

Karolina Ćwiek-Rogalska
Institute of Slavic Studies,
Polish Academy of Sciences
karolina.cwiek-rogalska@ispan.waw.pl
ORCID: 0000-0001-6142-5609

Data przesłania tekstu do redakcji: 17.06.2020
Data przyjęcia tekstu do druku: 01.09.2020

Archiving in the Face of Erasure: the Idea of the “Post-German” Archive

ABSTRACT: Ćwiek-Rogalska Karolina, *Archiving in the Face of Erasure: the Idea of the “Post-German” Archive*. “Poznańskie Studia Slawistyczne” 19. Poznań 2020. Publishing House of the Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences, Adam Mickiewicz University, pp. 77–100. ISSN 2084-3011.

The article introduces the notion of the “post-German” archive as an idea for further research on the erased cultures of Central Europe. The author questions the hierarchical and top-down structure of the institutionalized archive. Instead, she proposes to understand the “post-German” archive as an inclusive conception. It would incorporate various narratives, languages, and perspectives. In this way, the canonization of given motives can be avoided. The author pays special attention to the responsibility of the researcher. She illustrates the theoretical framework with examples from Polish and Czech archival practices.

KEYWORDS: archive; post-German; erasure; expulsion; Central Europe

1. Introduction

“That is impossible,” says the archivist, looking at my order. “This particular collection is not here, it is in Międzyzdroje.” I ask, then, if I can order it anyway. “Yes, you may,” the reply is fast and certain to the extent of giving me some hope, “but it will be here in three weeks, at the earliest.” The voice from another cabinet – the voice of the second archivist – adds: “Międzyzdroje is 120 kilometres from Szczecin!” I do not give up yet. “I have been here for two weeks,” I say, “so there is a chance it will make it in time?” “Well, no,” replies the first archivist. “It is 120 kilometers!” shouts the other one once again, invisible but vocal. “And you cannot go to Międzyzdroje yourself,” adds the first one,

with some satisfaction in his voice, “because there is no reading room there.”¹

This scene happened to me in one of the branches of the Polish State Archive (Polish *Archiwum Państwowe*) two years ago, when I was collecting records for one of my works concerning forced migration of German-speaking communities from the regions incorporated into Poland in 1945, looking for documents, hoping to find these “tear[s] in the fabric of time, unplanned glimpse[s] offered into an unexpected event” (Farge, 2015, 6). And this anecdote illustrates what a traditional archive is: a monolingual, top-down, closed, and hierarchical institution, understood more as a passive repository than an active resource ready to be used (Sleiman, Chebaro, 2018). For me, the voice, tone, and words of the archival clerk were closing the possibility to look into one, hopefully fruitful, collection. How many of such little scenes happen every day at every archive, engraved in brick and mortar, around the world? It has nothing to do with this well-known feeling of not being able to finish your work because there will always be something “unread, unnoted, untranscribed” left (Steedman, 2001, 18). It has nothing to do with an archive as a metaphor, and a lot with its very literal and concrete structure, a “space where those involved with the historical disciplines engage with material objects” (Manoff, 2004, 18). As such, it has also a lot in common with epistemic violence. The origin of the term, as well as the terms describing the authorities over the archive, are rooted in the Greek word *arkheion*. Originally it meant “a house [...] of the superior magistrates, the archons, those who commanded. [...] The archons are first of all the documents’ guardians. They do not only ensure the physical security of what is deposited and of the substrate. They are also accorded the hermeneutic right and competence. They have the power to interpret the archives” (Derrida, 1995, 1–2). The archons in the scene described above

¹ This story also unveils the double-edge of the archival epistemic violence. This time it concerns the archives and their employees. On the one hand, the modern archons are in theory powerful. On the other, they are often underfunded. Therefore, in a capitalist society, their status is lower when it comes to authority or a sole position within society. Based on this example, we can reformulate the Derridian idea of the archons, using the Latin maxim “quis custodiet ipsos custodes.” I would like to thank one of the Reviewers for the remark on the financial and HR realities of the Polish system, and Adriana Kovacheva for the valuable discussion on the subject.

demonstrated their power in these Derridian terms. The violence is thus inherently embedded in such a notion of the archive (Derrida, 1995, 7). Therefore, the archive is not simply a neutral gathering of documents, it could be a tool of oppression on service not only of government but also of various institutions and ideologies. This also applies to other institutions which were established at the same time with the “collecting *mentalité* and reverence for a distant past,” such as “museums, galleries, libraries, archives – even zoos” (Cook, 2011, 604). All of them are “deeply engaged in constructing cultural memory” (Cook, 2011, 611) of a given nation.

In the archival discourse, the meaning of the archive, as well as various disciplinary points of view wherefrom we are looking at it, are complex and complicated (Manoff, 2004, 18). Following that statement, my article aims at the question of how the archive can help us with looking into the cultures of the erased societies which had a great impact on West Slavonic cultures, and were disappeared in the course of forced migrations after 1945. In particular, I aim at how this goal would be achievable through the creation of a particular kind of archive: what I will call a “post-German” archive.² I believe the answer is possible if we understand the archive as the Foucauldian “system of discursivity that establishes the possibility of what can be said” (Manoff, 2004, 18). As a result, the archive that I denote

²The vague notion of what is “post-German” (“formerly German,” *poniemieckie*) in the Polish case firstly appeared in the decree of March 8, 1946 that concerned “abandoned and post-German property” (*Dekret z dn. 8 marca 1946 r. o majątkach opuszczonych i poniemieckich*). In the Czech case there is no such adjective and instead one can say that something was “left behind by Germans” (*zůstalo po Němcích*). In order to create a coherent narrative on the identity of the new inhabitants of the regions, in both countries it followed a process of negotiation where the “third” category (not Polish or Czech vs German) was applied. This category bears the name of “post-Germanness” / “former Germanness.” Additionally, the term “post-German” in Polish bears some semblance to the adjective “post-Jewish” (*pożydowski*) with using the prefix “po” (“post”) to “denote something that no longer exists in the same place” (Weizman, 2017, 39). As Yechezkel Weizman further suggests, in the aforementioned decree the property that was labelled “abandoned” should be in fact understood as “Jewish.” The decree regulated the property earlier confiscated by the Germans, and “in occupied Poland only Jewish property as such was officially confiscated by the Germans” (Weizman, 2017, 36). It was, therefore, the decree on “post-Jewish” as well as on “post-German” property, where both terms denoted not so much legal, as symbolic status of the property in question, establishing a new language of appropriation (Weizman, 2017, 39) and producing “a moral economy that justified the wartime and post-war taking of Jewish property in a very concrete sense” (Meng, 2011, 50).

as “post-German” should not be considered as an institution, but rather as an idea, enabling us to look differently at what is stored already in various institutions in Poland, Czechia, and Germany. I address auxiliary questions to help me explain the idea: What for we need the archive in the case of the research on the expelled Germans? How the “post-German” archive should look like? What is the role of materiality in such an archive? And finally, what is the task of the researcher in that particular case?

I want to contribute to the discussion from another point of view, as some scholars have already acknowledged the lack of interdisciplinary studies within the archival discourse. It results in “seeing the archive studies as a *‘maiden to history’*” and “scholars [...] largely not taking part in the same conversations, not speaking the same conceptual languages, and not benefiting from each other’s insights” (Caswell, 2016; on the historian-archivist relationship, v. Cook, 2011). I believe that anthropological knowledge contributes to this discourse and extends the framework of what can be said. “Good academics” (Perry, 2005, 339) in the case of archival research would, therefore, be not only historians (v. Perry, 2005, 340) but also representatives of other disciplines, such as cultural and social anthropology, ethnology or cultural studies – or what is nowadays to be named “studies of culture and religion” in official Polish administrative discourse. Using a more anthropological approach would allow the historical archival discourse to extend beyond its positivist roots that are still present, as well as contribute to decolonization of the archive, where the archive is “a muse to the nation and the state and the practical keeper of the empire” (Perry, 2005, 340). Archiving, in a colonial sense, rely on our conviction that we need the completeness of knowledge, its extensiveness, and that what is outside of the archive is not important and not worth remembering. On the contrary: to fully use the archive in the case I describe, we have to embrace the incompleteness. Only then the understandings of memory, history, forced migration, settlement, and witnessing would be understandable.

This article is an outcome of the interdisciplinary research initiative “Archive of the Disappeared” for the study of communities, spaces and cultures that have been destroyed through mass violence, initiated by Mezna Qato, Yael Navaro, Chana Morgenstern and Mahvish Ahmad of the University of Cambridge, at the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social

Sciences and Humanities (CRASSH). There, we were dealing with the primary question of what one can do in the absence of the archive, as well as with the impossibility of research in the case of spaces of annihilation. One of the forms of remembrance in the face of erasure is archiving, making an institutionalized archive. As a result, spaces of annihilation produce a counter-erasure, connected with the immediate impulse to collect, resulting in a kind of the “archive fever.” Owing to this contradiction, the archive is not memory set in stone but a *hypomnema*, a reminder, a kind of artificial memory (Michałowska, 2012; Reale, 1997), “an outside memory” (Ather, 2019, 163). The “domesticated” archive “has come to serve as a shorthand for memory” (Enwezor, 2008, 35), but of a particular kind: a prosthetic memory (Derrida, 1995, 11). Which is to say, these two activities: archiving and destructing, are even more connected with each other because making an archive assumes the oncoming destruction in a sense that we will need the archive to remember something that will be destroyed in the future. The matter of how to make something out of annihilation was answered by Derrida with his notion of the Freudian idea of the death drive: we know that we are mortal and we feel the desire to archive our world for the future, beyond our mortality. Therefore, the death drive is a creative force behind the archive fever (Derrida, 1995, 19). We can go even further and argue that we feel a desire to archive the world of others to make the sense out of it in a quiet, closed space of the archive, to domesticate it, and to subdue it to “our” logic.

The cases I would like to exemplify the theoretical framework with, are based on my experience with archives in Poland and Czechia (understood as a part of former Czechoslovakia). I would like to propose to think from a particular part of the world about the wider issue, even if one is not a regional specialist. In both countries, the archives that were left by Germans were incorporated into the new network of either Polish or Czech(oslovak) archives respectively, along with new sources, produced by the settlers who came – or were forced to come (Spurný, 2011; Tomczak, 2006) – in the place of the expellees, and the documents issued by the newly formed Communist governments. It means that what happened after the forced migration is the part of the post-German archival story. The settlement of the “recovered” lands, understood as a reconfiguration of society after the expulsion, formed archives of its own, and the social construction of this

concrete past is to be achieved through the archives. Therefore, in the case under scrutiny, the logic behind archiving would be a settler-colonial logic of a particular kind.

I argue that the conception of the post-German archive can help us show as a process (Danowski, Viveiros de Castro, 2017) the disaster of forced migrations and the annihilation of the seven centuries old German-speaking cultures of Central Europe. It is not surprising that archives can help us collecting facts, put forward answers to question such as “how did that village look like in the 1930s?,” “what was located in that ruined building where the weathered sign is still visible?” or “who lived in the house of my grandparents before they came to replace that person?” Nevertheless, I propose not to seek in the archive the evidence but knowledge (Young, 1987) since the “evidence is precisely that which is not self-evident,” and the “evidence is always a question” (Keenan, 2018, 12).

Is that particular memory re-producible? The archive is “a model of auxiliary representation” (Derrida, 1995, 92). So we have to remember that whatever emerges out of the archive is not a proper past, but the social construction, with the official historiography built around it. In a result, something is always erased in that process. What is disappeared is then nowhere and everywhere, and as such “the disappearance might have occurred in the past, but the disappeared is always present” (Ather, 2019, 160). The matter that I present is then not a question of the past, but a very contemporary matter, and even “a question of the future, the question of the future itself, the question of a response, of a promise and a responsibility for tomorrow” (Derrida, 1995, 36). In this way, the project of the post-German archive can be applied to similar problems as those described and analysed in this text. Similar occurrences happened not only in Central Europe, the region where mass displacement and genocide took place in the 20th century, resulting in the erasure or forced migration of various cultures (e.g. the culture of the Jewish population in Poland or the Polish population in today’s Ukraine). The disappearance of memory, as well as the need to restore it, does not only concern the displaced German communities, although they are the subject of my text.

2. What we need the archive for in the case of research on the expelled Germans?

After having explored the conceptions present in the archival discourse, let's see how the archive as an institution looks like. "Archives are not unproblematic storehouses of records awaiting the historian, but active sites of agency and power" (Cook, 2011, 601), they are "a representation of the taxonomy, classification, and annotation of knowledge and information" (Enwezor, 2008, 16), but the archive is not a closed form *per se*. It could be also defined "as a field of archaeological inquiry, a journey through time and space" (Enwezor, 2008, 16). In general, we tend to use this term in the first sense, because we like to neaten our archives.

This "act of consigning through gathering together signs" aims to achieve "an ideal configuration" (Derrida, 1995, 3). Such orderliness gives stories we have gathered a narrative form, and here memory, history, and archive meet. However, not everything can be put into a narrative form, "like sensory recollections or itemized lists" (Sa'di, Abu-Lughod, 2007, 22). Therefore, we should not treat documents as an orderly narrative, bearing in mind the notion of history as a social construction (Farge, 2015, 86). It is the archivist, the historian, the researcher that establishes the narrative, using rhetorical means (Erl, 2005, 42). But the orderliness is a tool of power that can be used by various social and political actors (Maksudyan, 2009, 636). In a beautifully carved metaphor of the archive as a scene, Arlette Farge compares the archive to the theatre and the process of dealing with the archival records to "unveiling a drama" of particular actors who are protagonists of the collections we are looking into. Here, then, we have to do with a particular play "with truth as with reality" (Farge, 2015, 27). In other words, the archive has creative power and allows us to create not only historiographies but also other forms, of "self-conscious fiction[s]" (Enwezor, 2008, 36). The process is noticeable during different stages of the creation of the archive and unveils what has been silenced as a result "of uneven power in the production of history" (Ghaddar, Caswell, 2019, 76). These stages include the making of sources when we create the facts; the making of archives when we assemble the facts; the making of narratives when we retrieve the facts; and finally, the making of history in the final instance when we give a retrospective to the significance (Trouillot, 1995, 27).

If Enwezor is right and in the Eastern Bloc there was a “collectivization of memory” after 1945 (Enwezor, 2008, 37), the previous great impact of German cultures on the formation of Czech and Polish cultural identity was to be erased from the archive as it was gradually erased from the outside reality (Halicka, 2015; Linek, 1997; Świder, 2001). By “the impact of German cultures on the formation of either Czech or Polish cultural identity,” I mean that both cultures were created either in the direct opposition to German culture (Macura, 1995) or in an “overlapping, interweaving and asymmetric” (Hahn, Traba, 2017, 11) contact with each other.

If we follow Derrida’s claim on the dual nature of the archive – where “the archive is made possible by the death, aggression, and destruction drive, that is to say also by [...] expropriation” (Derrida, 1995, 94) – in the first step towards the concept of the post-German archive we have to acknowledge that it is possible only because of the disaster that proceeds it. Without the expulsion, there would not be a need for any such archive, ever. The erasure of the German-speaking cultures from Central Europe meant not only to put them into oblivion but also to cover their traces, claiming the lands were always primary Slavic and to actively destroy anything that was left (Kobyliński, Rutkowska, 2005). Therefore, to reach whatever is post-German in the officially preserved documents, one has to make use of the “creative reading of state documents” (Fraser, Todd, 2016). It sends us back to the notion of archiving as an activity that causes disappearance, deciding what is worth preserving and what should be removed from the archive. As such, archiving is a colonial practice, reproducing the settler-colonial logic (on decolonization vis-à-vis the archive, v. more: Mbembe, 2020; Perry, 2005). This particular logic, based on the territorial behests, is making the land extracted and the population reduced. The lands claimed to be Slavic are more important than people who inhabit them then and now. Therefore, I would like to introduce the concept of the post-German archive in a form of instruction, divided into four steps.

The first step in thinking about the post-German archive is the importance of its inclusiveness “for narrative of usually marginalized groups” (Sleiman, Chebaro, 2018, 66). But here lurks another danger: a bourgeois nostalgia where narratives of some groups of expellees or settlers appropriate the representation of the lands as a paradise lost and exclude the other groups and different motivations of contemporary residents of the regions

resettled after 1945. As a result, it blurs “the discontinuities of this history and fails to illustrate the heterogeneity of hardly comparable experiences” (Adjemian, Suciyan, 2017, 19). Such danger is not unknown to different communities in the world that had to face the problem of self-preservation of a culture after the erasure in the new context, e.g. in Palestine (Sa’di, Abu-Lughod, 2007, 20) or Armenia (Adjemian, Suciyan, 2017, 19). Although there is often a narrative on the “discourse of expellees,” it does not mean that such discourse is shared by all those who have the experience of forced displacement (Nosková, 2016, 32). In the case of German expellees, some additional factors play an important role, such as the externalization of the feeling of guilt and the internalization of the Holocaust as the central point of national memory (Uhl, 2008, 157).

Owing to the complexity of the matter, the “post-German” archive should then “reveal the plurality of the culture pre-displacement” and “not be a response to the policies of narratives present post-displacement” (Sleiman, Chebaro, 2018, 72–73). Therefore, I continue to use the “post-German” as a descriptive adjective: it would emphasize not only what is “German” but also, with the prefix “post,” include into the story another side: the Czech and Polish settlers.³ Undeniably, history is partial and written by the victors (Gilloch, 2002; Hastrup, 1997; Kracauer, 1995), here, however, lies a paradox of the post-German archive. The settlers who should be regarded as victors were not a homogeneous group: some of them could have felt as victims similarly as the German expellees (Głowacka-Grajper, 2016; Praczyk, 2018; Tomczak, 2006) and they were victors only by name. This particular settlers’ situation is therefore paradoxical: if someone was displaced – even if they were in the position of acquiring something that was left behind by the previous owners – they could also feel a loss: they were uprooted and willing to re-create their memories of the settlement. Their victory lied in their presence in places wherefrom the others – the defeated – were forced to leave. Their stories were, as it seems, written by someone else, partially at least until 1989. It does not mean that we have no access to their memories: through various diaries that were sent to different

³The compound nature of the settlement is a well-known phenomenon and in both countries into the group belonged not only the representatives of Polish or Czech ethnicity. There were Roma, Slovaks, so-called re-emigrants from abroad, and others.

waves of contests for the diaries in case of Poland (Praczyk, 2018, 93–125) and in Czechoslovakia (Nosková, 2016, 24–25) we can access their mediated memories. Nevertheless, the settlers even as random victors still bear their “settler guilt” (Wolf, 1999). With their presence, the settler colonialism – understood as “a structure and not a finite event in time” (Ghaddar, Caswell, 2019, 73) – comes to the fore, and we cannot deny the question of colonialism in the case of the post-German archive.

Yet, although colonial administration usually produces a lot of documentation, in the case of the post-German lands it is a bit different. The administrators were trying to produce the documentation but often failed because of the high illiteracy, inability of the settlers to produce documents that were desired, and the freshly established frameworks of the new socialist system. In other words: the settlers did not know what they were expected to do. Here we can see a clear-cut clash between the activities of the alleged victors and the authoritarian state. “Becoming a community is a result of a historical process” (Adjemian, Suciyan, 2017, 2) and not a forced effort. Therefore, the memories of the settlers tell us about the present, not only the past, as well as they tell us how memories are produced (Praczyk, 2018). As a result, it would reveal “what people choose to make public, under what conditions, and with what forms of receptivity by others” (Sa’di, Abu-Lughod, 2007, 8). Therefore, it is no longer only the question of “I in the history” but also of “the history in me” (Mitterauer, 1991, 18).

The second step that should be taken would be to acknowledge the phenomenon of “canonization” (Hammer, 2001, 470) “of some stories and symbols” (Sa’di, Abu-Lughod, 2007, 7). Established representations are created by people or organizations that have the means to spread them successfully, and the organizations of expellees, as Jana Nosková noted, were among the politically very active groups in post-war Germany and were able to create the media through which they could spread their interpretations of the expulsion. Such a narrative never gained its uniform counterpart on the Czech(oslovak) or Polish side. Instead, the Communists prepared their narration that was not fully internalized by the settlers. In contrast, the organizations of the German expellees were able to present themselves to the public as representing all of the forcibly displaced (Franzen, 2008, 62; Nosková, 2016, 31).

There are several ways how to prevent us from the enchantment of such “canonization.” If we acknowledge that “[t]he archive is a vantage point from which the symbolic and intellectual constructions of the past can be rearranged” (Farge, 2015, 96), we can deconstruct particular images from the past, coming from both sides. Let’s illustrate the case with a tangible example. I will analyse iconic pictures (Liulevicius, 2010; Władyniak, 2019) of Germans fleeing from East Prussia, and then the set of photographs of new Polish settlers, rebuilding a ruined city of Koszalin (German Köslin in Pomerania, one of the cities that were incorporated into Poland after 1945). Both sets of images emerge out of “geographic nostalgia” (Davis, 2007, 54) for a lost place, although the place differs. They associate the land with a life before the critical change. In the case of the expellees, it would be the expulsion where the fierce nature of East Prussia is at once the greatest obstacle in finding shelter and safety and the mark of its uniqueness. In the case of the settlers, it would be the idyllic youth, although it was spent among ruins and in hard working conditions, but with the underpinning conviction about building the new world. Therefore, there is the underlying idealization of what both groups no longer have (or even what they have never had). The place becomes equivalent to a lost lifestyle since the actual physical space is maintained mostly by memories (Davis, 2007, 54). Therefore, while using photography as a source we should acknowledge that photos are also historical actors and that they should be valued for “the impact of the image on the historical imagination,” and not only as pure evidence (Adjemian, Suciyan, 2017, 6).

Let’s now compare the two aforementioned sets of photography. First, stored in the German Bundesarchiv, presents Germans fleeing their home during the late evacuation of East Prussia. The approach of the Red Army along with the reports on the inhuman cruelty of the soldiers hustled over two million people to seek help in uncoordinated and dangerous flight from their homes in the winter of 1945. The winter landscapes are the first to catch the eye of the beholder: the *Flüchtlinge* are marching through the snow blizzards, frozen lakes, and rivers while wearing heavy winter clothes. The trees are encrusted with rime frost. The coats and the hats of the refugees are covered with winter whiteness, their traces are well-visible in the deep snow that pursues them. The roads are marked by the

prints of wheels of heavy carts they drag with them, excellently apparent on the snow-covered surface.

The second set of photography is stored in the archive of the Koszalin Museum. It presents the settlers clearing rubble and rebuilding the city from the war damages. What is missed, though, is that the rubble was the effect of Soviet troops liberating the city – the heavy damage was done already after the siege and the capture of the town. The settlers, posing with the preserved buildings in the background, with shovels and wheel barrels, flipping over the tips of debris, are smiling. They are cleaning, engaging in small talks with each other. There will be a new town when they finish cleaning, a Polish town erected on German ruins – that is the message behind the set.

Here we see how photography is limited in use. On the one hand, it documents what is to be remembered: the suffering of the refugees, the effort of the settlers, the conditions of living in 1945 in two regions of what became contemporary northern Poland. On the other, it registers what is to be forgotten: the Soviet troops that are to be felt in both sets of photographs. Their oncoming presence is undergoing the documentation of the *Flucht*, as well as is lurking in the rubbles of Köslin. As such, photographs are to be used with caution (Nassar, 2009, 152). Furthermore, what we see is people, not individuals. We do not get their personal histories, but see them as representatives of a given group: the German *Flüchtlinge* or the Polish settlers, what could be commented with the remarks on the same problem with Armenian Jerusalem: “These photographs [...] were creating archetypes [...], making their [people on photography] individual stories invisible and their individuality erased/forgotten” (Adjemian, Suciyan, 2017, 13). As a result, taking pictures of various manifestations of post-Germanness that starts with evacuation and is continued through numerous forms of dispossession and appropriation is not only a process of creating archetypes or safeguarding of memory. The founding myth for the start of a new life for both groups is either the *Flucht* or the beginning of the settlement. Therefore, photography under scrutiny could be read as a sign of protest. The questions that we can attain to these two sets of photography are also: What happened to the home of my ancestors? What happened to my initial effort? Acknowledging both what is remembered and what is forgotten, creates an opportunity to explore the historical imagination of the post-German archive.

The third step into the post-German archive would be the inclusion of the names of localities in two languages, German and either Polish or Czech.⁴ It would contribute to the demanded polyvocality of the archive. Preserving the names is a call to remember and to ensure the legacy (Davis, 2007, 61–62). The inclusion is the more important, the more we acknowledge that institutional description which becomes a part of an archival collection is a form of epistemic violence. What are the names used to describe the collection? Are they emic or etic (Harris, 1976; Pike, 1966)? Are they rooted in the materials collected or were they imposed from above? And above all, are they legible to those who use the archive? It is pretty often that the users who search for the collection, have only one version of the name of the locality. Including them both would be of help to them. We have to acknowledge that in the case of post-expulsion landscapes places become “topolgängers”: “two [places] in the same place, doppelgängers in a single topography. They exist in the same streets, parks, and even the same buildings” (Dunn, 2018, 17). Here, the hybridity of each locality, with their rich history pre-1945 and the various new beginnings post-1945 would find its place and contribute to the discussion when the German name is more proper than the Polish when it comes to the reality it decodes, and vice versa.

The fourth step I postulate is an inclusion of both perspectives: of the expellees, as well as of the settlers. The first group, through a long process of gathering their memories and materials, have created both formalized archives (such as Lastenausgleichsarchiv in Bayreuth) and informal, collective archives, both analogue and digital. The sources one can find in various Heimatmuseums, Heimatstuben or Heimatbücher might be simply the collections of objects, memorialized maps of villages, or fragments

⁴The complicated history of Central Europe has caused the shifting of national borders since the early Middle Ages and the overlapping of migration waves of people of different origins, cultures and languages. If we would like to extend the submitted concept to the longer period of time, we have to acknowledge that before the German population, the areas of today’s northern and western Poland were inhabited by the Slavic and Baltic populations, whose remains were also obliterated. It is reflected in the matter of local names and their linguistic history. The names of some localities have pre-German, Slavic roots or even full names. For example, today’s Starosiedle near Gubin was called Starzeddel in German, but before that it was called Stare Sedlo in Lusatian. I would like to thank one of the Reviewers for this remark and the example given above.

from local chronicles. Such collections challenge the official history, even if by the institutionalized archives they are often perceived as poorly arranged, unreliable, or even useless. Nonetheless, they contribute to our understanding of the various ways of preserving homeland, as well as depicting the past by different groups of expellees (Faehndrich, 2003, 229). It is not surprising if we recollect Farge's remark that the "archive is born out of disorder" and is "an excess of meaning, where the reader experiences beauty, amazement, and a certain affective tremor" (Farge, 2015, 26, 31). The affective power of the archive makes it a tool in reclaiming justice by gathering such artefacts which have no place in an ordinary archive (Ather, 2019, 163). In other words, we should acknowledge the affective and subversive power of the archive.

The informal, collective archives of the expellees do not have a counterpart on the side of the settlers. Only recently we are seeing the peak of interest in the settlement history, both professional (Głowacka-Grajper, 2016; Spurný, 2011) and collective (various Facebook groups collecting post-war photos of the given locality). This step pushes us towards the question of the materiality of the post-German archive and the role of the researcher.

3. The moral obligation in the face of the materiality

A need to give the idea a material form is inherently connected with the activity of archiving (Derrida, 1995, 9). It would include not only analogue archives but also various forms of digitalization. "Digital" does not equal "immaterial" (Manoff, 2006, 316), and thus it is not without meaning what version of the text we analyse: what we look into is dependent on its material form (Hayles, 2003, 276). It all comes down to the fact that "knowledge is shaped by the means through which it is developed, organized and transmitted" (Manoff, 2006, 322). In the case of the post-German archive, a lot of materials that were left by Germans were digitalized and are available on-line. We should, however, bear in mind all of the above, especially if we acknowledge that "post-Germanness" dwells in various material forms around us.

If in the archive "its myriads of the dead, who all day long, have pressed their concerns upon you" (Steedman, 2001, 17), then there is a connection

between the materiality of the archive and the feelings we have while doing the archival work. How they are influenced, also physiologically, by the archive's materiality? Carolyn Steedman proposes a different look at the "archive fever" than Jacques Derrida. According to her, "fever" is caused by "the book, the very stuff of the scholar's life" (Steedman, 2001, 22). In the case under scrutiny it could be a discovery that was not made before but also the sole contact with what was left by Germans and what was stored – sometimes unintentionally – by the settlers, the material snippets of the erased reality.

For Steedman, this materiality is the dead, as people who produced these sources are dead. But this notion could be taken further. When she recollects an image from Jules Michelet, she sees that as she "breathed their dust, she saw them rise up. They rose from the sepulchre" (Steedman, 2001, 27). The archival work resurrects the dead and allows them to "take shape and form" (Steedman, 2001, 27). Here, the idea of Julian Wolfreys comes to mind: if he claims that literary texts are from their very nature "haunted" and "resurrected" by their authors as well as readers (Wolfreys, 2001, 71–72), why not to apply this approach to the archival sources as well? Especially because the archive is not a static place but continues to grow and therefore "there is no closure" and "the disappeared [...] exists as a perpetually living specter that lurks by the door in that knock that is always about to come" (Ather, 2019, 160). The archive is spectral (Derrida, 1995, 84) and its spectrality lies in its continuously growing form and ability to preserve and revive what was left or erased.

Such an approach to materiality could be seen as a solution. If we can share our human agency with what material was left, we will allow it to speak, at least partially, on its terms. It would mean "*to share agency* with other subjects that have also lost their autonomy" (Mbembe, 2020). We can start with some kind of "prosopopoeia," meaning "the attribution of a face and a voice to something inanimate" (Keenan, 2018, 5). It would teach us to be more humble in the face of erasure, and yet not to abandon hope.

In such an approach to the possible post-German archive, the role of the researcher has to be thought through, since it is the researcher who "activates" the archive (Ketelaar, 2001). The modern archon is no longer a guardian of the documents, and no longer has an undeniable hermeneutic right to claim what is inside the collection. His or her responsibility is much greater.

The researchers no longer only use archival collections, but they change them (Caswell, 2016, 7). The important question is therefore who does that: “what is essential is not the primary source itself, but the methodology of the scholar utilizing it, that is, the extent of his or her familiarity with the subject under investigation and skill at locating it in a broader context” (Tachjian, 2017, 6). It is because, even with the notion of shared agency, the sources “are mute witnesses, and their *language* is not always – or ever – unequivocal; they need interpreters, translators, if they are persuasively to demonstrate anything” (Keenan, 2018, 7). The scholarly and moral responsibility of the user is therefore much more considerable. Especially in the case of the archive combining the traces of erased culture with the traces of the newly formulating one, of the settlers. Which is to say, the archive is always “shaped by the aims of its creators” (Manoff, 2004, 16), the fact we cannot and should not overlook.

The archive understood not only as materials gathered together but also as a set of skills is built around various questions. One of them is “who can archive?” (cf. Cook, 2011, 606). Another question revolves around the issue of “who can have access to the archive,” is it limited in some way? Is it a result of the nature of sources or the question of their accessibility (cf. Adjemian, Suciyan, 2017, 3) or the “politics of capital,” e.g. open software and tools to be used? These questions lead inevitably back to the story I opened my article with. How to avoid negative answers that would steer us into the direction of elitist and inapproachable notion of the archive? It should be understood more as a custodianship than ownership. Such understanding would result from vast inclusion: shared agency and openness on different stories told by different interpreters yet in the framework of the structure of the archive that would determine “what can be archived and that history and memory are shaped by the technical methods of [...] archivization” (Manoff, 2004, 12).

It would require the possibility of the thought that we do not only use archives, but we are also used by them. There is a new archive that emerges out of our motions and gestures in which we are “interacting with the material” by various processes of connecting, contrasting, and gathering, as well as different traps and temptations (Farge, 2015, 63–73). We allow the documents to lead us, to become our interlocutors, we do not have any

more power over them than they have over us. We form with them some kind of partnership.

The interpretations we make using the archive could be our prosthetic memories as well as the sole figure of the archive is one. They become “the depository of traces” (Jedlowski, 2001, 36). Here, the ambiguity of the post-German archive comes to the fore: it is a connection of the erased culture of various German-speaking societies of Central Europe with the newly emerged cultures of the settlers. Therefore, what it needs, is a decolonization practice that “begin[s] with a settler desire to understand cultural difference” (Hall, 2000, 11). Such a step can be achieved only by having “transparent discussions around [...] settler colonialism, and structural oppression that characterise post-secondary institutions and [...] society more generally” (Fraser, Todd, 2016). Although this last quote comes from a very different context that is the one under scrutiny in this article – being a voice in the discussion on the indigenous archives in Canada – I believe it relates to most, if not to every, settlement cultures.

Finally, the researcher is a witness. According to Giorgio Agamben, he or she is someone who “experienced an event from beginning to end and therefore bears witness to it” (Agamben, 1999, 17). However, “to witness is to listen to the call of the ethical – to act” (Osuri, 2018, 151). Paraphrasing Kanjwal Hafsa’s notes on photography, it is not without meaning why we do archival work. Our “individual subjectivities are deeply interconnected with the image” (Hafsa, 2018, 88), or a source. In other words, the act of looking into a document, as well as our reasons to do so are hardly separable from the subject of archival records we are looking into. Witnessing “involves not only the act of seeing or going through an ordeal but also living to narrate the experience [...] it is the community or the collective that is the real subject of witnessing. And [...] there is a reciprocal relationship between the community and the witnessing: the community is itself formed in the process of witnessing” (Junaid, 2018, 253). In such form, the archival research is connected with another Derrida’s claim: about the engaged scholar (Derrida, 2012). To do academic work that is not engaged is, in such light, impossible.

4. Conclusions

Because of “whatever the archive contains is already a reconstruction – a recording of history from a particular perspective” (Manoff, 2004, 14), we are always dealing with the “incomplete discourses,” often “given under duress” and as such “the archives do not necessarily tell the truth, but [...] they tell *of* the truth” (Farge, 2015, 29). As archival researchers we do not create history by simply repeating the content of the archive, “but a pulling away from it, in which we never stop asking how and why these words came to wash ashore on the manuscript page” (Farge, 2015, 75). It should not, however, lead to the vast abstraction of the content. Yes, events are historically connected and are not isolated, as they happen in the same reality (cf. Mufti, 1998). But how not to over-universalize them to the point where their specificity is missing? Pointing to too much connection can lead us astray towards abstraction. Therefore, in the article, I was illustrating the general theoretical thinking on the possibility of the post-German archive with Polish and Czech examples. However similar, the processes of expulsion and settlement in both countries share also a lot of differences (Cwiek-Rogalska, 2018).

Therefore, because “archives, libraries, and museums create and preserve national identity and thus contribute to social stability” (Manoff, 2004, 22), in both cases the approach would be different, as different is the approach to the national identity vis-à-vis expelled Germans. Even more: to understand the idea of the post-German archive, we should widen the scope of the “nationality.” Are not the settlers “post-German” people? In this way, the idea of the post-German archive would be similar to an “attempt to distinguish between what was *unwritten* because it could go without saying and *everyone knew it*, what was unwritten because it could not yet be articulated, and what was unwritten because it could not be said” (Stoler, 2009, 3). Yes, the sole idea could provide us with useful tools for articulating what was not articulated before.

Nowadays, we face many practices of documentation in the face of the annihilation that were never an option in the times of the forced expulsions of Germans from Central Europe. Yet, some forms became canonized: how a biographical interview with an expellee should look like, what should we expect to hear. But what other aesthetic forms are

there? Is the changing audience of these sources influencing the form in which the story is told? Is there, in particular, any “normative outsider” not dealing directly with these things who we want to sympathize with the stories? Finally, are collective claims and individual claims to articulate the story separable? To what point is the story of expulsion a Central European story and to what point it is a matter of a given country, region, or even individual locality?

The idea of the possible post-German archive that I have just presented contradicts the notion of a classical archival institution. Instead of monolinguality, it allows us to hear a plurality of voices: both when it comes to the languages used, and the stories told and untold. Instead of a top-down approach, it would embrace bottom-up narratives and collect artefacts and stories in their sometimes unkempt form. Instead of being a closed and hierarchical institution, it would allow different stories and versions of these stories to sound and be interpreted by various researchers – but with the strong emphasis on their responsibility, to avoid mistakes we already know happen (Bellamy, 2004). The question of the responsibility of the researcher would be one of the most important here, even if we are not going as far as to say that history is nothing more than some form of collective memory (Burke, 1997). Maybe such an approach would allow others to have a more pleasant conversation in the archive than the one I described in the beginning.

References

- Adjemian, B., Suciyan, T. (2017). *Making Space and Community through Memory: Orphans and Armenian Jerusalem in the Nubar Library's Photographic Archive*. “Études Arméniennes Contemporaines” pp. 75–113. <https://doi.org/10.4000/eac.1129>.
- Agamben, G. (1999). *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive*. Trans. D. Heller-Roazan. New York: Zone Books.
- Ather, Z. (2019). *Archiving and Embodying the Disappeared*. In: *Resisting Disappearance: Military Occupation & Women's Activism in Kashmir*. Seattle: Washington University Press, pp. 146–196.
- Bellamy, E. J. (2004). ‘Laboratories’ Against Holocaust Denial – Or, the Limits of Post-modern Theory. “Parallax” 10 (1), pp. 88–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1353464032000171127>.
- Burke, P. (1997). *Varieties of cultural history*. New York: Cornell University Press.

- Caswell, M. (2016). *'The Archive' Is Not an Archives: On Acknowledging the Intellectual Contributions of Archival Studies*. "Reconstruction" 16 (1). <https://escholarship.org/content/qt7bn4v1fk/qt7bn4v1fk.pdf>. 6.10.2020.
- Cook, T. (2011). *The Archive(s) Is a Foreign Country: Historians, Archivists, and the Changing Archival Landscape*. "The American Archivist" 74, pp. 600–632. <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.74.2.xm04573740262424>.
- Ćwiek-Rogalska, K. (2018). *Pamięć w słowach – o nieadekwatności pojęć (przypadek czesko-polsko-niemiecki)*. "Acta Baltico Slavica" 42, pp. 8–24. <https://doi.org/10.11649/abs.2018.004>.
- Danowski, D., Viveiros de Castro, E. (2017). *The Ends of the World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Davis, R. (2007). *Mapping the Past, Re-creating the Homeland. Memories of village places in pre-1948 Palestine*. In: *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the Claims of Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 53–76.
- Derrida, J. (1995). *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/465144>.
- Derrida, J. (2012). *Specters of Marx*. London: Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203821619>.
- Dunn, E. C. (2018). *No path home: Humanitarian camps and the grief of displacement*. New York: Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501712517-011>.
- Enwezor, O. (2008). *Archive Fever: Uses of the Document in Contemporary Art* [Exhibition Catalogue]. New York: International Center of Photography.
- Erl, A. (2005). *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen. Eine Einführung*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-476-05007-6>.
- Faehndrich, J. (2003). *Erinnerungskultur und Umgang mit Vertreibung in Heimatbüchern deutschsprachiger Vertriebener*. "Zeitschrift Für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung/Journal of East Central European Studies" 52 (2), pp. 191–229.
- Farge, A. (2015). *The Allure of the Archives*. New Haven–London: Yale University Press.
- Franzen, K. E. (2008). *Die Akteure des Vertreibungsdiskurses in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. In: *Das Thema Vertreibung und die deutsch-polnischen Beziehungen in Forschung, Unterricht und Politik*. Hrsg. T. Strobel, R. Maier, Hannover: Georg-Eckert-Institut für Internationale Schulbuchforschung, pp. 61–66.
- Fraser, C., Todd, Z. (2016, February 15). *Decolonial Sensibilities: Indigenous Research and Engaging with Archives in Contemporary Colonial Canada*. "Internationale Online". https://www.internationaleonline.org/research/decolonising_practices/54_decolonial_sensibilities_indigenous_research_and_engaging_with_archives_in_contemporary_colonial_canada/. 10.06.2020.
- Ghaddar, J., Caswell, M. (2019). *"To go beyond": Towards a decolonial archival praxis*. "Archival Science" 19 (2), pp. 71–85. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-019-09311-1>. 23.10.2019.
- Gilloch, G. (2002). *Walter Benjamin: Critical Constellations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Głowacka-Grajper, M. (2016). *Transmisja pamięci: Działacze 'sfery pamięci' i przekaz o Kresach Wschodnich we współczesnej Polsce*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. <https://doi.org/10.31338/uw.9788323525950>.
- Hafsa, K. (2018). "Protest" *Photography in Kashmir: Between Resistance and Resilience*. "Women's Studies Quarterly" 46 (3 & 4), pp. 85–99.
- Hahn, H. H., Traba, R. (2017). *O czym (nie) opowiadają polsko-niemieckie miejsca pamięci*. In: *Wyobrażenia przeszłości. Polsko-niemieckie miejsca pamięci*. Red. H. H. Hahn, R. Traba, K. Kończal, M. M. Górny, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, pp. 11–45.
- Halicka, B. (2015). *Polski dziki zachód. Przymusowe migracje i kulturowe osvajanie Nadodrza 1945–1948*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Hall, C. (2000). *Introduction: Thinking the Postcolonial, Thinking the Empire*. In: *Cultures of Empire. A Reader: Colonizers in Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Ed. C. Hall. New York: Routledge.
- Hammer, J. (2001). *Homeland Palestine: Lost in the Catastrophe of 1948 and Recreated in Memories and Art*. In: *Crisis and Memory in Islamic Societies: Proceedings of the Third Summer Academy of the Working Group Modernity and Islam Held at the Orient Institute of the German Oriental Society in Beirut*. Eds. A. Neuwirth, A. Pflitsch. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, pp. 453–481.
- Harris, M. (1976). *History and Significance of the emic/etic Distinction*. "Annual Review of Anthropology" 5 (1), pp. 329–350. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.05.100176.001553>. 6.06.2020.
- Hastrup, K. (1997). *Przedstawienie przeszłości: Uwagi na temat mitu i historii*. Trans. S. Sikora. "Konteksty: Polska Sztuka Ludowa: Antropologia Kultury, Etnografia, Sztuka" 51 (1–2 [236–237]), pp. 22–28.
- Hayles, K. N. (2003). *Translating Media: Why We Should Rethink Textuality*. "Yale Journal of Criticism" 16 (2), pp. 263–290. <https://doi.org/10.1353/yale.2003.0018>.
- Jedlowski, P. (2001). *Memory and Sociology: Themes and Issues*. "Time & Society" 10 (1), pp. 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X01010001002>.
- Junaid, M. (2018). *Epitaphs as Counterhistories: Martyrdom, Commemoration, and the Work of Graveyards in Kashmir*. In: *Resisting Occupation in Kashmir*. Eds. H. Duschinski, M. Bhan, Z. Ather, C. Mahmood, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 248–277. <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812294965-010>.
- Keenan, T. (2018). *Getting the dead to tell me what happened: Justice, Prosopopoeia, and Forensic Afterlives*. "Kronos" 44 (1). <https://doi.org/10.17159/2309-9585/2018/v44a7>. 24.02.2019.
- Ketelaar, E. (2001). *Tacit Narratives: The Meaning of Archives*. "Archival Science" 1 (2), pp. 131–141. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02435644>.
- Kobyliński, Z., Rutkowska, G. (2005). *Propagandist use of history and archaeology in justification of Polish rights to the "Recovered Territories" after World War II*. "Archaeologia Polona" 43, pp. 51–124.
- Kracauer, S. (1995). *History: The Last Things Before the Last*. Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishing.

- Linek, B. (1997). *“Odniemczanie” województwa śląskiego w latach 1945–1950: W świetle materiałów wojewódzkich*. Opole: Instytut Śląski.
- Liulevicius, V. G. (2010). *The German Myth of the East: 1800 to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199546312.001.0001>.
- Macura, V. (1995). *Znamení zrodu: České národní obrození jako kulturní typ*. Jinočany: H&H.
- Maksudyan, N. (2009). *Walls of Silence: Translating the Armenian Genocide into Turkish and Self-Censorship*. “Critique: Journal of Socialist Theory” 37 (4), pp. 635–649. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03017600903205781>. 26.11.2019.
- Manoff, M. (2004). *Theories of the Archive from Across the Disciplines*. “Portal: Libraries and the Academy” 4 (1), pp. 9–25. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2004.0015>.
- Manoff, M. (2006). *The materiality of digital collections: Theoretical and historical perspectives*. “Portal: Libraries and the Academy” 6 (3), pp. 311–325. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2006.0042>.
- Mbembe, A. (2020). *Decolonizing Knowledge and Question of the Archive*. Africa Is a Country. <https://africaisacountry.atavist.com/decolonizing-knowledge-and-the-question-of-the-archive>. 23.01.2020.
- Meng, M. (2011). *Shattered Spaces: Encountering Jewish Ruins in Postwar Germany and Poland*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Michałowska, M. (2012). *Foto-teksty: Związki fotografii z narracją*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Mitterauer, M. (1991). *Lebensgeschichten sammeln: Probleme um Aufbau und Auswertung einer Dokumentation zur populären Autobiographik*. In: *Biographieforschung. Gesammelte Aufsätze der Tagung des Fränkischen Freilandmuseums am 12. Und 13. Oktober 1990*. Hrsg. H. Heidrich. Bad Windsheim: Verlag Fränkisches Freilandmuseum, pp. 17–35.
- Mufti, A. R. (1998). *Auerbach in Istanbul: Edward Said, Secular Criticism, and the Question of Minority Culture*. “Critical Inquiry” 25 (1), pp. 95–125. <https://doi.org/10.1086/448910>.
- Nassar, I. (2009). *Photography as Source Material for Jerusalem’s Social History*. In: *Transformed Landscapes: Essays on Palestine and the Middle East in Honor of Walid Khalidi*. Eds. C. Mansour, L. Fawaz. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, pp. 137–158. <https://doi.org/10.5743/cairo/9789774162473.003.0007>.
- Nosková, J. (ed.). (2016). *‘Proč to vyprávím?’: První polovina 20. Století v písemných vzpomínkách německých obyvatel Brna / ‘Warum erzähle ich das?’; die erste Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts in schriftlichen Erinnerungen deutscher Bewohner Brünns*. Trans. I. Kratochvílová, D. Sedláčková, V. Losseff. Praha: Etnologický ústav AV ČR, v.v.i. Praha – pracoviště Brno.
- Osuri, G. (2018). *Reflections on witnessing with the Association of Parents of Disappeared Persons, Kashmir*. “Feminist Review” 119 (1), pp. 144–153. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41305-018-0110-2>. 1.06.2020.

- Perry, A. (2005). *The Colonial Archive on Trial: Possession, Dispossession, and History in Delgamuukw v. British Columbia*. In: *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History*. Ed. A. Burton. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 325–350. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822387046-015>.
- Pike, K. L. (1966). *Etic and emic standpoints for the description of behavior*. In: *Communication and culture*. Ed. A. G. Smith. New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.
- Praczyk, M. (2018). *Pamięć środowiskowa we wspomnieniach osadników na „Ziemach Odzyskanych”*. Poznań: Instytut Historii UAM.
- Reale, G. (1997). *Toward a new interpretation of Plato*. Trans. J. Catan, R. Davis. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Sa'di, A. H., & Abu-Lughod, L. (2007). *Introduction*. In: *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the Claims of Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 1–26.
- Service, H. (2013). *Germans to Poles: Communism, nationalism and ethnic cleansing after the Second World War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139088336>.
- Sleiman, H., Chebaro, K. (2018). *Narrating Palestine: The Palestinian Oral History Archive Project*. “Journal of Palestine Studies” 47 (2), pp. 63–76. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jps.2018.47.2.63>. 3.10.2019.
- Spurný, M. (2011). *Nejsou jako my: Česká společnost a menšiny v pohraničí (1945–1960)*. Praha: Antikomplex.
- Steedman, C. (2001). *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Stoler, A. L. (2009). *Along the archival grain: Epistemic anxieties and colonial common sense*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400835478>.
- Świder, M. (2001). *Die sogenannte Entgermanisierung im Opperlner Schlesien in den Jahren 1945–1950*. Lauf: Europaforum-Verlag.
- Tachjian, V. (2017). *Daily Life in the Abyss: Genocide Diaries, 1915–1918*. New York: Berghahn Books. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvw04f4m>.
- Tomczak, M. (2006). *Obraz osadników w prasie i publicystyce polskiej*. In: *Ziemie Odzyskane 1945–2005. Ziemie Zachodnie i Północne. 60 lat w granicach państwa polskiego*. Red. A. Sakson. Poznań: Instytut Zachodni, pp. 45–58.
- Trouillot, M.-R. (1995). *Silencing the past: Power and the production of history*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Uhl, H. (2008). *Der gegenwärtige Ort von „Flucht und Vertreibung“ im deutschen und österreichischen Gedächtnisdiskurs*. In: *Diskurse über Zwangsmigrationen in Zentraleuropa. Geschichtspolitik, Fachdebatten, literarisches und lokales Erinnern seit 1989*. Hrsg. P. Haslinger, K. E. Franzen, M. Schulze-Wessel. München: Oldenbourg, pp. 157–174.
- Weizman, Y. (2017). *Unsettled possession: The question of ownership of Jewish sites in Poland after the Holocaust from a local perspective*. “Jewish Culture and History” 18 (1), pp. 34–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1462169X.2016.1267853>. 10.08.2020.

- Władyniak, L. M. (2019). *Memory in the borderland. A study of collective memory in the former East Prussia region of Poland and the Sudetes in the Czech Republic*. Prague: Charles University.
- Wolf, P. (1999). *Settler colonialism and the transformation of anthropology*. London: Cassell.
- Wolfreys, J. (2001). *Victorian hauntings: Spectrality, gothic, the uncanny and literature*. London: Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Young, J. E. (1987). *Interpreting Literary Testimony: A Preface to Rereading Holocaust Diaries and Memoirs*. "New Literary History" 18 (2), 403. <https://doi.org/10.2307/468737>. 1.06.2020.