Along a positive vein, mention can also be made of various transnational cross-currents involving utopian projects based on the promise of transcending all borders: aimed at establishing international socialism, as Kirn and Schwenkel show in their respective essays, or at a universal visual archive that also fostered national imaginaries, as shown by Edwards in hers. The memory of such transnational interactions and cross-currents became retrospectively nationalized once placed under the purview and control of national institutions, which thereby also foreclosed the production of alternative narratives as Legêne and Eickhoff show in their analysis of the cataloguing of colonial photographs. With the help of a transnational lens, however, it is now possible to see retrospectively some of the paths not taken in the formation of dominant national narratives, and so re-open archives and reactivate the potential of certain icons and narratives to become recuperated as new sites of future memory.

## Transnational dynamics

This collection of essays shows the inter- and transdisciplinarity at the heart of contemporary memory studies. The two editors come from socio-cultural anthropology and comparative literature respectively, and our contributors have been drawn in almost equal measure from the humanities and the social sciences. Combining expertise in this way will hopefully bring us closer to an outstanding desideratum: the integrated study of memory production as a cultural process embedded in social formations that it helps in turn to shape. In the case of the present topic, this has meant integrating a concern with institutions, actors, and struggles for power in concrete material circumstances with a concern for mediation, cultural forms, and the media-supported mobility of narratives across time and space. Integrating these two perspectives seemed all the more urgent given what appears to be a growing divergence between traditional state-controlled institutions of memory and ‘unregulated’ grassroots exchanges using digital media, and the emergence of new actors in the struggle to define collective memory.

Underlying our approach is a dynamic model of cultural memory that sees it in processual terms (as the outcome of ongoing cultural practices and unequal encounters) as well as generative ones (as an activity that is productive of stories and new social relations rather than merely preservative of legacies). As a number of recent studies have argued, and as is borne out by the essays here, cultural remembrance involves the continual production, remediation, and sharing of stories about a past that changes in relation to the new possibilities for interpreting it within shifting social frames operating at different scales and across different territories (see Erll and Rigney 2009). Mediated acts of remembrance help to create new narratives and displace or marginalize others and, by opening up fresh perspectives on the past, continuously change the grounds on which common futures are imagined (Gutman et al. 2010). The stabilizing, hegemonic role of memory narratives (Assmann 1995) and canonical “sites of memory” (Nora 1997) has deservedly received a lot of critical attention in the last half of the past century since they have such a formative influence. However, any focus on canonization needs to be offset by due concern for the parallel process whereby new acts of remembrance, spurred on by emerging groups in search of recognition, help generate new identities and contest old ones as part of a dynamic system. Seen in this way, cultural memory is always “on the move” (Rigney 2012), working as a “gyroscope that mediates trajectories from past to future through gravitational points in the present” (Olick 2010, 213). With this in mind, the present volume seeks to analyze the movement of narratives alongside the workings of power that underpin it. It will pay particular attention to those pressure points where this process



becomes foreclosed, when some images and stories become territorialized, stabilized, or otherwise caught up in national or ethnic practices and meanings.

This dynamic and generative approach to cultural memory acknowledges the complex temporalities whereby past, present, and future are re-calibrated. More importantly, it allows us to conceive of the relations between memory and social identity in other ways than as an unalienable inheritance that binds groups to a particular identity fixed in the past. Ever since Maurice Halbwachs' *Cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (1925), it has been generally accepted that personal recollection is shaped by "social frameworks," since people adapt what they remember to the social contexts (in the first instance, according to Halbwachs, the family, religion, and profession) in which they conduct and imagine their lives. Although the national frame has until recently been politically the most important and academically the most theorized, it co-exists and has long co-existed with multiple others. The essays below explore a wide variety of these alternatives, from extended families (Feuchtwang, Kuchler), to diasporic and mobile communities (Baronian, Kapralski), to globally-distributed publics (Erll, Kennedy), to entangled neighbors and immigrants (Rothberg), to would-be confederations (Rigney), and supranational and transnational organizations (De Cesari). Suffice it here to point out the more fundamental theoretical assumption: that social frames should not be conceived merely as 'containers' of memories, but rather as the historical outcome of acts of remembrance that help to (re)define groups – and their boundaries – and establish new modes of mutual implication (Ebron; see also Rothberg 2013).

At this point, the transnational lens on memory intersects in fruitful ways with recent discussions on the making of publics and counter-publics (Warner 2002) within the context of a transnational public sphere (Kennedy, this volume; see also Fraser 2007). If nationalizing cultures of memory (and much of the theorization that followed from it) took the borders of the mnemonic community as a given, the generative approach offered here indicates that communities and publics are created "prosthetically" (Landsberg 2004) through mediated acts of remembrance and, in line with this, shows how the borders between imagined communities become reconfigured through the agency of cultural remembrance itself. The dynamics of remembrance are thus intimately bound up with community-making since narratives about events belonging to 'our world' continuously reproduce, redraw or challenge the lines between 'them' and 'us.' And while cultural remembrance helps thus to create bonds, it is a two-edged sword whose power can also be deployed to discriminate against groups. As Michael Rothberg points out in this volume, Turkish migrants to Germany become caught in a double-bind, being simultaneously told that the Holocaust is not part of their history because they are not 'ethnically' German and then castigated for their alleged indifference to Holocaust remembrance (see also Rothberg and Yildiz 2011).



The idea of multidirectional memory, first developed by Michael Rothberg (2009), has proved very fruitful in opening up new perspectives on the ‘vectors’ (Wood 2009) and modalities by which stories and icons move across space, time, and social groups – or fail to do so. The concept of ‘multidirectionality’ has made visible the sedimented quality of memory discourses, and the fact that multiple dialogues and exchanges with existing narratives play a constitutive role in their making. Crucially, it reveals how the memory narratives central to the identity of one group can, in travelling, help model the narrative of another group in a manner that is mutually-supportive. In this process, Rothberg has shown, memory does not have to work according to the economy of a zero-sum game whereby one narrative gains public salience only at the cost of obliterating competitors.

As several contributions to the volume demonstrate, it is indeed the case that globally circulating memories and particularly the memory of the Holocaust – which has itself emerged as a paradigm and model for memory-making worldwide – have helped provide a language in which to articulate other narratives of suffering and loss (as well as a template for subjectivity and agency, see Ebron, this volume) in an increasingly transnational yet fragmented public sphere. However, there is also evidence to suggest that the relations between memorial traditions and the effects of memory encounters do not always amount to a zero-sum game or to a power-free interaction that is equally rewarding to both parties. Memory discourses are deeply entangled; yet such interconnections are often, if not always, asymmetrical ones, as the interactions between the memory of the Holocaust and the memory of the Palestinian Nakba illustrate, or the privileging of some genocides over others as part of a global canon. A Foucauldian understanding of power as fundamentally productive, as a power that works by empowering (while also regulating and subordinating), can help further illuminate the relationship between memorial traditions and effects of memory encounters in ways that go beyond the alternatives initially offered by Rothberg. In practice, as he himself has acknowledged in recent publications (Rothberg 2011), hierarchies of suffering are a frequent, even if avoidable, effect of memory encounters; comparison and mutual mirroring are often “agonistic” (Mouffe 2005) and even antagonistic, rather than non-competitive and equal. A more elaborate understanding of the complexity of such intersections and comparisons can help advance our understanding of memory politics beyond the simple paradigm of silencing and obliteration (see also Gilroy 2004) and bring it more in line with what Ann Stoler has called “aphasia” (Stoler 2011): an incapacity to engage with some dimensions of the past and their enduring and troubling presence. Stoler’s analysis bears in the first instance on France’s dealing with its colonial past, but it also speaks to broader European political dynamics, opening up a way to understand the aphasia relating to the thousands of deaths at sea of migrants and asylum seekers (of-

ten from former European colonies) as they attempt to cross Europe's borders in the Mediterranean. Their lives are becoming lost, invisible, in the interstices between national commemorative spaces and within everyday affective taxonomies that organize the distinction between “grievable” and “ungrievable” bodies (see Butler 2009) along racialized and national lines.

In order to flag this blind-spot or constitutive outside of transnational memory, we have included a visual contribution in our envoi in the form of a still from the video *Centro di permanenza temporanea* (literally: Temporary Stay Center, 2007) by Albanian-Italian artist Adrian Paci. In the video, a group of migrants crowd a gangway right in the middle of a runway, but it soon becomes clear that the planes leaving the airport are not for them, so they are left waiting, their faces scarred by the betrayal of their hopes for a better life. What awaits them is clarified by the video's title, which refers to the detention centers spread across Italy and other Mediterranean countries where irregular migrants are detained, often for months and in spite of not having committed any crime, until they are ‘repatriated.’ The survivors of the Mediterranean crossing end up stuck in a prison-like temporal, spatial, and legal limbo – a de-territorialized national frontier, and a key site in a broader accretion of borders that is itself deeply entwined with memory processes (Rigney, this volume; see also De Cesari 2012b).

Transnational memories are commonly believed to ground and foster a new international morality based on human rights (Kennedy). Yet the use of memory as a marker of citizenship (Rothberg) or as an informal accession criterion to the EU in cases such as Turkey (Rigney) indicates that the moral politics of remembrance are ambiguous. Unraveling the tangle of memory and human rights today means acknowledging the double role of memory: on the one hand, it offers a conduit to recognition and empowerment on the part of the marginalized and dispossessed (as in the case of the Roma, see Kapralski); on the other hand, it functions as an instrument of discrimination and a measure of exclusion.

The essays below, in focusing on particular instances of border-making and border-crossing, thus uncover some of the power dynamics and power struggles that are at the heart of the contemporary production of memory. While charting the movement and proliferation of particular narratives, they also help to re-launch some ‘residual’ memories that were blocked or marginalized or had simply lost momentum: socialist narratives of transnational solidarity (Kirn, Schwenkel), or hopeful memories of multicultural co-existence (Erl).

## Circulation

Globalized communication has meant, among other things, an observable convergence in the modes and aesthetics of remembrance practiced around the globe and the discourses informing them. One can think here, for example, of the so-called politics of regret and the global travels of public apologies as a cultural template (Olick 2007), the discourse of victimhood and trauma (Fassin and Rechtman 2009), and the discourse of World Heritage, not to mention the widespread familiarity with the Holocaust as a memory site (see Levy and Sznaider 2006; Rothberg 2009). This convergence in the ‘languages of commemoration’ indicated that our study of transnational memory should begin with the issue of ‘circulation’ and the question of how stories and models for remembrance shape what is remembered and provide conditions for the exchanges between individuals and groups. The first set of essays in our volume address these questions from different disciplinary perspectives and with reference to different geographical areas. Building on recent insights into the mobility or ‘travelling’ of memory, the four essays brought together here examine both the mediated quality of memories and the situated work that these perform as they move across media and between social groups. A key concern is with the ways in which mediation is culturally and imaginatively productive, but also socially so, shaping not only narratives but also the collective identities of the people who appropriate them. What triggers the alternation between deterritorialization and re-territorialization (or “vernacularization,” see Merry 2006) of globally circulating memories? Are digital media fostering such a thing as a transnational public sphere or simply the increasing interconnection of (still) distinctly national ones? Are we heading conversely towards the growing fragmentation and dispersion of communities of debate?

These issues have taken on fresh urgency in light of the fact that new media technologies and the emergence of participatory cultures (Jenkins 2006) have clearly multiplied the possibilities for reproducing, adapting, accessing, and transmitting images and narratives on the part of non-state actors. Media are increasingly powerful agents in connecting individuals and shaping their relations to each other and to the world (Garde-Hansen et al. 2009; Hoskins 2011). While texts, film, and photography continue to be key to the production of cultural memory, these media function more and more in online ecologies and as part of what Erll here calls “plurimedial networks” that operate across the borders of states. The emergence of a participatory culture facilitated by internet and social media is clearly changing the conditions in which memories are produced and circulated, offering new possibilities for intervention that have a low threshold but potential impact. This does not mean, however, that the internet should be un-

thinkingly celebrated as “digital democracy” (Kuntsman and Stein 2011); indeed, there is a growing literature on digital memories showing that despite widespread ideas linking the internet with Habermassian notions of the public sphere and communicative reason, cyberspaces and online communities of ‘debate’ can well turn into platforms of hatred and hate speech (Kuntsman 2010). Moreover, it is not a fully de-nationalized space (Rutten and Zvereva 2012, 2). Grassroots and non-state actors play an increasingly vocal role in producing memory in opposition to state-sponsored narratives and institutions (Kennedy, this volume offers a case in point), but also as a substitute for the latter in the context of shifting patterns of globalized governance (see Gupta and Ferguson 2002; Ferguson 2004). But do recent developments in media culture mean the end of the centrality of the nation-state as primary producer of collective memory and of hegemonic narratives about the past? And if there is a shift, what constellations of actors, forces, and resources enable the creation of cultural memory in the absence of state institutions and apparatuses?

The widespread imaginary of the ‘flow’ as the figure of mobility under the most recent phase of globalization overlooks, as signaled earlier, the importance of frictions and blockages in what are discontinuous memory movements. As the essays below illustrate, memory narratives indeed move with the help of media technologies, but they do so within ultimately limited circuits and along multiple pathways that, while they are sometimes a conduit to something new, may also turn out to be dead ends. How does the very metaphor of the deterritorialized and unbounded hide memory’s baggage of epistemic exclusions? How are hegemonic memories being produced in the shift from the museum to the internet as a chief apparatus of memory? Stef Jansen and Staffan Löfving have emphasized that we should approach “the key concepts of sedentarist and placeless paradigms – including territorialization and deterritorialization, emplacement and displacement – as empirical issues to be investigated rather than as philosophical assessments about what characterizes our age” (2009, 5; see also Amelina et al. 2012, 7).

The opening chapter by Astrid Erll takes as its empirical focus the representations of District Six in Cape Town and, analyzing this particular case, builds theoretically on her earlier work by considering in more detail the factors that shape the palimpsestic layering and the mobility of stories. Analyzing the rich mediation of District Six – which includes poetry, a museum, performances and the science-fiction movie *District 9* – Erll shows how this location became transformed into a memory template that travelled across media and places. She highlights in particular the role of cinema in facilitating the global circulation of stories, and shows how narrativization working across plurimedial networks helped turn the history of District Six into a mobile and mobilizing figure of memory that speaks to groups elsewhere. Her analysis ends by pondering the reasons for the ‘stick-

iness' of District 6 as an internationally-recognized figure of memory. Its global resonance was enhanced, she argues, by comparisons between the apartheid system and the Nazi regime. Ultimately, she claims however, its resilience as an icon that was picked up and reproduced in many parts of the world should be linked to the ways in which District 6 came to function as a "shorthand for lost hybridity." In other words, its role as a site of memory was entwined with its role as a site of possibility – a platform for imagining the future and for reactivating a path not yet taken in history.

In the essay following, Rosanne Kennedy examines the deterritorialization and reterritorialization, and the complex trajectories of an apparently extremely localized but in fact deeply cosmopolitan memory: Palestinian testimonies of violence. The chapter takes as case study testimonies solicited during the UN's *Fact-Finding Mission in Gaza* (2009), which was led by South African judge Richard Goldstone, to determine whether violations of human rights had been committed during the Israeli war on Gaza in December 2008–January 2009. Kennedy shows how the original testimonies were reproduced, reframed, and remediated as they were circulated in print form and on the internet by human rights institutions and activist networks. Her concern is less with the role of plurimediation as such than with the transformations incurred by the testimonies as they were brought to the attention – via a print edition, but also live readings on the part of celebrities – into a mode of address to an international public, specifically an American one. Her concept of "moving testimonies" is used to indicate that these testimonies did not merely travel 'under their own steam' as it were, but were made to move by particular actors with the intention of mobilizing publics elsewhere in support of the Palestinian people (and ultimately, via the appeal to human rights, their own right to nation-statehood). Her analysis concludes with a critical reflection on the nature of the transnational public sphere currently in the making under a human rights regime and on its impact on nation-state sovereignty or rather lack thereof. The global memory imperative, and the idea that the global circulation of memories and moving testimonies of suffering can help stop the human rights violations that caused it, is seriously called into question.

Film takes central stage in the third essay by Marie-Aude Baronian, on the work of the Canadian-Armenian artist and filmmaker Atom Egoyan. Building on Jacques Derrida's notion of "archive fever," she shows how Egoyan assumes the role of archivist for a stateless diasporic community in his audiovisual oeuvre: how his images are both grounded in particular locales (as in his recurrent depiction of the iconic Mt Ararat) and de-territorialized as internationally circulating films. His obsessive desire to fill the void of history (the double injustice of the Armenian genocide and its subsequent denial) ensure that his films work 'archivally.' Without the ambition to provide authoritative narratives, they never-

theless mimic memory work and provide an imaginary storage place and a virtual point of reference for a community without full material access to its history and its homeland. Baronian's close study of Egoan as a creative and self-reflexive curator of diasporic memory reveals the fundamental role of images, and particularly filmic imaginaries, in the transnational making of memories as well as the complexity of the process whereby forgetfulness and erasure are written into the visualizing process itself.

Where the first three chapters explore the circulation of memories through film, reports, and photography, the final chapter by Susanne Kuchler focuses on a different, often neglected, medium of remembrance: ordinary material culture, in particular, home-made domestic items. In a detailed analysis of quilt-making in the Cook Islands, Kuchler discusses the agency of quilts as quintessentially cultural objects and their semantic density in the lives of the islanders, particularly women, whether resident in the Cooks or in the diaspora. In this context, quilt-making and the act of sewing appear to be deeply entangled with community building, but in ways that challenge traditional notions both of community (modeled on kinship relations, including the nation, conceived as a community of fictive kindred) and of communicative memory (grounded in co-presence and story-telling). That quilts are media of memory is a key aspect of their cultural salience in the Cook Islands, though one which is bound up in fascinating ways with their future-oriented role in creating new pathways and relations rather than merely recalling old ones. Echoing Astrid Erll, Kuchler's analysis also suggests that memories travel faster across borders when they are capable of mobilizing imaginaries of the future and not just of the past.

## Articulation

With their focus on mediation, the essays in the first section show how acts of remembrance involve 'articulation' in the sense of 'giving expression' to events in the form of a narrative. Cultural memories are "articulated discourses" (see Hall in Grossberg 1986) made up of heterogeneous elements, borrowings, and appropriations from other languages and memorial traditions that are assembled together into narratives. But acts of remembrance, as the second section emphasizes, also involve 'articulation' in another sense: they help to link up ('articulate') individuals and groups through their common engagement with those narratives. It is this double meaning of the term that has given us the title of our second section.

The five essays collected here explore the various ways in which social relations are constituted and communities (re)formed through the exchange and ne-

gotiation of memories across imagined or actual borders. They offer further elaborations of the point made earlier that communities come into being by producing a coherent discourse of memory that serves both to bind the group and to demarcate it from outsiders, and that they do so often by analogy with other communities along multidirectional lines. They also provide examples of the ways in which narratives “become articulated, at specific conjunctures, to certain political subjects” (Hall in Grossberg 1986, 53): the emergence of a memory discourse is part of the constitution or coming into being of political subjects and, crucially, their inscription into (always shifting and unstable) power geographies. Circulating memories are thus both the medium and outcome of the entanglements between people and groups.

Publics and memory communities are constituted, as Kennedy shows in her study of the reception of the Goldstone report on Gaza, through the exchange of narratives in the form of borrowings, appropriations, cross-references, negotiations, and intersections. Asymmetrical as such exchanges are, they may in some situations become nevertheless an important resource in providing new avenues for subjectivity but also for citizenship and belonging. That the same memory discourse can simultaneously empower *and* marginalize some of the groups that claim it as their own is illustrated by the double bind described in Michael Rothberg’s essay, which examines the ways in which German Muslim citizens are made into improper subjects of memory and therefore placed outside the inner circle of citizenship increasingly marked by memorial criteria. His essay explores the way German Muslim women and immigrants actively participate in remembering the Holocaust, and use it as a platform for performances of citizenship. His analysis offers a new view of memory practices among migrant communities: where the usual emphasis is on the way migrants cultivate memory as a resource for long-distance nationalism and homeland politics, he emphasizes instead how public acts of remembrance can be used to engage dialogically with the host community. To this end, he introduces the notions of “thickening” and “unscripted new linkages” to describe the work of articulation effected by memory exchanges, encouraging us to think of memory as a resource for building relations rather than as an exclusive legacy.

In the essay following, Paulla Ebron brings to light the transnational dialogues and unexpected encounters that have shaped the emergence of the remembrance of slavery in the US public sphere. Analyzing a sample of cinematic, narrative and material sites of memory, her analysis traces the development throughout the twentieth century of what she calls “memory projects” of slavery, which helped shape a new public. She emphasizes the ways in which these memory projects emerged at the intersection of ‘grassroots’ and ‘official’ remembrance. She also traces the multidirectional interaction between Holocaust memory and



the memory of slavery from the early 1970s, in practices of remembrance and, crucially, in forms of subjectivity. Her central claim is that such interactions provided African-American activists with an “affective vocabulary” that helped to articulate the story of slavery and give public expression to its memory. The transnational spread of the Holocaust as memory site thus facilitated the multidirectional emergence into public visibility of the past and enduring legacy of slavery in the United States and, in the South, offered an extra transnational counterweight to the local emphasis on the secessionist legacy.

The availability of a transnational language for articulating suffering, trauma, and marginalization is also a central theme in the next essay by Slawomir Kapralski. Charting the history of Romani activism, Kapralski shows how the memory of Nazi persecution has been mobilized by marginalized, stateless actors to claim rights and access to citizenship. He demonstrates how recent Romani political activism has pursued ‘national’ identity and memory-making in the absence of state institutions and as part of an effort to fight discrimination and achieve equal status and rights in the countries where Roma live at best as second-class citizens. His analysis also illustrates the paradoxes and predicaments of a “transnational nationalism” whose strategy, in line with nineteenth-century models of nation-building, is centered on the mobilization of a collective memory, in this case, following post-Holocaust models, a collective memory of suffering and victimhood. Emphasizing the growing political role of the mobilization of memory in the framework of a politics of recognition (echoed by Rothberg), and hence its value as a conduit to inclusion and equality, Kapralski shows how Romani activists have attempted to produce a ‘national’ memory to claim their rights at the cost of adopting a victim role – with so far only partial success.

Christina Schwenkel’s essay vividly exemplifies the way transnational (and even nationalist) memories can be mobilized to create broader communities and solidarities. She discusses the transnational socialist remembrance of the Vietnam War through an analysis of GDR (East-German) and Cuban films of the war. These produce memories that are both nation-specific and nation-transcending. She emphasizes the role of visual culture and particularly of cinematic images in the constitution of what she calls a “postnational scopic regime of memory” which positions and interpellates the viewer in compelling ways. Arguing that there are particular figurations of humanity at the core of diverse scopic regimes of memory – discourses and imaginations of what constitutes the essence of the human – she compares notions of humanity within socialist discourse and socialist iconography with liberal humanitarian ones circulating as part of the human rights regime. With her analysis of the visual culture of memory formations and of the ways in which these expose not only particular ideas of community (national



vs. transnational) but also of the human, we have now come almost full circle in exploring the work of articulation and subjectification in remembrance.

The final essay in this section by Elizabeth Edwards adds an extra twist to this tale by showing, with reference to the photographic survey movement in late nineteenth-century Europe, how a utopian memory project directed towards ‘humanity’ could end up producing nationalized subjects in practice. Her analysis provides a reminder of the fact that the transnational, mediated circulation of memories and images is not new. More specifically, it presents the pan-European survey movement as an instance of an epochal “memorializing desire” that was nested within (and productive of) the landscape and vocabulary of nationalism at the same time as it aspired to become universal. Based on the large-scale mobilization of amateurs to capture the essence of ‘national’ experience with photos taken of everyday life, the ultimate aim of the survey movement was the creation of a utopian “memory bank” for a future conceived on a Europe-wide if not indeed world-wide, imperial scale. It combined organizations at local and national level, as well as a transnational network of connections and exchanges. Edwards argues that the movement was not only transnational in its organization, but also in the all-pervasiveness of a nationalizing mode of apprehension and sense of a common modernity that was brought to bear on the localized photographs. At the same time, she also shows that there was no easy fit, but rather a series of fractures and thresholds, between the local, the national, the European, and the global.

## Scales

As mentioned earlier, a critical rethinking of scale and of the unspoken hierarchies of scale implicit in our research practices is one of the core challenges of a transnational approach. The issue of scale is indeed present in all of the essays in our volume, as is cross-scale intersectionality. Where several essays bear, for example, on a nationalization paradoxically aided by transnational and supranational actors (De Cesari, Kennedy, Legêne and Eickhoff, in this volume), others contribute to the deconstruction of taken-for-granted hierarchies of affective power based on the distinction (see Margalit 2002) between thick, lived, and affective ‘local’ or national memories and artificial, empty, and thin transnational memories (Rothberg, Schwenkel). However, the essays collected in this final section offer more overt attempts to address the politics of scale and in particular of “scale-making” (Tsing 2000). How did and do apparatuses at different scales work to nationalize memory? Do recent developments mean the end of the primacy of the nation-state as the dominant framework for collective memory?

Focusing on UNESCO's World Heritage program, Chiara De Cesari's opening essay investigates the paradoxical ways in which transnational remembrance can help reproduce and reinforce national memories and nation-state institutions of memory. It also highlights the unsuspected entanglement of World Heritage and national sovereignty. By examining the translation of UNESCO's cultural heritage policies in the context of Palestine/Israel, she shows how this project of worldwide cultural heritage preservation entails a double predicament and fundamental contradictions. On the one hand, World Heritage reinforces nation-state apparatuses' reach and control over heritage sites and processes, often at the expense of the grassroots. On the other hand, recent World Heritage reforms in the direction of a less Eurocentric approach and a stronger multiculturalism not only risk affirming and solidifying cultural differences, but also the global asymmetries between them.

Working at the scale of the cognitive, the intimate, and the familial, the next essay by Stephan Feuchtwang offers a comparative study of the Indian Sora people alongside a Russian-Jewish family living in Berlin. Challenging Pierre Nora's reductive opposition between (contemporary) sites of memory and (past) *milieux* of memory, Feuchtwang shows how kinship, trans-generational connectedness, and alternative family archives provide enduring and crucial memory environments even in more recent times, and that they involve individual subjects in intense transpersonal relations that give them the sense of an extended temporality. Using the notion of "haunting memory," his analysis shows how such *milieux* are not only alive and well today, even as they adapt themselves to changing circumstances, but are also developing in complex interaction with the narratives produced by the apparatuses of the state.

The starting point of the next essay by Susan Legêne and Martijn Eickhoff is precisely at the level of the state and its role in shaping what is considered worthy of recollection or not. Their concern is with the role of archiving practices in the Netherlands in the national framing of histories of WWII and decolonization. With an empirical focus on colonial photographs in the Netherlands Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies (NIOD), they show how the transnational history of Empire and decolonization became post-hoc nationalized through the workings of the archive itself. The national scale determined what was deemed relevant or not, and how it was catalogued, leading to an artificial separation between the history of WWII and the history of decolonization that played an important role in the post-war effacement of the fundamental transnationality of European colonialism. Since a visual archive has a potential which exceeds the stories told about it, however, those committed to re-articulating Dutch history could use these photographs in the future in a new way: as a resource for writing

a new large-scale history of European colonialism that would have repercussions for both European memory and European citizenship.

If transnational histories are reduced to national ones, or displaced by them, thanks to the taxonomic and representational practices of national archives, it can also happen that transnational institutions inadvertently end up promoting ethno-nationalist memories. Gal Kirn discusses such a case with reference to the former Yugoslavia. He traces the transition from a transnational socialist towards an ethno-nationalist revisionist memory that took place in tandem with the fragmentation of the former Yugoslavia into seven different nation-states. In particular, he details what this scale reduction meant in politico-aesthetic terms, using the example of the memorials to WWII located across the former Yugoslav territory. His focus is on the remarkable socialist modernist memorials which perform a future-oriented memory and mobilize transnational aspirations, but which since 1989 have been neglected. Comparing these WWII memorials to more recent ones, Kirn's essay thematizes the deep entanglement of the new, post-conflict discourses of national reconciliation, nationalist historical revisionism, the rehabilitation of fascism, and very regressive forms of remembrance politics. Most interestingly, the paper traces the collusion between these nationalistic memory discourses and the anti-totalitarian thesis which has also been recently adopted, if only indirectly, by the EU through its policies relating to commemorative days – thus emphasizing the deep paradox of an institution such as the EU, which aims to foster new, transnational frames of memory but ends up lending legitimacy to very different kinds of locally-embedded ethnocentric remembrance.

Further reflecting on recent EU memory policies, Ann Rigney closes the volume by critically examining the assumption that European institutions should aspire to construct a new collective memory along the old national lines but on a larger-scale. She shows how ideas about the future of Europe have been articulated from the late 1940s in tandem with the gradual emergence of a master narrative that sees the EU as the outcome of an ability to overcome its past violence – an idea that found expression in the awarding of the Nobel peace prize of 2012 as well as in the planning of a “European House of History” in Brussels. Rigney's essay challenges the homogenizing top-down efforts to produce a common master-narrative as exclusivist and, literally, backward looking. She argues instead for a more forward-looking way of thinking about cultural memory that would emphasize its capacity to renegotiate the borders of communities at local, regional and macro-regional levels, and generate new “unscripted” linkages (Rothberg, this volume) at these different scales rather than merely express and enshrine existing legacies in an exclusive way. In particular, she indicates the importance of the arts, and their capacity to imagine the past differently, as potentially a key player in this process. This transformative multi-scalar view of memory is more appro-

priate when conceiving of new forms of citizenship within a rapidly changing and diverse EU than the ethnic-nationalist models inherited from the nineteenth century.

## Envoi

The volume charts a rich production of memory taking place across and beyond national boundaries. While showing that globalization is not just new, the essays also bring into focus the massive acceleration of transnational interconnectedness and the growing “transnationalization of the political” (Balibar 2004) that is taking place today. The extent of these changes also makes it necessary to ask if the link between memory and identity is not also in the process of becoming a thing of the past as something specific to the nation-state as a particular cultural-political formation. To a certain extent this may be true. Yet the essays also reveal how the production of new narratives in the interstices between nation-states and in the transnational arena, is gradually giving rise to new modes of remembrance that are not just historicist but also forward-looking. They illustrate the potential in diverse practices of remembrance to move beyond ethno-nationalist discourses of victimhood and, with the help of artists among others (Baronian, Rigney, in this volume), provide spaces for “imagining things otherwise” (see Esche 2004) as well as resources for alternative figurations of agency and political aspirations. Non-nostalgic modes of remembrance can indeed provide avenues to democratic and emancipatory politics (see Gutman et al. 2010), hence helping put some of the future back into memory (called for by, e.g., Huyssen 2010). Several contributions to the volume thus point towards memories’ ability to speak to the future, to their quality of containing *in nuce* a hint of a different condition. As Astrid Erll here suggests, it may ultimately be their future-oriented, agentic quality that makes them travel across borders.

By inviting specialists with expertise pertaining to different geographical areas, we hope to keep open a perspective on geo-political diversity in memory cultures, and on the variety of transnational pathways that are being used alongside globalized icons and modes of remembrance. Exhaustiveness was not possible, and given our own location, there is a certain provincial bias towards European themes, which is reinforced by the Euro-centered character of much work in memory studies. However, in line with our theoretical approach, the ‘Europe’ discussed in several contributions is marked by blurred, shifting boundaries and ramifying worldwide connections but also, crucially, by the ways in which it is constituted by its alleged ‘others.’ We are hopeful that the particular combination of approaches

and topics will work together fruitfully to open up new lines of inquiry and conceptualization that can travel beyond their original contexts.

## References

- Amelina, Anna, Thomas Faist, Nina Glick Schiller and Devrimsel D. Nergiz. "Methodological Predicaments of Cross-Border Studies." *Beyond Methodological Nationalism*. Eds. Anna Amelina, Devrimsel D. Nergiz, Thomas Faist, and Nina Glick Schiller. New York: Routledge, 2012. 1–20.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. 1983. London: Verso, 1991.
- Anderson, Benedict. "Exodus." *Critical Inquiry* 20.2 (1994): 314–327.
- Assmann, Jan. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." *New German Critique* 65 (1995): 125–133.
- Assmann, Aleida, and Sebastian Conrad, eds. *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Balibar, Étienne. *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Trans. James Swenson. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2004.
- Basch, Linda, Nina Glick Schiller and Cristina Szanton Blanc. *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, 1994.
- Beck, Ulrich. "The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity." *British Journal of Sociology* 51.1 (2000): 79–105.
- Beck, Ulrich, Daniel Levy, and Natan Sznajder. "Cosmopolitanization of Memory: The Politics of Forgiveness and Restitution." *Cosmopolitanism in Practice*. Eds. Magdalena Nowicka and Maria Rovisco. London: Ashgate, 2009. 111–127.
- Boyarin, Jonathan, ed. *Remapping Memory: The Politics of TimeSpace*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Butler, Judith. *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* London: Verso, 2009.
- Creet, Julia and Andreas Kitzmann. *Memory and Migration: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Memory Studies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011.
- Crownshaw, Rick, ed. *Transcultural Memory*. Special Issue *Parallax* 17.4 (2011).
- De Cesari, Chiara. "Creative Heritage: Palestinian Heritage NGOs and Defiant Arts of Government." *American Anthropologist* 112.4 (2010): 625–637.
- De Cesari, Chiara. "Anticipatory Representation: Building the Palestinian Nation(-State) through Artistic Performance." *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 12.1 (2012a): 82–100.
- De Cesari, Chiara. "The Paradoxes of Colonial Reparation: Foreclosing Memory and the 2008 Italy-Libya Friendship Treaty." *Memory Studies* 5.3 (2012b): 316–326.
- Erl, Astrid. "Travelling Memory." *Transcultural Memory*. Ed. Rick Crownshaw. Special Issue *Parallax* 17.4 (2011): 4–18.
- Erl, Astrid, and Ann Rigney, eds. *Mediation, Remediation, and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009.
- Esche, Charles. "What's the Point of Art Centres Anyway? Possibility, Art and Democratic Deviance." *Republic Art*, April 2004. Available at: [www.republicart.net/disc/institution/esche01\\_en.htm](http://www.republicart.net/disc/institution/esche01_en.htm) (accessed 8 March 2013).

- Fassin, Didier and Richard Rechtman. *The Empire of Trauma: Inquiry into the Condition of Victimhood*. Trans. Rachel Gomme. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2009.
- Ferguson, James. "Power Topographies." *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics*. Eds. David Nugent and Joan Vincent. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- Ferguson, James and Akhil Gupta. "Spatializing States: Toward an Ethnography of Neoliberal Governmentality." *American Ethnologist* 29.4 (2002): 981–1002.
- Fraser, Nancy. "Transnationalizing the Public Sphere: On the Legitimacy and Efficacy of Public Opinion in a Post-Westphalian World." *Theory, Culture & Society* 24.4 (2007): 7–30.
- Garde-Hansen, Joanne, Andrew Hoskins, and Anna Reading, eds. *Save As ... Digital Memories*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Gillis, John R., ed. *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.
- Gilroy, Paul. *After Empire: Multiculture or Postcolonial Melancholia*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Glick Schiller, Nina. "Transnationality, Migrants and Cities: A Comparative Approach." *Beyond Methodological Nationalism*. Eds. Anna Amelina, Devrim D. Nergiz, Thomas Faist, and Nina Glick Schiller. New York: Routledge, 2012. 23–40.
- Gluck, Carol, and Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing, eds. *Words in Motion: Toward a Global Lexicon*. Durham: Duke UP, 2009.
- Gluck, Carol. "Words in Motion." *Words in Motion: Toward a Global Lexicon*. Eds. Carol Gluck and Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing. Durham: Duke UP, 2009. 3–10.
- Glynn, Irial and J. Olaf Kleist, eds. *History, Memory and Migration: Perceptions of the Past and the Politics of Incorporation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Grossberg, Lawrence. "On Postmodernism and Articulation: An Interview with Stuart Hall." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10.2 (1986): 45–60.
- Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson. "Beyond Culture: Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference." *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*. Eds. Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson. Durham: Duke UP, 1997. 33–51.
- Gutman, Yifat, Adam Brown, and Amy Sodaro, eds. *Memory and the Future: Transnational Politics, Ethics and Society*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. 1925. Paris: Albin Michel, 1994.
- Hirsch, Marianne, and Nancy K. Miller, eds. *Rites of Return: Diaspora Poetics and the Politics of Memory*. New York: Columbia UP, 2011.
- Hoskins, Andrew. "Media, Memory, Metaphor: Remembering and the Connective Turn." *Transcultural Memory*. Ed. Rick Crownshaw. Special Issue *Parallax* 17.4 (2011): 19–31.
- Huyssen, Andreas. "Present Pasts: Media, Politics, Amnesia." *Public Culture* 12.1 (2000): 21–38.
- Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.
- Insin, Engin F. *Citizens without Frontiers*. London: Continuum, 2012.
- Jansen, Stef and Staffan Löfving. "Introduction: Towards an Anthropology of Violence, Hope and the Movement of People." *Struggles for Home: Violence, Hope and the Movement of People*. Eds. Stef Jansen and Staffan Löfving. London: Berghahn Books, 2009.
- Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New York UP, 2006.
- Levitt, Peggy and Sanjeev Khagram. "Constructing Transnational Studies: An Overview." *The Transnational Studies Reader: Intersections and Innovations*. Eds. Sanjeev Khagram and Peggy Levitt. London: Routledge, 2008. 1–18.

- Khalili, Laleh. "Virtual Nation: Palestinian Cyberculture in Lebanese Camps." *Palestine, Israel, and the Politics of Popular Culture*. Eds. Rebecca L. Stein and Ted Swedenburg. Durham: Duke UP, 2005. 126–149.
- Kuntsman, Adi. "Webs of Hate in Diasporic Cyberspaces: The Gaza War in the Russian-language Blogosphere." *Media, War and Conflict* 3.3 (2010): 299–313.
- Kuntsman, Adi and Rebecca L. Stein. "Digital Suspicion, Politics, and the Middle East." *Critical Inquiry*, 2011. Available at [criticalinquiry.uchicago.edu/digital\\_suspicion\\_politics\\_and\\_the\\_middle\\_east](http://criticalinquiry.uchicago.edu/digital_suspicion_politics_and_the_middle_east) (accessed 8 March 2013).
- Landsberg, Alison. *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*. New York: Columbia UP, 2004.
- Leerssen, Joep. "Nationalism and the Cultivation of Culture." *Nations and Nationalism* 12.4 (2006): 559–578.
- Leerssen, Joep. "Viral Nationalism: Romantic Intellectuals on the Move in Nineteenth-Century Europe." *Nations and Nationalism* 17.2 (2011): 257–271.
- Leerssen, Joep and Ann Rigney, eds. *Commemorating Writers in Nineteenth-Century Europe: Nation-Building and Centenary Fever*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Levy, Daniel, and Natan Sznajder. "Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5.1 (2002): 87–106.
- Levy, Daniel, and Natan Sznajder. *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*. Trans. Assenka Oksiloff. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 2006.
- Levy, Daniel, and Natan Sznajder. *Human Rights and Memory*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2010.
- Margalit, Avishai. *The Ethics of Memory*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2002.
- Merry, Sally Engle. "Transnational Human Rights and Local Activism: Mapping the Middle." *American Anthropologist. New Series* 108.1 (2006): 38–51.
- Mouffe, Chantal. *On the Political (Thinking in Action)*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2005.
- Nora, Pierre, ed. *Les lieux de mémoire*. 3 vols. 1984–1992. Paris: Gallimard, 1997.
- Olick, Jeffrey K. "The Politics of Regret: Analytical Frames." *The Politics of Regret*. New York: Routledge, 2007. 121–138.
- Olick, Jeffrey K. "Afterword." *Memory and the Future: Transnational Politics, Ethics and Society*. Eds. Yifat Gutman, Adam Brown, and Amy Sodaro. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. 209–213.
- Olick, Jeffrey K., Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi and Daniel Levy, eds. *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.
- Pratt, Geraldine and Victoria Rosner, eds. *The Global and the Intimate: Feminism in Our Time*. New York: Columbia UP, 2012.
- Quayson, Ato, and Girish Daswani, eds. *A Companion to Diaspora and Transnationalism*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.
- Renan, Ernest. "Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?" 1882. *Oeuvres complètes d'Ernest Renan*. Ed. Henriëtte Psichari. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1947–1961. 886–907.
- Rigney, Ann. "Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation of Cultural Memory." *Journal of European Studies* 35.1 (2005): 209–226.
- Rigney, Ann. *The Afterlives of Walter Scott: Memory on the Move*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012.
- Rothberg, Michael. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2009.
- Rothberg, Michael. "Introduction: Between Memory and Memory: From *Lieux de mémoire* to *Noeuds de mémoire*." *Yale French Studies* 118/119 (2010): 3–12.

- Rothberg, Michael. "From Gaza to Warsaw: Mapping Multidirectional Memory." *Criticism* 53.4 (2011): 523–548.
- Rothberg, Michael and Yasemin Yildiz. "Memory Citizenship: Migrant Archives of Holocaust Remembrance in Contemporary Germany." *Transcultural Memory*. Ed. Rick Crownshaw. Special Issue *Parallax* 17.4 (2011): 32–48.
- Rothberg, Michael. "Implicated Subjects." Utrecht University. June 2013. Lecture.
- Rutten, Ellen and Vera Zvereva. "Introduction: Old Conflict, New Media: Post-Socialist Digital Memories." *Memory, Conflict and New Media: Web Wars in Post-Socialist States*. Eds. Ellen Rutten, Julie Fedor and Vera Zvereva. London: Routledge, 2013. 1–17.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. "Colonial Aphasia: Race and Disabled Histories in France." *Public Culture* 23.1 (2011): 121–156.
- Tsing, Anna. "The Global Situation." *Cultural Anthropology* 15.3 (2000): 327–360.
- Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005.
- Vertovec, Steven. *Transnationalism*. London: Routledge, 2009.
- Warner, Michael. "Publics and Counterpublics." *Public Culture* 14.1 (2002): 49–90.
- Wimmer, Andreas and Nina Glick Schiller. "Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences." *Global Networks* 2.4 (2002): 301–334.
- Wood, Nancy. *Vectors of Memory: Legacies of Trauma in Postwar Europe*. Oxford: Berg, 1999.



Rosanne Kennedy

## **Moving Testimony: Human Rights, Palestinian Memory, and the Transnational Public Sphere**

Testimony, a transnational cultural form, is today crucial to the process of documenting violations, constructing memories, and soliciting witnessing publics in human rights campaigns.<sup>1</sup> The Holocaust has “shaped the discourse on collective, social, and cultural memory, serving both as touchstone and paradigm,” and has introduced the idiom of witness testimony (Hirsch and Spitzer 2010, 390). The Eichmann trial, in particular, has been identified as a landmark event for “legitimizing testimony as a form of ‘truth telling’ about the past” (Wieviorka 2006, 88), and consequently, for producing a collective memory of the Holocaust (Felman 2002).<sup>2</sup> While testimonies demonstrate the uniqueness of the witness’s perspective, they do so “using the language of the time ... and in response to questions and expectations motivated by political and ideological concerns” (Wieviorka 2006, xii). Thus, testimony is not simply personal nor does it have the detached perspective required of law or historiography; rather, it contributes to collective memory (Felman 2002; Wieviorka 2006, xii). The Holocaust paradigm, which is grounded in the presumption that memories of the Holocaust will act as a moral and legal justification for humanitarian intervention in present conflicts, has had significant impact both on memory studies and on human rights.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, it has been a potent justification – if not *raison d’être* – for the post-WWII memory apparatus. In human rights contexts, the approaches that have been developed to collect, archive, and present Holocaust testimony in legal courts, museum exhibitions, documentary films and the like, continue to inform processes for recording and remembering genocides, atrocities, and human rights violations today (Wieviorka 2006, xxiii; see also Felman 2002).

---

<sup>1</sup> On the concept of witnessing publics, see McLagan (2003, 609).

<sup>2</sup> For an account of the emergence of the Holocaust survivor as a bearer of historical truth, see Wieviorka (2006). On the Eichmann trial and Holocaust memory, see also Douglas (2001); Felman (2002); and Kennedy (2013). On the contribution of Holocaust scholarship to memory studies, see Hirsch and Spitzer (2010).

<sup>3</sup> For a summary of the impact of the ‘Holocaust metanarrative’ on the development of human rights, see Hapgood (2013).

Within memory studies Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider have been leading proponents of the Holocaust paradigm as a basis for human rights. “Memories of the Holocaust,” they argue, “facilitate the formation of transnational memory cultures, which in turn, have the potential to become the cultural foundation for global human rights politics” (2006, 4). In theory, if not always in practice, Holocaust memory, with its mantra of ‘never again,’ functions as an ethical prompt to nations to intervene in crisis situations to prevent atrocities. In *Human Rights and Memory* (2010), they extend this argument to consider the impact of the global human rights regime on national sovereignty. They identify the consolidation of a transnational Holocaust memory in the 1990s with the emergence of a “global memory imperative.” Fuelled by memories of past genocides and violations, the “global memory imperative” is “transforming nation-state sovereignty by subjecting it to international scrutiny,” and empowering the human rights regime to intervene into current sites of violation (Levy and Sznaider 2010, 149). Their argument should be regarded as aspirational, for it is not yet clear whether the human rights regime is in fact transforming national sovereignty, nor in what direction – whether it is making states more open or more fervently nationalistic.<sup>4</sup> The Israeli-Palestinian conflict, in which human rights non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have been deeply involved for the past twenty-five years, provides an especially rich site for considering the political and humanitarian effectiveness of the Holocaust paradigm and the global memory imperative.

## The global memory imperative and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict

In an era of human rights and of rapid media transmission, human rights reports are an important site for the production and transnational circulation of testimonies, and the construction of a transnational memory of human rights violations. In this chapter, I take as my case study the Goldstone Report, and in particular, testimonies that were produced in conjunction with the UN’s Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict in 2009 (hereafter, the Goldstone Mission). The Goldstone Mission, headed by South African judge Richard Goldstone, was appointed by the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) to investigate breaches of human rights and humanitarian law by the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) that were

---

<sup>4</sup> Israel regarded the Goldstone Report as an attack on its very existence as a state, and responded by threatening human rights organizations working within Israel.

alleged to have occurred during “Operation Cast Lead” – Israel’s name for its attack on Gaza in the final days of 2008. The Goldstone Mission submitted its final report – *Human Rights in Palestine and Other Occupied Arab Territories: The Report of the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict*, known as the Goldstone Report – to the UNHRC in September 2009 (see UN 2009; hereafter ‘the official report’). Goldstone, a South African lawyer and judge of Jewish descent, has been a leading figure in promoting the Holocaust as a metanarrative of human rights (Hapgood 2013, 53). The Goldstone Mission, during which Goldstone put the Holocaust paradigm into practice by holding public hearings that generated testimony, provides a revealing case study of human rights, transnational memory, and national sovereignty. In addition, the Goldstone Report was remediated for a North American audience in 2011 by the progressive American publisher, The Nation, which published an abridged and supplemented edition. Selected testimonies from the Goldstone hearings were edited and included in the American edition, which invites analysis of how they are framed and remediated for a North American audience, and what effects and affects they have had on that audience.

The Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territories and its blockade of Gaza have produced an ongoing legal and humanitarian crisis in which human rights NGOs have become deeply embedded, especially since the 1990s. Consequently, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has become a touchstone for scholarship on human rights, humanitarianism, witnessing and testimony, especially in relation to Palestinian national aspirations. Didier Fassin argues that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, especially since the second intifada, “enlightens many of the issues humanitarian workers are confronted with when they want to transform their witnessing into advocacy and make themselves spokespersons for the supposed voiceless” (2008, 534). The testimonies that were produced in conjunction with the Goldstone Mission, and later edited for an American public, provide an opportunity to consider how testimony is framed for different audiences. In this chapter, I introduce the concept of ‘moving testimonies’ to track the remediation of Palestinian testimony as it travels from Gaza and Geneva to English-speaking audiences in the West, especially in the United States. Both meanings of ‘moving’ – as travel and affect – are relevant to my analysis.

Human rights institutions and activists facilitate the movement of testimonies into the global public sphere. There are, as Gillian Whitlock (2007) points out, “well-established conduits for the production, authentication, and cultural transmission of testimony, and these are available to nurture . . . testimony in . . . campaigns for human rights” (74). Human rights organizations and the social and cultural practices they generate and support constitute a “circulatory matrix, or dedicated communications infrastructure, out of which human rights claims are generated and through which they travel. Comprising multiple layers – commer-

cial, nonprofit, nongovernmental, intergovernmental, and community ... these circuits provide the scaffolding for the making public of human rights violations” (McLagan 2006, 192). The concept of a “circulatory matrix” provides a useful framework for analyzing how human rights testimonies travel transnationally, and in the process, contribute to the construction of a “prosthetic” (Landsberg 2004) or “cosmopolitan” memory (Levy and Sznajder 2002) of Operation Cast Lead.

‘Moving’ is also a useful term to describe the affective dimension of testimony. It is widely recognized that human rights and humanitarian activists use testimonies of suffering as a means of soliciting a compassionate response from audiences, with the anticipation of moral, political and financial support. Testimony is premised on a belief that pain is a universal that crosses social, economic, and geographic boundaries (McLagan 2003; Allen 2009a). Meg McLagan argues that testimonies of suffering are an “inter-cultural technology” that connects “individuals ... from different worlds through the medium of pain, creating solidarity out of difference” (2003, 607). This affective dimension of testimony, which informs my use of the term ‘moving testimonies,’ is presumed to be crucial to the effectiveness of human rights reports in stimulating public memory and humanitarian advocacy.

My interdisciplinary framework brings together scholarship on human rights, testimony, and publicity – particularly but not exclusively in the Palestinian context – with scholarship on transnational memory. Two methodological approaches inform my analysis: analysis of the semiotics and poetics of testimony, and analysis of the mediation and framing of testimony in different contexts and for different audiences. McLagan proposes that “analysis of the relation between human-rights testimonies and transnational publicity ... involves bringing aesthetic questions about formal semiotic properties and generic conventions to bear on considerations about how testimonies generate action outside the textual event itself” (2007, 306). It is precisely this conjunction of the textual and the extra-textual dimensions of testimony that I undertake. On an empirical level, my aim is to analyze the circulation and mediation of Palestinian testimonies, and the memories they produce, as they travel “across and beyond ... territorial and social borders” (Erl 2011, 8). Specifically, I am interested in how they are mediated for national and transnational “witnessing publics” (see McLagan 2003, 609), and how they sustain or challenge the concept of a global memory imperative. Conceptually, I suggest that engagement with public sphere theory, and particularly with the concept of the transnational public sphere, would enrich the study of transnational memory and human rights.

## Publicizing the Goldstone Report: from the UN to the US

On April 2, 2009 the UNHRC initiated a fact-finding mission, the Goldstone Mission, in the aftermath of Israel's attack on Gaza in late 2008. 'Operation Cast Lead' lasted from 27 December 2008 to 17 January 2009, and resulted in approximately 1,400 Palestinian and 13 Israeli casualties. The government of Israel refused to cooperate with the mission. While reporting the casualties' figure of the Israeli army too, the Goldstone Mission accepted assessments from various Israeli, Palestinian, and international human rights groups that the vast majority of the Palestinian deaths were of civilians, including more than 300 Palestinian children (UN 2009, 90–91).<sup>5</sup> The number of civilian casualties was one of the 'serious concerns' raised by the Goldstone Mission. In the months afterwards, several human rights NGOs produced reports that documented violations of international humanitarian and human rights law by the IDF, particularly relating to the illegal use of white phosphorus (see e.g. Human Rights Watch 2009). The UNHRC tasked the fact-finding mission, which included three international lawyers – Christine Chinkin, Hina Jilani, and Colonel Desmond Travers – with investigating breaches of international law during Operation Cast Lead. In its searing final report, the Goldstone Mission documented numerous incidents, particularly by the IDF but also by Hamas, which potentially constituted war crimes and crimes against humanity, and recommended that the IDF and Hamas investigate these incidents. Particularly contentious were allegations that the IDF deliberately targeted civilians, and that the destruction of civilian infrastructure resulted from a deliberate Israeli policy of "collective punishment" of the people of Gaza for their support of Hamas.

The Goldstone Report, as text and event, has generated enormous controversy (see Falk 2010).<sup>6</sup> It has been read, debated, and critiqued not only by academics in

---

<sup>5</sup> The number of Palestinian deaths, and particularly deaths classified as 'civilian,' has been contentious. An Israeli report that rebuts the Goldstone Report reinstates the Israeli army's figure of 1,166 Palestinian casualties (Meir Amit, 323), and claims that over 100 were Palestinian police officers who were also active in 'terrorist' organizations (316–323). It cites the number of civilian deaths as being 'only' 20% of total deaths. By contrast, Raji Sourani, from the Palestinian Centre for Human Rights, states that "1,419 Palestinians were killed. The overwhelming majority of the dead – 1,167 or 82 percent – were civilians, the so-called protected persons of international humanitarian law. A further 5,300 Palestinians were injured, of whom approximately 2,400 were women and children" (Sourani 2011, 329). Sourani's figures are consistent with those of other human rights organizations.

<sup>6</sup> See also articles on the Goldstone Report in *Global Governance* 16 (2010).

international law, politics, philosophy, and history, but by media commentators, activists, and public intellectuals. Numerous websites, blogs, journalistic essays and academic articles evaluated, celebrated or rebutted the Goldstone Report.<sup>7</sup> For instance, in March, 2010, the Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Centre produced a response to the Goldstone Report, *Hamas and the Terrorist Threat from the Gaza Strip*, purporting to compare the “Goldstone findings” with “factual findings” (Meir Amit 2010). It accused the Goldstone Report of “vilifying” the IDF’s conduct in Operation Cast Lead, by claiming that the IDF targeted civilians rather than terrorist organizations. It also charged the Goldstone Report with ignoring issues that arise in “asymmetrical warfare” (Meir Amit 2010, 324).<sup>8</sup> Criticisms of the Goldstone Report have also come from supporters of Palestinian human rights. For example, Richard Falk (2011) and others have pointed out how most of its conclusions had already been reached by other respected international studies and reports on international law in the occupied Palestinian territories. Moreover, crucially, the Goldstone Report “proceeds on the basis of Israel’s right of self-defense without bothering to decide whether in a situation of continuing occupation a claim of self-defense is ever available under international humanitarian law” nor did it “examine whether the factual conditions prior to the attacks supported any security claim” (Falk 2011). Also, some critics have suggested that the report and the various discourses on the ‘war’ in Gaza represented Operation Cast Lead as an exception and thus obscured the protracted and systematic violence of the occupation (Allen 2012).

In April 2011, controversy was further inflamed when Goldstone wrote a bombshell op-ed in *The Washington Post* in which he withdrew the charge, made in the Goldstone Report, that the IDF deliberately targeted civilians, and noted that Israel had begun internal investigations of allegations, whereas Hamas had done nothing (Goldstone 2011). Israeli authorities celebrated Goldstone’s statement as a ‘retraction’ of the report. In response, the other members of the fact-finding mission re-affirmed their commitment to the findings of the report, and insisted that the documented violations should be investigated thoroughly (Jilani et al. 2011; see Pilkington and Urquhart 2011). Goldstone’s equivocations, they pointed out, had to be viewed in the context of the immense personal pressure on him, which extended to threats against his family and caricatures of him as a ‘self-hating Jew.’<sup>9</sup>

---

7 These are too numerous to list, but many sources are referenced in the articles in Horowitz et al. 2011.

8 For another take on the ‘asymmetrical’ nature of the conflict, see Allen (2012).

9 See responses by Mondoweiss (2011); Montell (2011); Pogrebin (2011).

Human rights organizations produce and circulate their reports not only to document specific violations, but also to publicize breaches and to solicit the support of the international community to hold states and individuals accountable for their actions. Michael Ignatieff (2003) observes that "... in the context of a state's stubborn refusal to cooperate, the monitoring bodies have only the power of publicity" (53).<sup>10</sup> Given the global significance of the Gaza conflict, and the UN's support for the fact-finding mission, its report was destined to attract significant publicity. A year after the report was published, Richard Falk (2010) suggested that despite its hefty 575 pages and legal language, the report had achieved "remarkable salience" and had "touched the raw nerve of global moral and political consciousness" (173). Acknowledging that it was never likely that members of the IDF would be prosecuted in the International Criminal Court (ICC), he contends that the most significant audience for the Goldstone Report is not international law but global civil society, as demonstrated by the growing 'Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions' (BDS) campaign. Launched in 2005 by Palestinian civil society, the global BDS campaign uses economic and political strategies to pressure Israel to end the occupation, to recognize Palestinian rights, and to comply with international law. Rashid Khalidi contends that the report has had an "unprecedented reception," especially amongst young Americans, and is "both a product of an evolving consciousness and a vital contributor to it" (2011, 376). For the report to reach a wider spectrum of global civil society, however, it needed to be made accessible and relevant to audiences despite its length and density.

In 2011, The Nation published an abridged and supplemented version of the Goldstone Report, thereby facilitating its transit to an English-speaking humanitarian and activist public. Entitled *The Goldstone Report: The Legacy of the Landmark Investigation of the Gaza Conflict* (2011), The Nation's edition (hereafter the American edition) is edited by Adam Horowitz, Lizzy Ratner, and Philip Weiss. It frames an abridged version of the Goldstone Report with a preface by Bishop Desmond Tutu, an introduction by Naomi Klein, a timeline of the conflict since 1947, maps, and a suite of articles by public intellectuals, academics, and journalists, mostly located in the United States, but with ties to Palestine and Israel. Available in paperback and as an e-book from Amazon, the American edition has

---

<sup>10</sup> Where violations of human rights are concerned, 'publicity' cuts in multiple directions. Numerous reports, commentaries, and blogs challenge and seek to discredit the findings of The Goldstone Report. See *Hamas and the Terrorist Threat from the Gaza Strip* (Meir Amit, 2010). Available at: [www.terrorism-info.org.il/en/article/19298](http://www.terrorism-info.org.il/en/article/19298); also linked on Right Side News, <http://www.rightsidenews.com/2010031528688/world/israel/hamas-and-the-terrorist-threat-from-the-gaza-strip-goldstone-report.html>; and on the IDF's official blog, [www.idfblog.com/facts-figures/rocket-attacks-toward-israel/](http://www.idfblog.com/facts-figures/rocket-attacks-toward-israel/) (all accessed 17 January 2014).



achieved unusual visibility in the American public sphere. For instance, publicity for the American edition was generated in May 2011, when the activist art group, Culture Project, as part of its ‘town hall’ series, *Blueprint for Accountability*, held a public event in New York city to discuss the fallout from Goldstone’s *Washington Post* op-ed article, and to call for an end to Israeli impunity.<sup>11</sup> The event – *Gaza, Goldstone and the Crisis of Impunity* – was sponsored by the Culture Project and Mondoweiss. The latter identifies itself as a “news website devoted to covering American foreign policy in the Middle East, chiefly from a progressive Jewish perspective,” and is hosted by Horowitz and Weiss, editors of the American edition of the Goldstone Report.<sup>12</sup>

The American edition, together with associated events, has created an opening for a public conversation, especially in the United States, on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Along with Weiss and Ratner, Naomi Klein and several other celebrity activists – many of them young American Jews – participated in *Gaza, Goldstone and the Crisis of Impunity*, which included readings of Palestinian testimonies from The Nation’s edition of the Goldstone Report.<sup>13</sup> The involvement of a younger generation of North American Jews in promoting *The Goldstone Report* conveyed the message that Jews can be critical of Israel’s treatment of Palestinians, and of the United States government’s unqualified support for Israel, without being anti-Semitic. This validation is important for changing the politics of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the United States, which has long been a strong moral and economic supporter of Israel. While it is difficult to trace changes in public opinion directly to the Goldstone Report, the publication of the American edition has coincided with increased activism on the conflict on university campuses and on the internet, including growing support for the BDS campaign.<sup>14</sup> A sign of its

---

**11** For further information, see [blueprint.cultureproject.org/gaza-goldstone-and-the-crisis-of-impunity](http://blueprint.cultureproject.org/gaza-goldstone-and-the-crisis-of-impunity) (accessed 17 January 2014).

**12** See [mondoweiss.net/about-mondoweiss](http://mondoweiss.net/about-mondoweiss) (accessed 17 January 2014).

**13** Trudie Styler read the testimony of Mahmoud Abd Rabbo al-Ajami at the event, see [blueprint.cultureproject.org/category/past-events/](http://blueprint.cultureproject.org/category/past-events/) (accessed 21 March 2014). Al-Ajami’s testimony is included in The Nation’s edition of the Goldstone Report (Horowitz et al. 2011, 174–176).

**14** See for instance: [jewishvoiceforpeace.org/campaigns/young-jewish-and-proud/](http://jewishvoiceforpeace.org/campaigns/young-jewish-and-proud/); [electronicintifada.net/tags/students-justice-palestine/](http://electronicintifada.net/tags/students-justice-palestine/); [electronicintifada.net/blogs/nora-barrows-friedman/victory-campus-free-speech-us-dept-education-throws-out-anti-semitism/](http://electronicintifada.net/blogs/nora-barrows-friedman/victory-campus-free-speech-us-dept-education-throws-out-anti-semitism/); [www.theasa.net/caucus\\_activism/item/academic\\_and\\_cultural\\_boycott\\_campaign/](http://www.theasa.net/caucus_activism/item/academic_and_cultural_boycott_campaign/); [mondoweiss.net/2013/12/association-convention-resolution.html](http://mondoweiss.net/2013/12/association-convention-resolution.html); [www.nytimes.com/2014/01/12/us/another-academic-group-considers-israel-censure.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/12/us/another-academic-group-considers-israel-censure.html) (all accessed 17 March 2014). For commentary on the reception of the report in the United States, see Khalidi (2011).



increasing visibility, the BDS campaign has been discussed at academic conferences in the United States – including the American Studies Association (2013) and the Modern Language Association (2014) – and is increasingly reported on in the mainstream news.<sup>15</sup>

The editors of the American edition of the Goldstone Report rhetorically positioned it as a transformative event in the collective memory of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The cultural politics of the American edition are signaled by two aspirational words in the subtitle – ‘legacy’ and ‘landmark.’ A ‘landmark’ implies that the commission’s report has been instrumental in bringing about a significant change, not so much in the conflict itself, but in the public perception of it. Raja Sourani, from the Palestinian Centre for Human Rights, comments that “[f]or Palestinians, the Goldstone Report represents an acknowledgement of their suffering and of the systematic nature of Israel’s illegal actions . . . what had been known in the Occupied Palestinian Territories for years but had never been brought up so sharply on the international level” (Sourani 2011, 330). The preface and introduction suggest that the report is contributing to “a new accountability,” a phrase that recurs in the preface, introduction, and commentaries in the American edition. Former chair of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Bishop Tutu (2011) advocates that: “once we have read it [the report], we must pursue its . . . calls for accountability” (ix). The introduction also refers to the end of the “myth of Israeli exceptionalism” – the ideology that Israel, in its occupation of Palestinian territories and its violations of Palestinian rights, is exempt from being held to the same standards of international law that apply to other nations. The anticipated ‘legacy’ is one in which Israel will be under increased pressure as a result of the scrutiny of its human rights violations. In short, the editors rhetorically presume the outcome they hope the report will produce – that it will be a ‘landmark’ and have a ‘legacy’ – and in so doing, implicitly position the report within the ambit of a global memory imperative.

Of particular significance from the perspective of transnational memory, Naomi Klein’s introduction to the American edition demonstrates how the “global memory imperative” is used in practice. Klein (2011) quotes a 2001 article by Goldstone, written with reference to the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission, in which he writes: “If future perpetrators of genocide, crimes against humanity, and serious war crimes are brought to justice and appropriately punished then the millions of innocent victims who perished in the Holocaust will not

---

<sup>15</sup> See, for instance, “Netanyahu Promotes Efforts Towards a Peace Deal,” 7 March 2014. [www.nytimes.com/2014/03/05/world/middleeast/netanyahu-promotes-efforts-toward-a-peace-deal.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/05/world/middleeast/netanyahu-promotes-efforts-toward-a-peace-deal.html) (accessed 7 March 2014).

have died in vain. Their memory will remain alive and they will be remembered when future war criminals are brought to justice” (Goldstone 2001, as quoted by Klein 2011, xiv). Klein’s remediation of Goldstone’s 2001 article exemplifies the way Holocaust memory functions as a moral justification and prompt to prosecute human rights violations in the present. For instance, she comments that “[i]t is this theory of justice – a direct response to the Nazi Holocaust – that Justice Goldstone brought to his work in Gaza in 2009, insisting that his fact-finding mission would examine the crimes committed by both Israelis and Palestinians” (xiv-xv). In transposing Goldstone’s comments on Holocaust memory to his work on human rights violations in the Gaza conflict, she demonstrates just how mobile and “multidirectional” (Rothberg 2009) Holocaust memory can be in an era of human rights. But this raises an urgent question: what is the evidence that the global memory imperative, in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, will have the desired long-term effect of ending the occupation and securing human rights for Palestinians? Before returning to this issue, I offer a close reading of two linked testimonies from the Goldstone hearings, by a father and son, to consider the discourses they used in communicating their horrific experiences to the Goldstone Mission, to listeners in Gaza, and to a transnational public.

## **A humanitarian discourse of suffering**

As a judge in South Africa, Goldstone was familiar with the powerful and moving effects of testimony, and its value as a means of publicizing human rights violations. As chair of the fact-finding mission in Gaza, Goldstone, together with the other commissioners, determined to hold public hearings during which Palestinian and Israeli victims could testify, thereby extending the Holocaust testimonial paradigm to the Gaza conflict. In providing a public stage for survivors, the mission enabled the transmission of Palestinian and Israeli memories of violent conflict to local and transnational publics. The commissioners wished to hold all of the hearings on site in Gaza, but Israel refused to allow witnesses from Israel and the West Bank to enter Gaza; consequently, they testified at hearings in Geneva, while residents of Gaza testified in Gaza City. The Gaza hearings, held on 28–29 June 2009, were broadcast live to a hall in Gaza City that was open to the public and the media, with simultaneous translations into English and Arabic, and were televised. The hearings in Geneva on 6–7 July 2009 were translated into English, Arabic, and Hebrew. Transcripts and webcasts of the hearings are available on the UN Human Rights Council website, constituting a unique public archive of the proceedings. Of equal, if not more importance, are the afterlives

of testimony, for instance in activist campaigns, films, museum exhibitions, artworks, and digital installations. Through these afterlives, which keep memory and testimony alive for new audiences, testimony contributes to and shapes collective memory.

In Palestine, local NGOs and UN agencies, through the ubiquitous use of a discourse of suffering, are re-shaping the language and nature of political struggles in the Israeli-Palestinian context (see Khalili 2007; Fassin 2008; Allen 2013). Laleh Khalili argues that with the rise of a liberal discourse of rights and development at the end of the Cold War, and the associated emergence of NGOs in Palestine, political claim making was increasingly couched in a language of trauma, victimhood, and human rights, thereby appealing to international audiences and actors – especially in Europe and North America – for sympathy and support. Revolutionary armed struggle ceded to human rights, and the heroic narrative gave way to the tragedy of abject victims in need of transnational support (Khalili 2007, 39). Along with many others, Khalili observes that the theme of suffering in human rights discourse is linked to “the centrality of Holocaust narrative and symbols of trauma” (35). What she calls “trauma drama” – the performance of a “drama of suffering for an audience whose sympathy is sought” – has had a profound impact on contemporary nationalist discourse in Palestine (34–35). On the basis of recent ethnographic research in Palestine, Lori Allen argues that since the second intifada, suffering has come to permeate Palestinian political discourse even more intensely than it had previously. In the transnational human rights community, suffering is perceived to be the basis of a ‘common humanity’ and, as such, is presumed to give rise to political entitlement (Allen 2009a, 162). The discourse of suffering produces the “rights-bearing suffering subject” (Allen 2009, 162) and the discourse of trauma, closely aligned with that of suffering, produces a “suffering subject” (Fassin 2008). The “suffering subject” position is more palatable to a Western audience and more likely to generate compassionate responses than an overtly political subjectivity, such as “the suicide bomber” or the “youthful stone thrower.” The discourse of suffering and trauma, however, obscures a more overtly political discourse of occupation, colonization, and the struggle for national self-determination (Fassin 2008).

Many international human rights lawyers and humanitarian advocates regard the minimum aim of human rights as the reduction of human suffering (see Baxi 1998). Appealing to the transnational discourse of suffering, Goldstone aligned the hearings with the aim of exposing and alleviating suffering. “The aim of holding these public hearings,” he declared, “was to show the human side of the suffering; to give a voice to the victims so that they are not lost among statistics” (UN press release, 7 July 2009). At the same time, he cautioned that the testimonies did not constitute evidence in the legal sense; they were not subject to a judi-

cial process of proof, and were “not in any way similar to truth and reconciliation commissions.” Goldstone’s comments indicate that the primary addressee of the testimonies was not international law but a humanitarian audience – that is, global civil society. Despite his disclaimer that the testimonies did not constitute legal evidence, testimony produces truth effects and truth claims. Goldstone’s comments, which reinforce the presumption of authenticity, are an example of what Lori Allen (2009a), drawing on Mazzarella, calls “immediation”. In the Palestinian context, immediation refers to the way human rights institutions obscure their own role in mediating testimonies, and instead prime audiences to receive testimonies as “authentic experience and truth” (Allen 2009a, 162). Allen argues that in the Palestinian context, in which political and social change has been stalled, “the immediacy of pain – and sympathy for it – has become a weak core of politics” (162). At the public hearings in Gaza and Geneva witnesses recounted, in the now ubiquitous language of trauma, victimhood, and human rights, their grief, loss, and outrage at the violent attacks that killed beloved family members and members of the community.

## Moving testimony

The testimony collected by the Goldstone Mission has been framed and re-framed for different audiences, as it has travelled from one geopolitical context to another, in the different registers of the public hearings, the official UN report, and the American edition of the report. To consider these differing contexts I have selected a single incident: a missile attack on the al-Maqadmah mosque, which is on the outskirts of Jabaliyah camp. Although informed by testimony that was delivered at the public hearings, the official report provides a de-subjectified description of the bombing:

On the evening of 3 January 2009, between 5 and 6 p.m., a large number of people had gathered in the mosque for evening prayers. Witnesses indicate that between 200 and 300 men had gathered on the first floor. A number of women had also congregated in the basement at that time. Witnesses explained that in time of fear or emergency it was the tradition to combine sunset and evening prayers. ... The witnesses indicated that prayers had ended and the sermon was just beginning. At that point there was an explosion in the doorway to the mosque. One of the two wooden doors was blown off its hinges and all the way across the prayer area to the opposite wall. As a result of the explosion at least 15 people died. Almost all were inside the mosque at the time. One of the casualties was a boy who had been sitting at the entrance. His leg was blown off by the missile strike and found afterwards on the roof of the mosque. A large number, around 40, suffered injuries. (UN 2009, para. 824–825, footnotes omitted)

The official report, which records the incident in a clinical, forensic style, and avoids graphic or personalizing details about the deaths, exemplifies the ‘de-subjectified’ style characteristic of human rights reports.<sup>16</sup> As Wilson (1997) observes, “accounts of human rights violations are characterized by a literalism and minimalism which strip events of their subjective meanings in pursuit of objective legal facts” (134). In the example above, the doors become a proxy for the devastating effects of the missile strike on human bodies: the boy’s leg, like the doors, was “blown off;” boy and doors are rendered interchangeable. As Wilson points out, “the ‘just give us the facts’ approach inherently implies . . . excising personal biography, the filter of memory and the performative dimensions of the speech act” (146). He has advocated that human rights reports should try “to capture the nature of the subject matter” – extreme violence with resulting shock and trauma – “through engaging with the existential circumstances of the victims, bystanders, even the perpetrators” (156). He argues that authors of human rights reports could learn how to represent the subjective experience of trauma from discussions about representing the Holocaust.

In contrast to the de-subjectified account provided in the official report, the testimony that was presented at the public hearings conveyed the subjective perspective of witnesses and survivors. For instance, at the hearing in Gaza on 28 June 2009, 91-year-old Moussa Al-Silawi testified about the attack on the mosque that killed his son and several other family members.<sup>17</sup> He is a “superstes” witness – someone who “lived through the ordeal and suffered it,” and who testifies in the first person from a subjective perspective (Fassin 2008, 535). His testimony, grounded in a specific geographical location and conflict, exemplifies what Bhaskar Sarkar and Janet Walker (2010) call ‘situated testimony:’ testimony delivered at the site of a catastrophic event by a witness who was present. Al-Silawi begins with a ritual address to God, and locates himself as a member of a specific community:

In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful, I am Moussa Al-Silawi. I live in Jabalyah Camp, on the eighth block. On the day of the event . . . I went to the mosque . . . After evening prayer we heard a shell hit the mosque. And we have no idea what we saw at the moment. It was absolutely incredible and we started screaming. We screamed and we called for God . . . And after that, and after, I heard, I was told that your son Ibrahim, your son Ibrahim Moussa Isa Ibrahima Al-Silawi, he was carried to the hospital and he became a martyr. He died. He has seven daughters . . . Altogether they are ten who became orphans, without any-

---

<sup>16</sup> For analyses of the rhetoric and genre of human rights reports, see Cohen (1996); and Duda (2006).

<sup>17</sup> The testimonies of Moussa Al-Silawi and Moteeh Al-Silawi are archived at: [www.un.org/webcast/unhrc/archive.asp?go=090628](http://www.un.org/webcast/unhrc/archive.asp?go=090628) (accessed 17 March 2014).

body to, to give them assistance. And moments later I heard ... “Ahmed, Ahmed Al-Silawi, he is also dead. He’s a martyr.” He was completely disintegrated in the mosque. [Al-Silawi also lost a nephew and two grandchildren.]

Moussa Al-Silawi suffered devastating losses. Attempting to articulate this loss in front of both the immediate audience in Gaza, and a global legal and humanitarian audience, it is striking that he uses both national and transnational discourses to communicate his traumatic experience and his understanding of the political significance of the events. He uses the Islamist nationalist discourse of the martyr, which has become prevalent among Palestinians especially since the 1980s (Khalili 2007, 6).<sup>18</sup> Since the second intifada, the discourse of the martyr has expanded to include not only suicide bombers, but also any Palestinian killed by Israeli fire (Fassin 2008). Thus, while recalling his shattering experience of the attack on the mosque, Moussa Al-Silawi’s testimony, framed within a nationalist discourse of martyrdom and self-sacrifice (Kahlili 2007), contributes to a collective memory that places Palestinian deaths during Operation Cast Lead within the longer history of the Palestinian national struggle.<sup>19</sup>

Al-Silawi speaks in the familiar terms of transnational humanitarian and moral discourses – including a discourse of dignity, a discourse of Palestinian rights and justice, and a discourse of duty and obligation – to make an ethical claim on Arab and Western nations to intervene in the conflict and to end Palestinian suffering. In an echo of Holocaust memory, he laments that Palestinians have been abandoned both by Arab and Western nations, despite the ethical imperatives of Islam and international law:

may God protect us ... may He ... punish also all the Arabs that have allowed this to happen. The governors, the rulers who have let us down ... and I call on you ... Where is rule? Where is justice? Where is Islam? Where is the government? Where is the whole world?

His testimony exemplifies Khalili’s observation that “the affinity of local nationalism with broader transnational discourses negates the idea that Palestinian nationalist practices are *sui generis* products of a static and unique Palestinian culture” (3). Rather, with its rhetorical questions, Al-Silawi’s testimony demonstrates

---

**18** Khalili (2007) argues that since the 1960s, Palestinian nationalist discourse has undergone a shift from a heroic to a tragic mode. The image of the guerilla fighter has been replaced by that of abject martyrs and victims, and the heroisms of the nationalist movement have given way to tragedies of endured losses (6–7).

**19** On the gendered dimensions of the discourse of the martyr, see Khalili (2007); and Allen (2009b).

that Palestinian discourse is transnational and multidirectional, incorporating both global and nationalist discursive trends.

Al-Silawi's son, Moteeh Al-Silawi, the sheikh of the mosque, also testified at the Gaza hearings. Whereas the official report described the effects of the bombing on inanimate objects such as the doors, he graphically details the carnage on human bodies caused by the missile attack:

It was a terrible, terrible shock ... people go to the mosque for safety, and we saw bloodshed ... I saw legs, I saw legs and arms uh, I saw the, the leg of a small child, and I stepped on it, even ... I saw this blood being shed in the mosque. The mosque, the safe place where everybody should feel safe.

There was a lot of uh, action and everybody running around in the mosque. At that moment I cannot describe to you what I felt. It was frightful ... I – with my own foot I stepped on the head of a small child. Where is the world? Where is international law? Is this what the Palestinian people deserve, our children screaming?

Lori Allen contends that the representation of suffering and damaged bodies “remains central to Palestinian nationalist representations” (Allen 2009a, 162). Palestinians use images that depict the effects of Israeli violence – bodies that are reduced to “blood, guts, and flesh” – as a means of “staging claims to a humanity shared in common with the international community and, therefore, to their status as deserving of human rights ...” (162). When Al-Silawi describes stepping on a child's head “with my own foot,” he immerses listeners, as well as himself, in the horror of the scene. Testimony is a mode of address that presumes a response. As Felman and Laub observe, “to testify ... before an audience of readers or spectators – is more than simply to ... relate what has been lived, recorded and remembered. Memory is conjured ... in order to address another ... to appeal to a community” (1992, 204). Through his testimony, Al-Silawi solicits listeners to share his shock and outrage at wanton killing, and to empathize with the suffering of victims and their families.

In addressing the international legal community and global civil society, Moteeh Al Silawi's testimony inevitably uses the language of suffering. Testimonies of suffering, presumed to be universal and to be a basis for political entitlement (Allen 2009a, 162), make “ethical claims on viewers and cultivate ... potential actors” to intervene in the conflict (McLagan 2003, 609):

I tell the world, the world listening to me now: where is the law of international protection? Where ... are the Geneva Conventions on the protection of civilians in time or war? Where is democracy? Where is the right to worship that the European countries call for? Where is international law? ... A dog would die in one of the European countries or in Israel and there is upheaval because of the dog, but we see sheikhs dying, their body parts scattered around

in a place of worship, and nobody looks at them. Where is justice? Where is justice? Where are human rights? The issue, the question of Palestine – and we hear about international law, about human rights, about Geneva Conventions – where is all of that?

His appeal to the international community in the language of dignity, suffering, and human rights indicates “the profound influence of global politics on the production and reproduction of local memories . . .” (Khalili 2007, 5). International humanitarian law provides him with a political subjectivity, and human rights discourse provides the moral justification to make claims. He uses his testimony, however, to point to the limits of the human rights regime, and its failure to prevent Palestinian suffering and death.

As the above examples demonstrate, the official report and the public hearings differ dramatically in their accounts of the same incident. Whereas legal evidence requires precise details of events, the testimonies make a moral appeal for support and intervention. While the official report privileges the language of fact, the testimonies evoke emotion and produce affect. Yet the split between fact and emotion is not absolute, since legal claims for justice and recognition of rights are increasingly made in the language of emotion, suffering, and dignity, as demonstrated in the Al-Silawis’ testimonies. The distinctive rhetorical and affective registers of the official report and the testimonial archive are reinforced through form.

While the fact-finding mission was tasked with documenting breaches of international law, it also, like all human rights reporting, aimed to reach a broader humanitarian public as a means of preventing future violations. For a legal audience, the report needed to conform to juridical expectations of rationality, neutrality, and proof supported by material and testimonial evidence. For a humanitarian audience, emotions and morality – not law and rationality – are at the core of the enterprise (Dudai 2006, 790). To satisfy a humanitarian audience, the producers of human rights reports often include first-person unedited testimonies from victims and witnesses in the text. Testimonies provide the reader with “the emotional, non-legal, language that the authors feel compelled not to insert themselves” (Dudai 2006, 790). The UN fact-finding mission was, however, tarred with allegations of anti-Israeli bias even before it got underway.<sup>20</sup> In this sensitive political context, the otherwise standard human rights practice of including graphic and emotion-laden first-person testimony – with its aim of conveying the suffer-

---

<sup>20</sup> Some critics argued that one of the commissioners, Christine Chinkin, should have been rendered ineligible to serve because she had signed a petition supporting an academic boycott of Israel. See e.g.: [blog.unwatch.org/index.php/2009/07/05/why-goldstone-mission-member-must-resign/](http://blog.unwatch.org/index.php/2009/07/05/why-goldstone-mission-member-must-resign/); [www.jpost.com/Opinion/Op-Ed-Contributors/As-biased-as-their-UN-masters](http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Op-Ed-Contributors/As-biased-as-their-UN-masters) (both accessed 10 December 2013).



ing of victims – in the body of the report may have been seen as inflammatory. Perhaps as a compromise solution, the report draws on these testimonies to document its findings, but the transcripts of the hearings are not included in the official report. Instead, they are archived, together with a webcast, on a UN website.<sup>21</sup> As a supplement to the report, the testimonies do not directly challenge the report's detached legal realism, but they are available to humanitarian activists for use in campaigns.

## Domesticating testimony: the familial trope and intercultural witnessing

The shift that I have been mapping from a legalistic documentation of events in the official report to a humanitarian approach was, I have suggested, evident in the discourse of suffering Goldstone used to justify holding the public hearings. The American edition of the Goldstone Report, which incorporated fifteen testimonies from the hearings, signals a further shift from a juridical conception of testimony as evidence to the politics of advocacy, and from a focus on prosecuting human rights violations to witnessing Palestinian suffering. This act of witnessing underpins the global memory imperative – the belief that witnessing Palestinian suffering will generate support from global civil society, which will in turn pressure Israel to end the occupation. The American edition of the Goldstone Report offers the opportunity to examine the remediation and circulation of these testimonies as they move from one geopolitical context – the public hearings held in Gaza and Geneva six months after the conflict – to another, the United States nearly two years later. Given support for Israel by the United States government, American citizens – who can be regarded as 'implicated subjects' (Rothberg 2013) – are an important audience for human rights publicity about the conflict.

Packaged in the American edition, the testimonies from the Gaza hearings are de-territorialized – they are removed from the Palestinian sites where the events occurred and from the hall in Gaza (or Geneva) where they were originally performed.<sup>22</sup> These narratives exemplify the concept of 'moving testimonies': they are positioned in the American edition of the report to add an affective, humanizing dimension, which creates possibilities for audiences in the West to identify em-

---

<sup>21</sup> Webcasts of the hearings are available on a UNHRC webcast archive site: [www.un.org/webcast/unhrc/archive.asp?go=090628](http://www.un.org/webcast/unhrc/archive.asp?go=090628) (accessed 17 March 2014).

<sup>22</sup> For a discussion of territorialization and deterritorialization, see Kennedy et al. (2013).

pathically with Palestinians on the basis of a shared humanity, claimed through the presumed universality of bodily and psychological suffering, and especially, of grief at the destruction of families and the random deaths of civilians, especially children and the elderly. The circulatory matrix of human rights – the NGOs, the UN, activist networks, publishers, and the internet – move the testimonies materially and virtually across national borders. Both meanings of ‘moving’ – affective and literal – are crucial for soliciting the support of transnational publics that could increase scrutiny of Israel’s activities and potentially pressure Israel to change its behavior, for instance, through civil society initiatives such as the BDS campaign.

As a result of their publication in the United States, the testimonies were re-territorialized and even domesticated for an American audience. The process of domestication occurs through the selection of testimonies that are included in the report, how they are framed and edited, the discourses they use, and the tropes they exemplify – all of which humanizes Palestinians and potentially makes it easier for Americans to identify with them. Moussa Al-Silawi’s testimony, the first testimony in the American edition, is reported seamlessly in English, without any hesitations or repetitions in speech, no awkward English expressions, and no sign of translation, thereby erasing an important symbol of linguistic and cultural difference.<sup>23</sup> The testimonies included in the American edition foreground certain issues for an American audience while omitting others. For instance, Moteeh Al-Silawi’s testimony included disturbing and graphic details of dismembered bodies, which are omitted in the American edition.<sup>24</sup> What is included, however, is his appeal to a global public: “Where is the world? Where is international law? Is this what the Palestinian people deserve, our children screaming? Where are the Arab countries?” His condemnation of both Arab and Western nations may make his plea more acceptable to Americans. His testimony thus functions both as a reminder of a failure on behalf of the international community to prevent human rights abuses, and as prod to intervene in the ongoing conflict.

In human rights advocacy, the figure of the innocent child is “the humanist foundation stone” (Hapgood 2013, 69). Stephen Hapgood argues that the suffering child – “the central figure of liberal humanism” – is a “proxy for naturalness (guilelessness, blamelessness). In this way both compassion and justice can be anchored on the child. Nothing is more authentic” (71). Whereas the Israeli report that rebuts the Goldstone Report downplays the deaths of civilians (Meir Amit 2010), in the testimonies selected for the American edition the figure of the child –

<sup>23</sup> Excerpts from Moussa Al-Silawi’s testimony are printed in Horowitz et al. (2011, 15).

<sup>24</sup> Excerpts from Moteeh Al-Silawi’s testimony is included in Horowitz et al. (2011, 136).

who has been killed, dismembered, and orphaned as a result of the attack – is prominent. Moussa Al-Silawi, for example, articulates his shock explicitly in relation to the deaths of children: “I have lived 91 years, I have seen everything, but . . . I have never seen such a catastrophe. We see our children dead . . . We transport them to the hospital . . . and then we carried them to the cemetery.” His repeated references to children resonated with concerns about Israel’s assault on Gaza that were expressed in the media during the attack. By drawing attention to the killing of children and parents, and the shattering of family bonds, the Palestinian testimonies make a moral case that the IDF showed a reckless and callous disregard for Palestinian life and the families that sustain it. Images of the brutal separation of parent (usually the mother) and child – which following Clare Kahane I call ‘the familial trope’ – are often used to solicit identification and compassion from an audience (see Kahane 2001). The figure of the child and the familial trope work rhetorically to facilitate testimony as an “intercultural technology” that brings people together across cultural and social differences, positioning them in “relationship with one another in such a way that obligations are put into play and communities of solidarity are formed” (McLagan 2006, 193).

Another dimension of the American report – its implicit endorsement of psychology, and specifically trauma discourse – merits attention for its transnational reach. On the basis of his ethnographic research with humanitarian mental health workers in Palestine and Israel, Didier Fassin argues that a “new language of trauma” has replaced the language of oppression, and the image of the suffering victim has taken the place of the liberation fighters of the past (see Fassin 2008, 532). This new language “adds psychological and cultural representations to the political and moral representation of the facts” (Christian Lachal, as quoted in Fassin 2008, 532). In the political arena “trauma produces the suffering being just as humanitarianism produces the victim” – and in this way the presence of psychologists and psychiatrists enables and makes necessary a particular form of subjectification (Fassin 2008, 533). Fassin, together with Richard Rechtman, has analyzed the effects of teams of psychiatrists and psychologists, who see it as their task to bear witness to Palestinian suffering. They place the Palestinian case in the broader context of the development of humanitarian psychiatry, which, as a clinical and moral diagnosis, is used worldwide to communicate the suffering of victims to the world (Fassin and Rechtman, 2009). The forms of subjectivity that are produced through humanitarian psychiatry, in Palestine as elsewhere, enable individuals to exist not only as victims, but also politically. Indeed, victims are compelled to use the language of human rights and trauma if they hope to make political claims that have a chance of being heard in the transnational public sphere. This is precisely what we see in the testimony of Moussa and Mo-teh Al-Silawi.

Humanitarian psychiatrists and psychologists working in Gaza and Israel have been crucial in moving testimonies into the global public sphere. Fassin argues that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, especially since the second intifada, is “the site where the politics of testimony has relied most on psychiatrists and psychologists” (Fassin 2008, 535). Of the fourteen testimonies included in *The Nation’s* edition of the Goldstone Report, several are by psychiatrists and psychologists, working on both sides of the conflict. Dr. Rony Berger, for example, testifies that 28.4% of the population of Sderot, an Israeli town, “suffer from PTSD as a result of constant exposure to rocket fire from Hamas” (Horowitz et al. 2011, 53). Dr. Tawahina testifies that the Gaza war had “led to many, many psychological disorders, the treatment of which and the rehabilitation of the victims will need a very long time ...” (Horowitz et al. 2011, 37). “Recourse to the concept of trauma,” Fassin argues, “expand[s] the range of victims considerably... Potentially the entire Israeli population is susceptible to suffering from posttraumatic stress symptoms.” He adds a caveat: “But the farther away the individual is from the attack, the less clinical the description ...” (Fassin 2008, 550). In other words, the primary use of trauma discourse is not only or not even necessarily to achieve a clinical diagnosis. Rather, “to talk of suffering in order to speak about domination is to do morals and politics with new words” (Fassin 2008, 532). The Goldstone Report repeatedly uses the psychological language of trauma to draw attention to the long-term effects of violence on the affected populations. The mission, for example, states that it believes that “the Israeli armed forces arbitrarily prevented the evacuation of the wounded from the al-Samouni area, thereby causing ... severe psychological trauma in at least some of the victims, particularly children” (Horowitz et al. 2011, 124). Through such statements it legitimates trauma – “a new language of the event” – as the moral discourse for understanding and interpreting violence in our time. It does so, however, at the expense of speaking in the explicitly political terms associated with an older vocabulary of liberation struggle – a vocabulary of violence, domination, oppression and liberation (Fassin and Rechtman 2009).

The American edition of the Goldstone Report further domesticates Palestinian testimony for a US audience through its concluding essay, “Messages from Gaza,” by Laila El-Haddad. At the time of the assault on Gaza, El-Haddad was living in North Carolina with her husband and two young children. A journalist from Gaza, she is the author of a blog, “Gazamom,” and a memoir, *Gaza Mom: Palestine, Politics, Parenting and Everything in Between* (2010). Through her self-fashioning as “Gazamom,” El-Haddad positions herself as a ‘rooted cosmopolitan’ – tied to specific places but also crossing territorial and national borders. By joining together the American familial idiom ‘mom’ with the remote ‘Gaza,’ she brings her identities as Palestinian and American into intimate proximity, and

temporarily collapses the cultural, geographic and political distance between Gaza and the US.

During Operation Cast Lead, El-Haddad reported on her daily and sometime hourly conversations via Skype with her father and mother, moving seamlessly between the American domestic and the Gaza domestic under siege. Her essay opens with a poignant memory: “When I spoke to my father over Skype the night of January 16, 2009, from Durham, North Carolina, it was with the very real possibility that we might never see or speak to each other again. He was in his home in Gaza City, in the heart of Israel’s assault on Gaza” (El-Haddad 2011, 417). She tells readers that during the assault she and her father did back to back interviews on CNN, which legitimates their speaking positions in the United States. “I called my parents every hour; sometimes every few minutes when I saw renewed bombardment on my television screen, my eyes fixed on Al Jazeera English a good part of the day despite my son Yousuf’s nagging to switch to cartoons” (418). Skype brings distant places into intimate proximity; cartoons and missile strikes compete for visual space. When El-Haddad daughter’s first birthday occurred during the siege, she “couldn’t help but think: Who was born in bloodied Gaza on that day?” (419). Representing Palestinians in familial terms valued by Americans, El-Haddad challenges media images of Palestinians as anti-Western terrorists. Instead, Gaza becomes a place peopled with moms, dads, and kids, and Americans are invited to identify with their terror.

El-Haddad’s essay – a diary of transnational familial conversations during Operation Cast Lead – constitutes a personal and now public memory. While the first part humanizes Palestinians for an American audience, the second half provides a history lesson. El-Haddad explains that “Gaza is an occupied territory that has been subject to a premeditated, methodical siege since the free and fair parliamentary elections in 2006” (420). She proposes that “the siege is not about food and sustenance ... it is about freedoms: freedom to move in and out of Gaza ... freedom to learn, to work, to farm, to build, to live, to prosper.” Her strategic appeals to freedom, a cherished American value, create a basis for American readers to identify compassionately with Palestinians trapped in Gaza, and to respond to *The Goldstone Report’s* call “for action, for accountability” (421). The overwhelming message is one of Palestinian humanity and dignity: “we Palestinians are human, like you.”<sup>25</sup> Her essay – another example of how testimony functions as an ‘intercultural technology’ – invites Americans to demand that Israel respects Palestinian human rights to live in dignity and free from occupation.

---

25 For an incisive account of how life writers from conflict zones in the Middle East produce identification with Western audiences, see Whitlock (2007, 34–35).

The Goldstone Report, informed by the Holocaust paradigm and the global memory imperative, exemplifies the way memory travels transnationally. It has documented and publicized violations committed during Operation Cast Lead, it has contributed to collective memory, and it has attracted significant publicity transnationally. But to return to the question I asked earlier, how effective is the Goldstone Report as a form of transnational memory in achieving the ultimate end of human rights – to end human rights abuses against Palestinians? Here, the concept of the transnational public sphere may provide some insight into the obstacles blocking the effectiveness of the human rights regime.

## **Conclusion: the transnational public sphere and the limits of memory**

The concept of transnational memory implies, as its corollary, a transnational public sphere. Michael Warner (2002) argues that a public exists by virtue of being addressed, and that “texts that can be picked up at different times and in different places by otherwise unrelated people” are “crucial in constructing publics” (51). As texts that publicize violations and shape public opinion, human rights reports such as the Goldstone Report address “otherwise unrelated people” and thereby bring into being a transnational humanitarian public. As Nancy Fraser (2007) has argued, the concept of the public sphere has implicitly assumed a Westphalian frame, in which the public sphere was “a bounded political community with its own territorial state” (8). As was evident in the case of the Goldstone Report, however, “current mobilizations of public opinion seldom stop at the borders of territorial states” (Fraser 2007, 14). Thus, public sphere theory and memory studies are both confronting significant conceptual and empirical issues as they shift focus from a national to a transnational frame. It may therefore be beneficial to memory studies to consider how public sphere theory responds to the challenges raised by the transnational as a field of operation.

Fraser argues that while the concept of a transnational public sphere is today both taken for granted and empirically plausible, it poses conceptual challenges to the theory of the public sphere. The public sphere has been envisioned as a site for democratic discussion of ideas that do not necessarily agree with those of the national government. In the political theory of democracy, a public sphere is concerned with the legitimacy and efficacy of “public opinion as a political force” (Fraser 2007, 7). In this context, “publicity is supposed to hold officials accountable and to assure that the actions of the state express the will of the citizenry. Thus, a public sphere should correlate with a sovereign power” (7). These issues

go to the very heart of the legitimacy and efficacy of a transnational regime such as human rights, which works to generate public opinion in contexts in which the interlocutors are not fellow members of a national political community. For instance, in the case of the Gaza conflict, transnational public opinion is mobilized not to hold Israel accountable to its citizens, but rather, to the moral standards of global civil society (8). But how effective is the transnational public sphere, supported by the human rights regime, in pressuring a sovereign power? Fraser observes that rather than “institutionalizing debate among citizens who share a common status as political equals, post-Westphalian publicity appears in the eyes of many observers to empower transnational elites, who possess the material and symbolic prerequisites for global networking” (11). This criticism has been repeatedly leveled at the human rights industry, which despite its ubiquitous presence in the occupied Palestinian territories, has failed to alleviate Palestinian suffering and end the occupation.

Rather than jettison the concept of a transnational public sphere, Fraser proposes that it needs to be reformulated to take account of the conditions that prevail in a post-Westphalian world. To this end, she articulates the “all-affected principle:” in a transnational world, “public opinion is legitimate if and only if it results from a communicative process in which all potentially affected can participate as peers, regardless of political citizenship” (Fraser 2007, 11). In the case of the Gaza conflict, this would mean that Palestinians, even though they are stateless, should participate as peers in a communicative process of making claims of abuses and constructing memories that circulate in the transnational public sphere. The public hearings held by the Goldstone Mission enabled Palestinians some small participation, not simply as victims but as political subjects, in the process of generating public opinion about the conflict, and demanding that Israel, and indeed ‘the world,’ be held accountable.

What relevance do these observations have for transnational memory studies? Levy and Sznajder presume that memories of atrocity, and I have argued, the circulation of testimonies of ongoing violations, will generate publicity and a response from global civil society. “Publicity,” Ignatieff points out (2003, 53), “is only effective to the extent that others report and care about the exposed shortcomings of the government in question.” In the case of the Gaza conflict, documentation of human rights violations alone is not enough to compel international intervention. There are also geopolitical realities that determine whether nations or international bodies will intervene. Florian Hoffman argues that human rights discourse is now facing competition from an expanding “human security discourse” (2006, 403). Israel defends its punitive actions in Gaza on the grounds that Hamas poses a terrorist threat to Israel’s citizens, and Operation Cast Lead was necessary for Israel’s security. In a context in which human rights competes



with human security, it does not follow that scrutiny from the human rights regime is transforming Israel's national sovereignty – its sense of itself as an inviolable nation. Indeed, Israeli leaders have interpreted the Goldstone Report as an attack on the legitimacy of the nation itself and as an 'existential threat.' In its wake, the government of Israel has become more defensive, and demanded greater patriotic loyalty from its citizens to counteract international criticism, especially of the IDF. Moreover, to the extent that human rights actors and institutions support claims for a sovereign Palestinian nation, the human rights regime is not working against the concept of the nation-state or national sovereignty per se. Rather, it is working against the ways in which Israel invokes national sovereignty to oppress Palestinians and legitimate violence against them. It is also worth recalling that a nation's right to self-determination is a foundational principle of international law. Thus, what we see in human rights discourse is a tension between subverting nationalism in defense of universal rights and protecting nationalism as a state right. Nation-states would not, of course, join the international human rights system if their own rights were invalidated.

The American edition of the Goldstone Report, which addressed American readers both as citizens of the United States, and as potential members of a transnational public sphere, raises additional considerations concerning the effects of the transnational human rights regime on national sovereignty. The American edition aimed to generate public opinion and to spur debate not only on Israeli policies towards Palestinians, an issue that had long been censored in the United States by claims of anti-Semitism. It also invited debate on the American government's unconditional support for Israel. In lobbying the American government to change its policies on Israel, Americans operate as members a national public sphere. Their criticism of American support for Israel would need to go "through the institutions and agencies of the nation-state." Thus, a transnational network such as the human rights regime needs "to work with and through ... nationalism to achieve maximum political effectivity" (Cheah 2006, 43). Rather than human rights contributing to the demise of national sovereignty, as Levy and Sznajder propose, it may be more accurate to recognize that the publicity generated by human rights campaigns and reports is a case of "nationalism operating in a cosmopolitical [or transnational] force field" (Cheah 2006, 42). As members of a transnational public sphere, American readers could also choose to participate in global civil society initiatives, such as the BDS campaign, to pressure Israel to change its policies towards Gaza, but these campaigns also work, at least some of the time, on and through national governments.

Rather than assume that the human rights regime is transforming national sovereignty, then, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, as illustrated through the case of the Goldstone Report, compels us to consider the limits of the global mem-



ory imperative in a geopolitical system in which nation states still hold sovereign power. The Goldstone case, which generated significant publicity, demonstrates that human rights reports do indeed create a form of transnational memory of events. The Goldstone Report has been effective at producing a temporary mobilization of global civil society, as indicated by the *Blueprint for Accountability* event. Indeed, the growing BDS campaign against Israel suggests the possibility of a longer-term mobilization. Although the Holocaust paradigm was invoked both explicitly and implicitly in the Goldstone Mission, the global memory imperative – i.e. stimulating a public memory and awareness of human rights violations – did not achieve the intended aim of ending human rights violations and changing Israeli policy towards Palestinians in Gaza and the Occupied Territories. Referring to the human rights industry, Lori Allen asks a pressing question: “how [does] . . . a system that so obviously does not deliver on its promise continue to grow, functioning as if it could fulfill those ideals” (Allen 2013, 20)?

The optimistic claims of ‘never again’ – made for both the Holocaust paradigm and the global memory imperative – are clearly overstated. While the fact-finding mission public hearings did not lead to the prosecution of members of the IDF or Hamas for war crimes, the public hearings did create a testimonial archive of Palestinian and Israeli testimonies, which is now available to activists, filmmakers, writers and historians to mine for political purposes and for cultural memory. Contemporary technologies, such as live video streaming and audio and visual recording, have transformed these ‘live’ testimonies into recorded memories that are now preserved on the internet for posterity. In contributing to a local and global memory, this archive constitutes an important legacy of the Goldstone Mission. It can be used to preserve memory until such time as there is a national or transnational community ready to receive and act upon it (Gutman 2011). But this result is a far cry from the claims of preventing violations that are routinely made on behalf of the global memory imperative.

## References

- Allen, Lori. “Martyr Bodies in the Media: Human Rights, Aesthetics, and the Politics of Immediation in the Palestinian *Intifada*.” *American Ethnologist* 36.1 (2009a): 161–180.
- Allen, Lori. “Mothers of Martyrs and Suicide Bombers: The Gender of Ethical Discourse in the Second Palestinian *Intifada*.” *Arab Studies Journal* 17.1 (2009b): 32–61.
- Allen, Lori. “The Scales of Occupation: ‘Operation Cast Lead’ and the Targeting of the Gaza Strip.” *Critique of Anthropology* 32.3 (2012): 261–284.
- Allen, Lori. *The Rise and Fall of Human Rights: Cynicism and Politics in Occupied Palestine*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2013.

- Al-Silawi, Moteeh. Testimony 6. *The Goldstone Report: The Legacy of the Landmark Investigation of the Gaza Conflict*. Eds. Adam Horowitz, Lizzy Ratner, and Philip Weiss. New York: Nation Books, 2011. 136.
- Al-Silawi, Moussa. Testimony, presented in Gaza on [www.un.org/webcast/unhrc/archive.asp?go=090628](http://www.un.org/webcast/unhrc/archive.asp?go=090628) (accessed 30 December 2012).
- Al-Silawi, Moussa. Testimony 1. *The Goldstone Report: The Legacy of the Landmark Investigation of the Gaza Conflict*. Eds. Adam Horowitz, Lizzy Ratner, and Philip Weiss. New York: Nation Books, 2011. 15.
- Baxi, Upendra. "Voices of Suffering and the Future of Human Rights." *Transnational Law and Contemporary Problems* 128 (1998): 125–169.
- Cheah, Pheng. *Inhuman Conditions: On Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2006.
- Cohen, Stanley. "Government Responses to Human Rights Reports: Claims, Denials, and Counterclaims." *Human Rights Quarterly* 18. 3 (1996): 517–543.
- Douglas, Lawrence. *The Memory of Judgment: Making Law and History in the Trials of the Holocaust*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2001.
- Dudai, Ron. "Advocacy with Footnotes: The Human Rights Report as Literary Genre." *Human Rights Quarterly* 28 (2006): 783–795.
- El-Haddad, Laila. "Messages from Gaza." *The Goldstone Report: The Legacy of the Landmark Investigation of the Gaza Conflict*. Eds. Adam Horowitz, Lizzy Ratner, and Philip Weiss. New York: Nation Books, 2011. 417–421.
- El-Haddad, Laila. *Gazamom: Palestine, Parenting, Politics and Everything in Between*. Charlottesville: Just World Books, 2010.
- Erl, Astrid. "Travelling Memory." *Transcultural Memory*. Ed. Rick Crownshaw. Special Issue *Parallax* 17.4 (2011): 4–18.
- Falk, Richard. "The Goldstone Report: Ordinary Text, Extraordinary Event." *Global Governance* 16 (2010): 173–190.
- Falk, Richard. "What Future for the Goldstone Report? Beyond the Name." 20 April 2011. [richardfalk.wordpress.com/2011/04/20/what-future-for-the-goldstone-report-beyond-the-name/](http://richardfalk.wordpress.com/2011/04/20/what-future-for-the-goldstone-report-beyond-the-name/) (accessed 28 February 2014).
- Fassin, Didier. "The Humanitarian Politics of Testimony: Subjection Through Trauma in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict." *Cultural Anthropology* 23.3 (2008): 531–558.
- Fassin, Didier, and Richard Rechtman. *The Empire of Trauma: An Inquiry into the Condition of Victimhood*. Trans. Rachel Gomme. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2009.
- Felman, Shoshana. *The Juridical Unconscious: Trials and Traumas in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2002.
- Felman, Shoshana and Dori Laub. *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Fraser, Nancy. "Transnationalizing the Public Sphere: On the Legitimacy and Efficacy of Public Opinion in a Post-Westphalian World." *Theory, Culture and Society* 24.4 (2007): 7–30.
- Goldstone, Richard. "Reconsidering the Goldstone Report on Israel and War Crimes." *Washington Post*. 1 April 2011. [articles.washingtonpost.com/2011-04-01/opinions/35207016\\_1\\_drone-image-goldstone-report-israeli-evidence](http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2011-04-01/opinions/35207016_1_drone-image-goldstone-report-israeli-evidence) (accessed 17 January 2013).
- Goldstone, Richard. "From the Holocaust: Some Legal and Moral Implications." *Is the Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Comparative Genocide*. 2nd edn. Ed. Alan S. Rosenbaum. Boulder: Westview Press, 2001.

- Gutman, Yifat. "Transcultural Memory in Conflict: Israeli-Palestinian Truth and Reconciliation." *Transcultural Memory*. Ed. Rick Crownshaw. Special Issue *Parallax* 17.4 (2011): 61–74.
- Hapgood, Stephen. *The Endtimes of Human Rights*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2013.
- Hirsch, Marianne and Leo Spitzer. "The Witness and the Archive." *Memory: History, Theories, Debates*. Eds. S. Radstone and B. Schwarz. New York: Fordham UP, 2010. 390–405.
- Hoffmann, Florian F. "'Shooting into the Dark': Toward a Pragmatic Theory of Human Rights (Activism)." *Texas International Law Journal* 41.3 (2006): 403–414.
- Horowitz, Adam, Lizzy Ratner, and Philip Weiss, eds. *The Goldstone Report: The Legacy of the Landmark Investigation of the Gaza Conflict*. New York: Nation Books, 2011.
- Human Rights Watch. *Rain of Fire: Israel's Unlawful Use of White Phosphorus in Gaza*. New York: Human Rights Watch, 2009. [www.hrw.org/reports/2009/03/25/rain-fire](http://www.hrw.org/reports/2009/03/25/rain-fire) (accessed 15 April 2009).
- Ignatieff, Michael. "Human Rights, Sovereignty, and Intervention." *Human Rights, Human Wrongs: The Oxford Amnesty Lectures, 2001*. Ed. Nicholas Owen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.
- Jilani, Hina, Christine Chinkin, and Desmond Travers. "Goldstone Report: Statement Issued by Members of UN Commission on Gaza War." *The Guardian* 14 Apr. 2011. [www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/apr/14/goldstone-report-statement-un-gaza](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/apr/14/goldstone-report-statement-un-gaza) (accessed 28 April 2011).
- Kahane, Claire. "Dark Mirrors: A Feminist Reflection on Holocaust Narrative and the Maternal Metaphor." *Feminist Consequences: Theory for the New Century*. New York: Columbia UP, 2001. 161–188.
- Kennedy, Rosanne, Jonathan Zapanik, Hannah McCann, Miranda Bruce. "All Those Little Machines: Assemblage as Transformative Theory." *Australian Humanities Review* 55 (2013): 45–66.
- Kennedy, Rosanne. "Memory, History and the Law: Testimony and Collective Memory in Holocaust and Stolen Generations Trials." *Memory and History: Understanding Memory as Source and Subject*. Ed. Joan Tumblety. London: Routledge, 2013. 50–67.
- Khalidi, Rashid. "Palestinian Dispossession and the U.S. Public Sphere." *The Goldstone Report: The Legacy of the Landmark Investigation of the Gaza Conflict*. Eds. Adam Horowitz, Lizzy Ratner, and Philip Weiss. New York: Nation Books, 2011. 375–386.
- Khalili, Laleh. *Heroes and Martyrs of Palestine: The Politics of National Commemoration*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Klein, Naomi. "Introduction." *The Goldstone Report: The Legacy of the Landmark Investigation of the Gaza Conflict*. Eds. Adam Horowitz, Lizzy Ratner, and Philip Weiss. New York: Nation Books, 2011. xi–xvii.
- Landsberg, Alison. *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*. New York: Columbia UP, 2004.
- Levy, Daniel and Natan Sznajder. "Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5.1 (2002): 87–106.
- Levy, Daniel and Natan Sznajder. *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*. Trans. Assenka Oksiloff. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 2006.
- Levy, Daniel, and Natan Sznajder. *Human Rights and Memory*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2010.
- McLagan, Meg. "Principles, Publicity, and Politics: Notes on Human Rights Media." *American Anthropologist* 105.3 (2003): 609–612.
- McLagan, Meg. "Introduction: Making Human Rights Claims Public." *American Anthropologist* 108.1 (2006): 191–195.

- McLagan, Meg. "Human Rights, Testimony, and Transnational Publicity" *Nongovernmental Politics*. Eds. Michel Feher, Gaëlle Krikorian, and Yates McKee. New York: Zone Books, 2007. 304–317.
- Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Centre. *Hamas and the Terrorist Threat from the Gaza Strip: The Main Findings of the Goldstone Report versus the Factual Findings*. Israeli Intelligence and Heritage Commemoration Centre, March 2010.
- Mondoweiss, "What the Goldstone Op-ed Doesn't Say." *Mondoweiss* 5 April 2011. [mondoweiss.net/2011/04/what-the-goldstone-op-ed-doesn't-say.html](http://mondoweiss.net/2011/04/what-the-goldstone-op-ed-doesn-t-say.html) (accessed 18 January 2013).
- Montell, Jessica. "Beyond Goldstone: A Truer Discussion about Israel, Hamas and the Gaza Conflict." *Washington Post Opinions* 5 April 2011. [articles.washingtonpost.com/2011-04-05/opinions/35230405\\_1\\_goldstone-report-judge-richard-goldstone-israel](http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2011-04-05/opinions/35230405_1_goldstone-report-judge-richard-goldstone-israel) (accessed 18 January 2013).
- Pilkington, Ed. and Conal Urquhart. "UN Gaza Report Authors Round on Goldstone." *The Guardian* 14 April 2011. [www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/apr/14/un-gaza-report-authors-goldstone](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/apr/14/un-gaza-report-authors-goldstone) (accessed 28 April 2011).
- Pogrebin, Letty Cottin. "The Unholy Assault on Richard Goldstone." *The Goldstone Report: The Legacy of the Landmark Investigation of the Gaza Conflict*. Eds. Adam Horowitz, Lizzy Ratner, and Philip Weiss. New York: Nation Books, 2011. 409–416.
- Rothberg, Michael. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2009.
- Rothberg, Michael. "Beyond Tancred and Clorinda: Trauma Theory for Implicated Subjects." *The Future of Trauma Theory*. Eds. Gert Buelens, Sam Durrant, and Robert Eaglestone. London: Routledge, 2013. xi–xviii.
- Sarkar, Bhaskar and Janet Walker, ed. *Documentary Testimony: Global Archives of Suffering*. New York and London: Routledge, 2010.
- Sourani, Raji. "The Right to Live in Dignity." *The Goldstone Report: The Legacy of the Landmark Investigation of the Gaza Conflict*. Eds. Adam Horowitz, Lizzy Ratner, and Philip Weiss. New York: Nation Books, 2011. 329–336.
- Tutu, Desmond. "Foreword: A Call to the Community of Conscience." *The Goldstone Report: The Legacy of the Landmark Investigation of the Gaza Conflict*. Eds. Adam Horowitz, Lizzy Ratner, and Philip Weiss. New York: Nation Books, 2011. vii–ix.
- UN. *Human Rights in Palestine and Other Occupied Arab Territories: Report of the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict*. Human Rights Council Twelfth Session [A/HRC/12/28]. 29 September 2009. [www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/12session/A-HRC-12-48.pdf](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/12session/A-HRC-12-48.pdf) (accessed 28 February 2014).
- Warner, Michael. "Publics and Counterpublics." *Public Culture* 14.1 (2002): 49–90.
- Whitlock, Gillian. *Soft Weapons: Autobiography in Transit*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Wieviorka, Annette. *The Era of Witness*. Trans. J. Stark. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2006.
- Wilson, Richard. "Representing Human Rights Violations: Social Contexts and Subjectivities." *Human Rights, Culture, and Context: Anthropological Perspectives*. Ed. Richard Wilson. London: Pluto Press, 1997. 134–160.

**Martijn Eickhoff** is Senior Researcher at the NIOD (Netherlands Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies) in Amsterdam and a lecturer in cultural history at the Radboud University Nijmegen (RUN). His research focuses on the politics of memory and archaeology particularly in times of regime change and political violence. He has published widely on the role of academics in the Third Reich and Nazi-occupied Europe. He is currently preparing, in collaboration with Marieke Bloembergen, a book on archaeology and heritage in colonial and post-colonial Indonesia.

**Astrid Erll** is Professor of Anglophone Literatures and Cultures at Goethe-University Frankfurt am Main. She has written monographs on memories of the First World War and of British colonialism in India. She is co-editor (with A. Nünning) of *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies* (De Gruyter, 2010) and (with A. Rigney) of *Mediation, Remediation, and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory* (De Gruyter, 2009). She is author of *Memory in Culture* (Palgrave 2011)/*Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen* (2005, 2nd ed. 2011), widely-used introductions to memory studies.

**Stephan Feuchtwang** is Professor Emeritus in the Department of Anthropology, London School of Economics. He has published books on Chinese popular religion, feng-shui, and (with Wang Mingming) on grassroots charisma in southern Fujian and northern Taiwan. His comparative study of the transmission of great events of state violence in China, Taiwan, and Germany was published in *After the Event* (Berghahn Books, 2011). Together with Michael Rowlands he is completing a long-term comparative project which reworks the notion of civilizations in terms of polycentric spreads and mixtures rather than as cultures that clash.

**Slawomir Kapralski** is Professor of Sociology in the Center for Social Studies at the Graduate School for Social Research, Warsaw and a researcher at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences. His research focuses on Roma memory and the memory of the Holocaust in Poland. He has published in *History & Memory* and *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* among other journals. His most recent book (2012, in Polish, English title: *A Nation from the Ashes: Memory of Genocide and Roma Identity*) examines the consequences of the Holocaust for Roma communities in Europe. He also co-authored *Roma in Auschwitz* (2011), published (in English) by the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum.

**Rosanne Kennedy** is Associate Professor of Literature and Gender, Sexuality and Culture at the Australian National University. Her research interests include trauma, testimony, and memory and its remediations in cultural, literary, and hu-

man rights texts and contexts. Her articles have appeared in numerous journals including *Comparative Literature Studies*, *Biography*, *Studies in the Novel*, *Women's Studies Quarterly*, *Australian Humanities Review* and *Profession*. She edited with Susannah Radstone a special issue of *Memory Studies* on “Memory Studies in Australia” (July 2013). She is currently leading a Go8/DAAD project on “Memory and its Media.”

**Gal Kirn** is currently a Humboldt Postdoctoral Fellow at Humboldt Universität in Berlin. His dissertation in political philosophy at the University of Nova Gorica combined contemporary French philosophy with the history of the emergence of socialist Yugoslavia and its tragic break-up. He is co-editor of the books *Encountering Althusser* (Bloomsbury, 2012) and *Yugoslav Black Wave Cinema and its Transgressive Moments* (JvE Academie, 2012), and editor of *Postfordism and its Discontents* (JvE Academie, 2010).

**Susanne Küchler** is Professor of Anthropology and Material Culture at University College London. She has conducted ethnographic fieldwork in Papua New Guinea and Eastern Polynesia over the past 25 years, studying memory, creativity, innovation and futurity in political economies of knowledge from a comparative perspective. Her publications include *Malanggan: Art, Memory and Sacrifice* (Berg, 2002) and *Tivaivai: The Social Fabric of the Cook Islands* (British Museum Press, 2009). She is currently working on a new book entitled *The Material Mind*.

**Susan Legêne** is Professor of Political History at the Free University, Amsterdam, and former head of the Curatorial Department at the Tropenmuseum in Amsterdam. As leader of the CLUE-program “Global History and Heritage in a Post-Colonial World,” her research focuses on citizenship and the cultural meaning of the colonial past in processes of nation-building since the nineteenth century, and on the impact and meaning of digitally mediated public history (see [www.ghhpw.com](http://www.ghhpw.com)). In *The Netherlands East-Indies at the Tropenmuseum: A Colonial History* (Amsterdam KIT Publishers, 2011), co-edited with Janneke van Dijk, she explores the museum's many cultural sources for political history.

**Adrian Paci** is one of the most active artists in the contemporary international art scene. Born in 1969 in Shkoder, Albania, in 1997 he moved to Milan where he currently lives and works. He has held solo shows in institutions such as Trondheim Kunstmuseum, Norway (2014); MAC, Musée d'Art Contemporain de Montréal (2014); Padiglione d'Arte Contemporanea – PAC, Milan (2014); Jeu de Paume, Paris (2013); Kunsthaus Zurich (2010); and MoMA PS1, New York (2006). Among many group shows, Paci's work has been featured in the 14th International Architecture