The Politics of Memory in Post-Authoritarian Transitions, Volume Two

The Politics of Memory in Post-Authoritarian Transitions, Volume Two:

Comparative Analysis

By
Joanna Marszałek-Kawa,
Patryk Wawrzyński
and Anna Ratke-Majewska

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

The Politics of Memory in Post-Authoritarian Transitions,
Volume Two: Comparative Analysis

By Joanna Marszałek-Kawa, Patryk Wawrzyński
and Anna Ratke-Majewska

This book first published 2017

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2017 by Joanna Marszałek-Kawa, Patryk Wawrzyński
and Anna Ratke-Majewska

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1270-6
ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1270-2

CONTENTS

Introduction viii
Joanna Marszałek-Kawa and Patryk Wawrzyński

PART ONE: RESEARCH PROJECT

Chapter One 2
The Politics of Memory as the Constitutional Factor
of New Identity during the Transition from Authoritarian Regimes:
An Overview of the Research Project
Anna Ratke-Majewska and Joanna Marszałek-Kawa
The General Assumptions of the Project 2
The Selection of Cases 6
The Significance of the Project 8

Chapter Two 10
The Overview of the Methodology of Research on the Remembrance
Policy and Political Identity during Transitions
Anna Ratke-Majewska and Joanna Marszałek-Kawa
The Analysis of the Transitional Politics of Memory 10
The Comparative Analysis of the Transitional Remembrance—
Towards a General Model 16
The Selection of Sources 25

Chapter Three 31
The Politics of Memory and Political Identity: A Theoretical Overview
Anna Ratke-Majewska and Joanna Marszałek-Kawa
Identity in Theoretical Considerations 31
Political Identity as an Element of Universal Human Identity 34
The Politics of Memory 41

PART TWO: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Chapter Four 50
The Comparative Aspects of Using Remembrance Narratives to Construct a New Political Identity during the Post-Authoritarian Transition
Patryk Wawrzyński and Joanna Marszałek-Kawa
General Remarks 50
The Relationships within the Research Categories 52
Relationships between Research Categories 65
The Relationships between the Categories and the Source, Course and Scale of the Transition 80
The Relationships between the Categories and the Cause of Change .. 89
The Relationships between the Categories and the Authoritarian Identity 93
The Relationships between the Categories and the Democratic Identity 98
Summary 106

Chapter Five 114
The General Model of Using Remembrance Narratives to Construct a New Political Identity during the Post-Authoritarian Transition
Patryk Wawrzyński and Joanna Marszałek-Kawa
The Nature of the Transitional Government's Remembrance Policy 114
Using Remembrance Narratives to Construct the New Political Identity 120
Similarities and Differences in the Transitional Remembrance Policy 143
The General Model of the Structure of Transitional Remembrance Policy 154
Summary 167

References 172

Annex One 181
Table of Detailed Results of the Remembrance Policy in Chile

Annex Two 183
Table of Detailed Results of the Remembrance Policy in Estonia

Annex Three 186
Table of Detailed Results of the Remembrance Policy in Georgia

Annex Four 188
Table of Detailed Results of the Remembrance Policy in Poland

Annex Five 190
Table of Detailed Results of the Remembrance Policy in South Africa

Annex Six 192
Table of Detailed Results of the Remembrance Policy in Spain

INTRODUCTION

BY JOANNA MARSZAŁEK-KAWA AND PATRYK WAWRZYŃSKI

The past does matter. The past makes us who we are. This basic truth was an inspiration for the three-year-long research into the transitional government's remembrance policy. Our objective was to understand how the past, during democratisation, becomes a political asset. Being aware of the fact that the past does matter, we were keen to see the consequences of its influence on the state and society. We were interested in the stories that were promoted by the governments of six countries during great transformations and the construction of a new order on the ruins of overthrown dictatorships. Not only did we seek to find out what they concerned, but we first of all wanted to discover what they were aimed at, and what role the new leaders had assigned to them.

Our work resulted in a book consisting of two volumes. In the first one, we described six cases of the transitional remembrance policy—Chile, Estonia, Georgia, Spain, Poland, and South Africa. It is a collection of some fascinating academic narratives, which lead the Reader through the twists and turns of telling about the past, the remembering and forgetting on different continents, in different cultures, and under different political circumstances. The second volume uses cases to create a theoretical model aimed at understanding the role of the government in the transitional politics of memory. It is a precise lecture which allows the Reader to get to know the relations between democratisation, remembrance policy, and the reconstruction of the society's political identity. It is a piece of research work that considerably enriches political science, significantly extending our knowledge about the function of the past during the transformation of a political system. In the first place, however, it discusses and clarifies a number of scientific discoveries which completely change our understanding of the government's remembrance policy.

While working on the book, we were focused on its future utility as the key lecture on the transitional remembrance policy. That is why we

divided the volume into two complementary parts. The first one explains the research assumptions of our project, taking the Reader through the basics from which we derived our hypotheses and through the measures which we used to verify them. The first part consists of three chapters. The first serves as the introduction to our project—it shows its basic assumptions, discusses the posed research questions, and explains the theoretical assumptions which we were guided by while designing the research. In the next chapter, we provided a framework for the adopted research methodology: both at the level of the analysis of the cases of using remembrance narratives in particular countries and at a universal level, where, thanks to comparative tools, we constructed an overall model. It also presents the sources of our study and indicates what we were guided by in selecting them. Chapter three concerns the most important theoretical aspect of our project—the relationship between the politics of memory and the political identity of the society. It explains basic categories and expressions that we used in our research, and presents the key inspirations which gave rise to our understanding of the role of the transitional remembrance policy.

The second part of this volume continues the lecture, presenting the results of the comparative study of the six cases of using remembrance narratives during democratisation. It is made up of two chapters (chapter four and five) that are the essence of our research and which provide answers to the questions we asked. They show what the transitional remembrance policy is like, what its universal features are, and what it is that most impacts its ultimate shape. Those chapters are not merely a precise lecture—they are also a fascinating road from the observation of the role of remembrance narratives in six countries to the construction of a theoretical model which makes it possible to understand the structure of this phenomenon. They are the result of the application of a complex methodology and the accomplishment of the research team that undertook the pioneering task to explain why, during political transformations, telling about the past does matter. The presented results are innovative within the scope of social sciences—our aim was not to describe what was already commonly known, but to select one direction in which we would push the boundaries of our understanding of the remembrance policy. Hence, those who want to see this book as an academic handbook confronting different theories and discussing various approaches will be surprised. There are a number of other publications which fill this gap in the publishing market. Our proposal is a journey through some important scientific discoveries, with the destination being the understanding of what remembrance policy is and what functions it fulfils during the course of democratisation.

In chapter four, we focused on the relationships between the particular elements of the model. We show what it is that links the use of the interpretations of the past within and among the eight categories on which we focused our attention—the legitimisation of the new elites, the presence of the previous regime's representatives, the transitional justice, the social costs of transformations, the adoption of new social and political standards, symbolic roles of democratisation, the historical need for national unity, and the change of the state's identity in international politics. Furthermore, we also examined their significant relationships with the source, course and scope of the transition, the internal and external change factors, as well as the shape of the identity of the authoritarian society, and the promoted vision of the democratic community. As a result, the Reader can understand not only how particular elements of the transitional remembrance policy influence each other, but also what aspects exert a significant impact on its shape.

Chapter five provides an even more detailed picture of the use of remembrance narratives during democratisation. It begins with confronting theoretical hypotheses with overall observations and the results of the analysis of the intensity of relationships. It enables the Reader to understand the significance of the questions we asked, and how our research made it possible to answer them. Owing to this, the description of the most important similarities and differences between the countries under study becomes clear. The next subchapter is devoted to this description. It deals with the issue from two different viewpoints, i.e. the universal one, the starting point of which is the question of what the transitional remembrance policy is like, and the individual one, which makes it possible to emphasise the similarities and differences from the perspective of a particular country—Chile, Estonia, Georgia, Spain, Poland, or South Africa. It is exactly in this part of the book where we present the Reader with our most important discoveries and explain how much our findings change from the previous beliefs about the role of the interpretations of the past. The final stop of our scientific journey is the creation of the general model of the post-authoritarian remembrance policy, which consolidates all collected data, and which we built using all analyses. Not only does it indicate the most important features of the use of remembrance narratives, but it can also serve as a simple and precise tool for other researchers in their research into the significance of the past during democratisation.

Why is our study important? Firstly, it explains how the remembrance policy leaves its mark on the post-authoritarian transformation. Secondly, it identifies common features for all the cases of the use of remembrance

narratives and highlights the key differences between the countries. Thirdly, it shows the complex structure of the transitional remembrance policy—its shape, intensity, dynamics and relationships within it. Fourthly, it provides valuable and reliable theoretical models, which not only enrich our knowledge but, outright, lay the foundations for a new direction in studies of democratisation. Fifthly, an effect of the research is the creation of a number of research tools which make it easier to examine the importance of remembrance narratives during political transformations. Sixthly, our research was a pioneering attempt to turn the relations between the government's remembrance story-telling, the change of a political system, and the reconstruction of the political identity of the society, into a subject of study within the framework of political science.

Our research provided some very interesting findings. Reading this volume is the best way to get to know and understand them. They are the first step towards formulating the theory of remembrance policy in an orderly manner, based on empirically verified claims. In our work, we present hard data only, using them to build a model of using remembrance narratives during the course of democratisation. We avoid any speculations—our aim was to create a precise lecture, and we are confident that what is more important for the Reader is reliable knowledge about the transitional remembrance policy rather than some interesting, but lacking any scientific confirmation, assumptions, as offered by a number of other authors. We are also convinced that reading this volume will be an interesting experience; that it will help the Reader to better understand why the past does matter; and how history becomes a political resource and effective weapon in the struggle for a better, democratic future.

***

We should like to thank the **National Centre of Science in Kraków, Poland** for awarding us research grant DEC-2012/05/E/HS5/02722 which enabled us to finance our work. Without the support it would not have been possible to answer the questions we asked in our project, and our knowledge about the transitional government's remembrance policy would be less developed. We also express our gratitude to the authorities and administration of the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, who supported our research and the work of the research team. We are grateful to our partners in Chile, Estonia, Georgia, Spain and South Africa, who helped us collect the necessary sources and understand the political uniqueness of these countries. We should like to thank our associates and colleagues who provided us with advice, help and invaluable comments.

Professor Joanna Marszałek-Kawa would like to additionally thank her parents, Halina and Adam Marszałek, husband, Daniel Kawa, and daughters—Zuzanna and Marianna—who make each day a brighter one, and also her friends, who are an inspiration to me in both my private and professional life. The invaluable support of the close ones gives me heart and encourages me to undertake new challenges. It also helps to dispel doubts which sometimes arise. I am unable to find sufficient words to express my gratitude to the late Professor Czesław Mojsiewicz and his wife Emilia, who opened the door for me to the world of science, my masters—Professor Jan Wawrzyniak, Professor Marek Chmaj, Professor Jacek Sobczak, and Professor Krzysztof Pałecki. I also thank Professor Andrzej Antoszewski, who is an unparalleled exemplar of an academician, but who has remained a wonderful human being in the first place, always surrounded by a bunch of admirers. And last but not least, I should like to give my honours to a number of persons who stood by me in difficult times for me and my family. My thanks go to Piotr Plecka M.D. and Professor Tadeusz Dmochowski—thank you for staying close and turning a blind eye to my imperfections.

Dr. Patryk Wawrzyński wishes to thank his wife Alicja Stańco-Wawrzyńska for her support during the research and the countless talks on the interpretations of the findings, the colleagues from the research team for their hard work, involvement and discussions, and the University of Cape Town who welcomed me during my research visits to South Africa. I am also grateful for the inspiration, ideas, arguments and counter-arguments provided by my friends, colleagues and associates: Marek A. Muszyński, Gabriela Czarnek and Ralph Schattkowsky, as well as Filip Cyuńczyk, Magdalena Hoły-Łuczaj, Adam Jarosz, Zwelethu Jolobe, Vita Juknevičienė, Irina Kantor, Felipe Kipreos, Jerzy Koronkiewicz, Jacek Knopek, Kamil Łuczaj, Sabine Marschall, Monika Nalepa, Krzysztof Olszewski, Daniel Oross, Heiko Pääbo, Alicja Palęcka, Anna Quirin, Clara Sarmento, Anette Seegers, Karen Smith, Marek Wojnar, Izabela Woźniak i Michał Zabdyr-Jamróz.

Dr. Anna Ratke-Majewska also wishes to thank her husband Kamil Majewski for his invaluable support, undisturbed patience and understanding during the research, as well as her parents Barbara and Stanisław Ratke for their help, dedication, and time. I also thank my friends and colleagues, and my mentors—you are my inspiration, support and role models.

PART ONE

RESEARCH PROJECT

CHAPTER ONE

THE POLITICS OF MEMORY AS THE CONSTITUTIONAL FACTOR OF NEW IDENTITY DURING THE TRANSITION FROM AUTHORITARIAN REGIMES: AN OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT[1]

BY ANNA RATKE-MAJEWSKA AND JOANNA MARSZAŁEK-KAWA

The General Assumptions of the Project

The main objective of the project was to discuss the issue of the impact of the politics of memory on the new political identity of societies in the period of transition from the authoritarian regime to democracy. In other words, the fundamental assumptions which referred to the issue of the influence—through the pursued politics of memory—of the structures and institutions of the post-authoritarian state on its society's political identity. The goal of the project formulated in this way—which focused on the identification of the role of remembrance narratives in the process of the reconstruction of the state and society—was reflected in two basic research problems. The first of them refers to the question **to what degree new remembrance narratives were used in the transition period**, while the other addresses the issue of **the models of the politics of memory used for building a new political identity during transformations**. The first problem had to be solved in order to accomplish the other research

[1] The project, headed by Professor Joanna Marszałek-Kawa (Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, Poland), was funded by the National Science Centre, under decision no. DEC-2012/05/E/HS5/02722. The project team consisted of Dr. Patryk Wawrzyński, Dr. Anna Ratke-Majewska and Dr. Joanna Piechowiak-Lamparska. The project was realised in the years 2013-2016.

task, which not only mirrored all issues discussed in the project, but also determined the manner and design of our research. Consequently, the key task—necessary for solving the main research problems of the project—was to conduct a thorough qualitative analysis of the cases of the application of the remembrance policy as an element of the state's efforts to develop its citizens' new political identity in the period of transition from the authoritarian regime to democracy, with due consideration given to diverse cultural, social, economic and political circumstances.

What became the main axis of the project was the activity of the state. This assumption was based on the common perception of the politics of memory as a sphere under the influence of state authorities, which is exclusively shaped by state institutions.[2] Analyses carried out during the implementation of the project were thus aimed at identifying mechanisms through which the state applies remembrance narratives for justifying democratic changes and for increasing social support for the democratisation of the political system. Moreover, the aim of the research was to discover the phenomenon of supervenience[3] occurring between the

[2] The politics of memory is the issue that has been thoroughly and widely discussed in the literature on the subject, both Polish and international. Among Polish authors dealing with this area are such scholars as: Marek A. Cichocki, Marcin Król, Dorota Malczewska-Pawelec, Lech M. Nijakowski, Tomasz Pawelec or Jacek Sawicki, although this list is a lot longer [see, for example: Cichocki, 2005; Malczewska-Pawelec, Pawelec, 2011; Nijakowski, 2008; *Pamięć jako przedmiot…*, 2008; Sawicki, 2005]. The members of the research team that implemented this project, have also contributed to the academic discussion on remembrance [see, among others: Ratke, 2011; Wawrzyński, 2012; Wawrzyński, Ratke-Majewska, Marszałek-Kawa, 2015].

[3] Let us quote here the words of one of the leading theoreticians of the concept of supervenience, Jaegwon Kim: "First, the possibility of human action requires our mental states—beliefs, desires and intentions—to have their effects in the physical world. Acting in accordance with our will, our beliefs and desires, intentions and decisions, they have to somehow make our limbs—moving in a specific way—cause changes around us. It is owing to this that we are able to cope with our surroundings, write philosophical papers, build bridges and towns, as well as make gaps in the ozone layer. Perception, our only window to the world, requires physical objects around us to be causes of perceptive experiences and beliefs. The reasoning thanks to which we obtain new knowledge and beliefs on the basis of the already existing knowledge, assumes the causal determination of the new belief by the old one… Memory is a complex causal process assuming interactions between experiences, storing them physically and reproducing them in the form of beliefs. By giving up perception, memory and reasoning, we renounce almost all human knowledge" [2002: 41].

entire national cultural memory and political processes. What is also important is the fact that in the process of building the features that describe relations between the memory of the past, political identity and the authorities' activity in the transition period, individual circumstances of each case under study—which formed a unique context of the ongoing changes—were taken into account.

We posed a number of hypotheses on the basis of the research issues established in the project. The main hypothesis, which constituted the essence of the problems under study, was **the statement about the universality of the model of transition from the authoritarian to democratic system at the level of the state's use of remembrance policy to create a new political identity of the society**. It meant having to study areas that were common for two unilateral relations of the transformation period. The first of them was the relation between the state and the memory of the past, while the other one was reflected in the link between the state and the political identity of the society. This required adopting two research perspectives at the same time. The holistic perspective saw transition as a political phenomenon with a homogeneous set of instruments, tools and manners of action of the state, and it was best reflected in the comparative analysis method applied in the study. The individual perspective, in turn, addressed the particular cases of transition, taking into consideration local circumstances, including specific economic, ethnic and national conditions, as well as geopolitical, cultural and social ones. It also considered the issue of international relations. It was reflected in a thorough analysis of case studies in the project.

What is also important is the fact that the fundamental research hypothesis presented above—referring to the universality of the applied tools of the remembrance story-telling during the transition, which enabled the state to construct a new political identity of citizens and build social support for democratic transformations—gave rise to the necessity of formulating additional hypotheses to supplement the main assumption.

The first of the auxiliary hypotheses was expressed in the statement that **countries—considering their specific local circumstances, including economic, cultural and national conditions—to a large extent use new remembrance narratives for shaping the political identity of their societies in the transition period, first of all through references to the historical or cultural legacy of a given community.** These references are in turn aimed at: firstly—justifying democratisation processes, secondly—incorporating democratic values into the society, and thirdly—preventing social conflicts triggered by a wave of changes. To this end, remembrance narratives focus on the presentation of the

ongoing processes as changes which are the continuation of national tradition and which are non-conflicting historic events, as well as an expression of the implementation of the intergenerational contract, based on desired attitudes rooted in the glorious history of the nation.

According to another auxiliary hypothesis—which is connected with the one mentioned above—**the state during the democratic transition significantly reduces its interest in the authoritarian past and in the transitional justice**. It was assumed that the motives behind such an attitude include the willingness to minimise a risk of exacerbating conflicts and divisions within a community and a threat of refusing to grant legitimacy to the new authorities both by the economic and political elites of the previous regime and by social groups supporting authoritarian structures. This means giving up the rhetoric which would create an impression that the new state elites aim to take revenge on the representatives and adherents of the old regime, its officials and functionaries, which would meet with strong opposition from a large part of the society and lead to the destabilisation of the emerging political system. What appears in the place of narrative calling for the settling of all accounts with or punishing crimes of authoritarianism are cautious and balanced actions, which involve seeking compromise, forgiveness, and—first of all—reconciliation.

Moreover, we also verified a hypothesis according to which **the efforts to prove that the right way of democratisation was chosen constitute the most important field of the state's activity in which the memory of the past is used in the transition period**. Therefore, democracy was presented as a manifestation of national tradition or an expression of the important features of a nation, inseparably linked with its existence. It may also be seen as a tribute paid to the victims of repressions and to the heroes of a struggle for independence. In this way, the social costs of transformations, especially those of an economic character, become justified. The construction of a new identity through references to the important elements of national memory is thus to ensure: (1) social legitimacy for the time of reforms crucial for the system; (2) the unification of the society around shared ideas; and (3) strengthening the position of the new political elites. Hence, identity and memory should motivate the society to follow the chosen path towards democracy, even if it means losing some of its privileges, giving up some ambitions, or the deterioration of material status. It plays the role of a historical incentive of a higher level, adding meaning to sacrifices one made. This is why remembrance is used by the state to formulate the idea of the

intergenerational contract and is combined with other significant factors constituting cultural legacy.

The Selection of Cases

To solve research problems specified in the project—which centred on multi-aspect relations between memory, national identity and democratisation—we needed to select diverse cases so that they would encompass the broadest possible range of historical, territorial and problem experiences. On the basis of the selected sample, we had to formulate some general conclusions. Moreover, what was also important from the angle of the relevance of the project, we needed to come up with some recommendations for practitioners who deal with establishing priorities for the politics of memory in the state. We made it easier to accomplish this task by selecting such a wide range of varied cases. This is why the case studies concern the transitions in Chile, Estonia, Georgia, Poland, South Africa and Spain. The research thus involved countries in which—at a different time, pace and to a different degree (complying with the research proposal of Lavinia Stan, the author of numerous publications on the issues of transition justice and the politics of memory[4])—a democratic transformation took place. What is important is that the selected cases represented different geographical and civilisation regions, political traditions, cultures and historical experiences, which allowed us to come up with reliable general conclusions, going beyond the framework of phenomena specific to a particular area of the world. Moreover, since transitions of the system took place in different socio-political conditions, transformation goals and visions of the post-authoritarian state and society also varied. Therefore, **Chile** was an example of the political change from the authoritarian regime established after a military coup d'état; **Estonia—** an example of the first wave of post-communist democratisation; **Georgia—**an example of the second wave of post-communist democratisation (one of colour revolutions); **Poland—**an example of transition from the communist regime aimed at fast integration with the West; **Spain—**an example of changes from the authoritarian system established after a civil war; and **South Africa**, in turn, was an example of post-colonial democracy-making and, at the same time, a transition from a repressive racist regime based on the exclusion of a part of the society and on limiting human rights. Thus, the selection of countries to be studied was well suited to the goals of the project.

[4] See, among others: Stan, 2013; *Transitional Justice…*, 2009.

It should also be mentioned that, apart from their diversity, there was yet another advantage of such a selection that was of high relevance for our research. It was the representativeness of each transition, viewed not only at the regional scale, but also in the field of the character of the ongoing changes, including the features of the system that was vanishing as a result of democratisation. That is why we excluded some cases of transformation, especially those considered to be single changes of the system (not fulfilling the condition of representing features typical of a larger community) or those which could not be seen as completed.

Firstly, we decided to leave out German transition, which many researchers find to be the model transformation, thus it is often seen as an obvious choice when it comes to discussing a number of issues related to democratic changes. Nevertheless, the specific character of the process of democratisation in this country (both in the case of the Federal Republic of Germany, where the democratic system adopted after World War II was imposed by the anti-Nazi coalition, and in the case of the German Democratic Republic, where the unification of two German states meant the extension and instant adoption of the solutions developed by the Western neighbour) made this case exceptional and unique, incomparable to others. This is why we did not treat it as a universal and representative example in the studies on transition.

Secondly, our analyses did not include the democratisation of the Russian Federation, Ukraine, or the post-Soviet republics of Central Asia, where democratic changes—quoting a popular view often appearing in publications concerning the internal situation of the above-mentioned countries—did not come to an end and their political systems began to adopt features of authoritarian-democratic hybrids.[5] Similar arguments were raised for the non-inclusion of Arabic states in the discussion. Democratic changes in this region, initiated by the Arab Spring, had not been completed when we started work on this project, and their direction and scope were difficult to predict.

Thirdly, we recognised the cases of Poland (as the only satellite state of the USSR) and Estonia (as a former Soviet republic) as representative of the whole area of Central and Eastern Europe, which meant that we did not include other examples of democratic transition in the region in our research. The assumption we adopted in the project was based on the conviction (which was widely accepted in the scientific discourse) that

[5] It must be emphasised that our opinion on the condition of democracy in the above-mentioned countries was valid both during the preparation of the assumptions of the project (2012) and in the period of implementing them (from 2013 to 2016).

democratic changes in this part of the world—despite some slight differences determined by the specific nature of a given case—each time reflected a single phenomenon: the post-communist transformation [see: Huntington, 1995].

Fourthly, in our project we did not deal with partial transitions (or semi-transitions), such as the political and civil equalisation of African Americans in the United States and indigenous people of Australia and New Zealand. These problems were only partly related to the issues under study, and if we had included them, the research field of the project would have become hard to define. This is why we ignored them in our research. It must be noted, however, that we were fully aware of the fact that there is a widely-held belief in the literature according to which changes in the above-mentioned countries are seen as transition from the authoritarian regime to democracy due to a significant change of the society's influence on the government (the extension of democratic legitimacy).

The Significance of the Project

The main assumptions of the project included the identification of similarities and differences in the sphere of the remembrance narratives used by post-authoritarian governments in the transition period, the explanation of relations between the remembrance story-telling and the political identity of the society, as well as the presentation of the origins of the narrative and their influence on the democratisation of the state. The above areas—specified by the framework of our analysis—reflect the project's expected contribution to the development of the scientific discipline. The first volume of the publication—based on the studies we conducted—shows six local models of the remembrance policy used by the state in the period of democratic changes, while the second one presents a general overview of the model of the politics of memory used by post-authoritarian governments in the period of transition from the authoritarian to democratic system. Thus, the publication—based on the research fields defined by the problems solved in the project—has filled a gap existent in the scientific discourse. Although the issues of democratisation, remembrance and political identity have been present in the Polish and global science for years, no research into the above issues has been done with an emphasis on their interrelationships within the scope and direction specified in the project. In this way, the project has offered a chance of looking at the problem of political transformations from a different angle, at the same time determining a new field of research into the process of democratisation.

Therefore, the publication, representing an important opinion in the discussion on the importance of the politics of memory, provides an opportunity to stimulate academic debate. By verifying our hypotheses we may also reflect on the efficiency and purposefulness of the implementation of the government's remembrance policy. Another important issue, which enhances the relevance of our research, is its interdisciplinary nature, both in the sphere of the assumptions formulated and the results achieved. The analyses combine a number of various fields in social and political sciences, thanks to which they may be interpreted at many layers of scientific activity. Moreover, the innovativeness of the project contributes not only to the theory, but also to the practice of political action. The presented attitude may constitute a basis for the formulation of multi-level strategies, representing a useful tool ready to be used by institutions shaping the nation's politics of memory or dealing with the optimisation of memory management.

The main target group of the publication is the academic community, interested in the issues of democratisation, political identity and the politics of memory. The research shows a completely new perspective from which relations between these phenomena are considered, owing to which they may arouse curiosity among researchers in the field of social science and humanities. Moreover, it can be a rich source of knowledge for people outside academic circles, who are interested in the issues of political transition and differences between the state's interpretation of the past and processes occurring within the society.

CHAPTER TWO

THE OVERVIEW OF THE METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH ON THE REMEMBRANCE POLICY AND POLITICAL IDENTITY DURING TRANSITIONS

BY ANNA RATKE-MAJEWSKA
AND JOANNA MARSZAŁEK-KAWA

The Analysis of the Transitional Politics of Memory

The first problem that needed to be addressed when dealing with the research subject was the study of transitional remembrance in the six countries selected for the project: Chile, Estonia, Georgia, Poland, South Africa, and Spain. Its aim was: first of all—to discover the remembrance narratives a given state uses in the transition, secondly—to what extent they were used in each case, and, thirdly—the features of the post-transitional political identity determined by the state's narratives. The key issue was thus to identify the principal determinants of the authoritarian political identity on the one hand, and the democratic political identity on the other in order to capture changes in their contents occurring during transition. The comparison of these identities and the identification of differences between them were in turn made on the basis of the analysis of the state's policy of commemoration, seen as their constituent factor. In other words, by studying particular cases we were able to identify the type of remembrance narratives applied by the state during democratisation and the degree to which it was used, as well as their role in the development of the post-authoritarian identity of the society.

The main task that had to be undertaken in the project, and which became crucial for the examination of the politics of memory in the selected countries during the transformation of the political system and its role in the process of changing the citizens' identity, was the distinction of common and universal solutions—related to the issue of commemoration–

–used in the period of transition to democracy. In this way, we established eight research categories that reflected the application of remembrance narratives in the transition for justifying the basic challenges for democratisation. These categories constituted the foundation for designing tools for the analysis of particular cases and for comparative analysis. They were as follows:

1. **The legitimisation of coming to power by new political elites—**a category reflecting the role of remembrance narratives used during the transition for justifying the exercise of power by new political elites, which takes into consideration the following aspects: the past as the legitimisation of new elites, exploiting the idea of the state's continuity for the legitimisation, the use of the idea of the state's continuity, the continuity vs. the change of national symbols and the pantheon of heroes as a source of legitimisation, the reconstruction of the landscape of memory, preventing internal conflicts and the historical legitimisation of the new elite, and memory as a source of reconciliation and forgiveness administered by new elites and within boundaries set by them;
2. **The presence of the former regime's representatives in public life**—a category reflecting the role of remembrance narratives used during the transition for justifying the presence of the representatives of the previous regime in democratic life, which takes into consideration the following aspects: justifying the necessity of the presence of the regime's representatives in public life as a way to prevent conflicts, the political presence of past elites as the legitimisation of democracy and political pluralism, defining pluralism and democratic equality through the presence of former elites, historical justifications for constructing a new political identity, and the historical justifications of the separation of the past from the present day and the boundaries of that division;
3. **Procedures of the transitional justice—**a category reflecting the role of remembrance narratives used during the transition for justifying a selected formula to hold accountable or not accountable the apparatus of the authoritarian regime, which takes into consideration the following aspects: transitional justice as a form of legitimising the rule of law, transitional justice as punishing the culprits, transitional justice as a source of forgiveness, and the limited scope of transitional justice as the effect of preventing an increase in social divisions;
4. **Social and economic costs of transformations**—a category reflecting the role of remembrance narratives used in the transition

for justifying the social costs of changes, especially of an economic transition: the past vs. the future dichotomy as the justification of the necessity of the costs of transformations (and the comparison of the amount of sacrifice of those who *struggled for freedom* with the smaller sacrifice of those who suffered during the transition), the historical justification of new economic attitudes (as private initiative, entrepreneurship, self-organisation and responsibility), the historical sources of economic stratifications, and the past as the justification of capitalist ideas;

5. **The adoption of new social and political standards**—a category reflecting the role of remembrance narratives used during the transition for justifying the adoption of new, often culturally distant, social and political standards, which takes into consideration the following standards: the significance of the need for transformations as the consequence of historical events, the significance of the intergenerational agreement for the adoption of new standards, the significance of new national heroes as role models of new attitudes, the balance between tradition and modernisation, and memory as a myth-motoric inspiration in a new definition of patriotism;
6. **Symbolic roles of democratisation** as the fulfilment of the intergenerational agreement and a tribute to the victims of the authoritarian regime and to repressed opposition—a category reflecting the role of remembrance narratives used during the transition for explaining symbolic roles of democratisation as more than just a regime change. It took into consideration the following aspects: emphasising the historical necessity of democratisation (the intergenerational character of democratisation), showing democratisation as a tribute to the victims of the authoritarian regime, pro-democratic selection of narratives and their heroes, national heroes as role models of democratic and civic attitudes, and the new organisation of time (public holiday calendar) as a way to transfer ideas from elites to the society;
7. **The historic need for national unity**—a category reflecting the role of remembrance narratives used in the transition period for justifying national unity, which reflects the following aspects: the past as the justification of national unity, the historical justification of reconciliation and forgiveness, the transformation of the landscape of memory from authoritarian to pluralist, and the reconstruction of the pantheon of national heroes towards diversity;

8. **The new state's identity in international politics,** including membership of inter-governmental organisations, alliances, and associations—a category reflecting the role of remembrance narratives used during the transition for justifying the change of the state's foreign policy, which takes into consideration the following aspects: the experience of the past as the justification of membership of organisations and international alliances, membership of international organisations to complement the transformation and a historical challenge, (re-)gaining the *right* and *due* position in the international community as the realisation of the new political identity, and the past as the justification of new standards implemented in the face of the accession to international organisations.

The categories discussed above enabled us to devise and conduct research on the transitional politics of memory in the six countries selected for the project. However, we would not have been able to carry out this task, had we not established a catalogue of applicable methods. The research methodology of the project was thus based on mutually complementary and interpenetrating methods of analysis. They included:

1. **The statistical and descriptive analysis—**which enables a detailed presentation of the phenomenon of transition in a limited and short period of time. Such a presentation accurately reflects events occurring then and corresponding to the research field of the project;
2. **The processual analysis**—which enables capturing a change (considered in terms of a complex process), including the case of the transition from authoritarianism to democracy and the transformation of the authoritarian political identity of citizens into a democratic identity;
3. **The narrative analysis**—which enables the identification of elements of remembrance narratives used during the transition, in order to discover the functions they fulfilled;
4. **The content analysis**—which enables the identification of goals and values conveyed by the messages sent by state institutions in the transition period;
5. **The institutional and legal analysis—**which enables the presentation of principles which govern the functioning of the state's political institutions and the political system at the stage of political changes;

6. **The analysis of social networks—**which serves the purpose of reconstructing the complexity of social relations, considering the issue of the transfer of commemoration contents and the diffusion of ideas between state institutions and the society. It enabled us to reflect on the issue of the influence of the promoted remembrance narratives on the society and on the problem of the internalisation of this content in the sphere of political identity.

As mentioned previously, the analysis of the particular cases of the transitional politics of memory was based on the distinguished universal research categories and with the application of the selected methods. Therefore, each of the countries under study was analysed in the same manner, which allowed us to confront the results in the subsequent phase of the project. In order to build the foundation for discussing each given case, we established the time framework of the transition, identified the period of political transformations in history, and focused on the elements constituting the content of the authoritarian political identity. Then, we examined remembrance narratives applied in the transition period. In each case, not only did we discover instances of a given aspect of a narrative, but we also identified their degree of relevance within the framework of a specific category. The complexity of our research field was reflected in rich and multi-layered descriptions, which enabled us to draw conclusions regarding the features and shape of the post-transition political identity adopted during democratisation.

It should also be added that designing each case study was made easier by the creation of a unique tool for the sake of the project—a list of research categories, which enabled us to draw conclusions concerning the relevance of aspects that it included. This list—the graphic representation of which is found below—not only made it possible to systematise the results of our studies and to put conclusions in order, but significantly facilitated a description of each transition case. It also became the basis for constructing a tool for conducting a multi-aspect comparative analysis, particularly owing to the fact that it could be used for devising uniform summaries of each case study.

Research Category	Item	Field of impact
The legitimisation of new elites	1-1	The past as a legitimisation of new elites
	1-2	Use of the idea of the state's continuity
	1-3	Use of national symbols and heroes
	1-4	New landscape of memory
	1-5	Counteracting internal conflicts
	1-6	Remembrance as a source of reconciliation
The justification of the presence of former elites	2-1	Counteracting internal conflicts
	2-2	As a legitimisation of democracy
	2-3	As a definition of pluralism
	2-4	Building a new political community
	2-5	Division between the past and the present
The transitional justice	3-1	Transitional justice as a legitimisation of the rule of law
	3-2	Transitional justice as a punishment for human rights violators
	3-3	Transitional justice as a source of forgiveness
	3-4	Limited scope of the transitional justice
Social costs of transformations	4-1	The necessity of social costs of change
	4-2	New economic attitudes and behaviours
	4-3	The past as a source of stratifications
	4-4	The legitimisation of capitalism
Adaptation of new social and political standards	5-1	The historical necessity of changes
	5-2	The role of the intergenerational agreement
	5-3	National heroes as role models
	5-4	Balance between the tradition and modernisation
	5-5	The past and a new definition of patriotism
Symbolic roles of democratisation	6-1	The intergenerational character of changes
	6-2	Democratisation as a tribute for victims
	6-3	The pro-democratic selection of narratives
	6-4	National heroes as examples of behaviours
	6-5	New organisation of time

Historical need for national unity	7-1	The past as a legitimisation of national unity
	7-2	Reasons for reconciliation and forgiveness
	7-3	Diversity of the landscape of memory
	7-4	Reconstruction of national heroes' pantheon
New state's identity in international relations	8-1	Reasons for membership of IGOs
	8-2	New identity as a fulfilment of transformations
	8-3	(Re-)Gaining an appropriate position in IR
	8-4	Adaptation of new standards

Table 2.1. The research tools used in the analysis of the transitional remembrance policy

Note. *The scale of the level of significance used in the table above consists of the following degrees: very low (1), low (2), moderate (3), high (4), very high (5).*

The Comparative Analysis of the Transitional Remembrance—Towards a General Model

One of the main tasks of the project, expressed at the level of articulated problems and constructed hypotheses, was an attempt to devise a universal model of the application of remembrance narratives by the state for the sake of building a new political identity of the society in the period of transition from the authoritarian to the democratic system. Hence, our aim was to design a general pattern that would mirror the way in which state authorities pursue the remembrance policy during democratisation—what tools they apply and what ways they follow—with the intention of ensuring lasting social support for changes of the system through the incorporation of desired values into the political identity of citizens.

What served as the foundation for the construction of such a general model were the analyses of particular cases—of Chile, Estonia, Georgia, Poland, South Africa and Spain, i.e. single models of the transitional politics of memory in the countries under study. We found comparative analysis to be essential for building a universal model as it allowed us to confront the results obtained at the earlier stage of the project. This method was based on recognising the role that every single aspect of narrative—forming part of particular research categories—played in the pursued policy of commemoration, taking into consideration the extent of significance of each of them. It enabled us to come up with a general

description of the assumed political identity of democratic post-authoritarian states.

In order to create a universal pattern, we needed to focus on relations between commemoration, political identity and democratisation, but we had to do it from the angle of the whole set of cases rather than from the perspective of individual countries. It was a multi-stage task, which needed to be carried out in the consecutive phases of our comparative analysis. Thus, we constructed the universal model in the following order:

1. Firstly, it was necessary to show similarities and differences between six case studies with regard to eight research categories distinguished in the project;
2. Secondly, we needed to observe relations between variables: (1) within the framework of research categories; (2) between research categories; (3) between research categories and sources, paths and scopes of transition; (4) between research categories and external and internal factors of transformation; (5) between research categories and features of authoritarian identity; as well as (6) between research categories and features of post-authoritarian identity;
3. Thirdly, on the basis of the above analyses, we were able to construct a model of relations between the government's policy of commemoration and political identity in the conditions of transition to democracy. At this stage, we also provided recommendations concerning the application of the constructed pattern, targeted mostly at policy-makers and people of science.

The systematic and reliable comparative analysis would not have been possible without a proper tool which facilitated the implementation of the task. At this stage of our research, the tool for analysis was based on a tool constructed for the particular cases of the transitional politics of memory, and, additionally, was supplemented with additional variables, such as: a source of transition, a course of transition, a scale of changes, internal and external factors, the authoritarian identity, and the post-authoritarian identity. The reason for introducing additional, extended variables was that we wanted to show interrelationships not only within the categories of the transitional politicized remembrance, but also between the events preceding a transformation, including those accompanying the changes of the political system. Hence, by placing transformation processes in the reality specific to particular cases, we were able to consider the issues under study from a broader perspective, which contributed to the creation

of the model of the remembrance policy, applied for building a new political identity during the transition.

For the sake of the comparative analysis, we converted the data obtained at the stage of case studies into numerical data, with the following figures corresponding to the extent of significance: very high = 5, high = 4, moderate = 3, low = 2, and very low = 1. This enabled us to calculate average values within each category. Owing to this, we were able to summarise the results of the studies at the general level. For supplementary variables, the occurrence of a given category in a specific country was coded as 1, while the non-occurrence of it was 0. By attributing numerical labels in this area, we managed to average the results by extending the area of the comparative analysis.