

UDC 930.1(100)“1945/2015”:304.4
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.26.275197

Viktor GUDZ

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Professor of the Department of History and Archeology, Bohdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University, 10 Hetman Street, Melitopol, Ukraine, postal code 72312 (viktorvgudz@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0001-5756-1683
Researcher ID: AAT-8382-2021

Olexander SYTNYK

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Professor of the Department of History and Archeology, Bohdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University, 10 Hetman Street, Melitopol, Ukraine, postal code 72312 (oleksander_sytnyk@i.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0001-7743-8148

Віктор ГУДЗЬ

доктор історичних наук, професор, професор кафедри історії та археології Мелітопольського державного педагогічного університету імені Богдана Хмельницького, вул. Гетьманська, 10, м. Мелітополь, Україна, індекс 72312 (viktorvgudz@gmail.com)

Олександр СИТНИК

доктор історичних наук, професор, професор кафедри історії та археології Мелітопольського державного педагогічного університету імені Богдана Хмельницького, вул. Гетьманська, 10, м. Мелітополь, Україна, індекс 72312 (oleksander_sytnyk@i.ua)

COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF NATIONAL MEMORY AND HISTORICAL POLICY IN THE INTERNATIONAL DIMENSION (review of the monograph: The problem of historical memory in the world-historical discourse (1945 – 2015): monograph/head of the Author’s team – corresponding member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, doctor of science, prof. A. I. Kudryachenko, scientific editor: Doctor of Science, Assoc. Soloshenko V. V., technical editor: candidate of political science, associate professor of science. Rozumyuk V. M. Kyiv: State University “Institute of World History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine”, 2021. 312 p.)

КОМПЛЕКСНЕ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ ПАМ’ЯТІ ТА ІСТОРИЧНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ У МІЖНАРОДНОМУ ВИМІРІ (рецензія на монографію: Проблема історичної пам’яті у всесвітньо-історичному дискурсі (1945 – 2015 рр.): монографія / керівник авторського колективу – член-кореспондент НАН України, д.і.н., проф. Кудряченко А. І., науковий редактор к.і.н., доц. Солошенко В. В., технічний редактор к.політ.н., с.н.с. Розумюк В. М. Київ: ДУ “Інститут всесвітньої історії Національної академії наук України”, 2021. 312 с.)

In a new work by scientists of the Institute of World History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, the concept of historical memory is characterized as one of the

basic paradigms of social and humanitarian disciplines, the main directions of memory studies are defined, and a thorough analysis of memory policy in many European countries is carried out, Asia, North America. Since the main function of historical memory is the formation of identity, the memory of the people serves as its connecting link. The laconic conclusion of the 103 Authors of the work “Kingdom of Memory”: “France is memory” also applies to other nations. Accordingly, Taras Shevchenko addressed “my dead and living and unborn compatriots in Ukraine and not in Ukraine”, covering the entire temporal and spatial dimension of the nation’s mental identity. It is not for nothing that the main target of Russia’s existential hybrid war against Ukraine is the identity of the Ukrainian nation, with efforts to destroy its fundamental component – historical memory and replace it with “Russian World”. Therefore, the relevance of the reviewed research is determined by the importance of the policy of memory in the era of globalization, when each country faced the dilemma of preserving its ethnocultural heritage as a marker of the identity of the people and at the same time – bringing the national cultural product to the world market, which requires increased attention of scientists.

Chapter 1 “Theoretical and methodological foundations of the study of historical memory” deals with the theoretical basis and methodology of research on the topic. In particular, in subsection 1.1. “Main directions of theoretical reflection on the problems of historical memory (memory studies)” The authors analyzed the main directions of the scientific discourse on the problem of memory (memory studies), noting that memorial studies were initiated by M. Halbwaks, who distinguished individual and collective memory. The scientific heritage of A. Warburg, based on which the “Warburg school” went far beyond the boundaries of cultural studies, and the views of the luminaries of the “Annals” school, starting with M. Blok, who interpreted the concept of memory as the cornerstone of the existence of the entire Western civilization (p. 14). The “memorial boom” of the 1980s was characterized as well as the new humanitarian subdiscipline – memory studies, the subject is the concept of “memory”, and, in particular, the concept of “cultural memory” of the Assman couple. The authors interpreted the definitions of “politics of memory” and “historical politics”, identifying them as activities of political elites aimed at forming collective memory to foster patriotism and improve the image of the state. On the other hand, there is the “Call from Blois” (2008) of famous historians of Europe: history should not be a conjunctural handmaiden and no political power can arrogate to itself the right to establish historical truth and limit the freedom of the researcher (pp. 21–23). However, the authors avoided presenting their opinion on the limit of admissibility of state influence on the formation of historical memory.

At the beginning of subsection 1.2. “The methodology of world history in the study of the mechanism of formation and reproduction of historical memory”, The authors noted the complexity of researching the concept of memory as an interdisciplinary object, as a result of which the own position of many scientists regarding the methodological foundations of their studies is not visible. Usually, the definitions of the concept of “historical memory” are compared, and, according to the Western research tradition, the methodological approach is limited to reducing the problems of world history to local ones (p. 27). Instead, the Authors themselves insist that the concept of “mentality” proposed by L. Fevre and M. Blok is key to the analysis of historical memory. Such a traditionalist way of seeing historical reality is based on the methodological postulate: “nothing happens in history that does not have its origins”. At the same time, the Authors singled out the spiritual forms of reproduction in the collective consciousness of value motivations that have proven effective in the past. Among other

methodological pillars, the scientific heritage of A. Bergson, as the developer of the concept of modern national identity, as well as the works of M. Halbwachs, P. Nore, P. Ricoeur, S. Linde, Y. and A. Assman, and E. Renan, are singled out. B. Anderson, E. Hobsbawm, O. Vasiliev and others. In the end, the Authors established that it was the specialists of the “Annals” school who developed the most balanced approaches to the analysis of the mechanism of reproduction and retransmission of the spiritual heritage of humanity and the influence of the mental characteristics of ethnic groups on the world-historical process (pp. 35–36). So, in the first chapter of the work, scientists of the Institute carried out a historiosophical analysis of studies of historical memory and clearly defined the methodology of their own research, which is one of the important indicators of the high professional level of the Author’s team.

The most attention in chapter 2, entitled “Consolidating potential of memory policy: general patterns and national features” is given to memory policy in Germany (subsection 2.1. “Memory policy and the return of cultural values as components of overcoming the totalitarian legacy in Germany”).

The authors, following H. Koenig, singled out four historical periods of the policy of “overcoming the past” in Germany and carefully examined them according to the content of social reflection. It is substantiated that at the first stage (1945 – 1949) the measures of denazification did not change the attitude of Germans toward Nazism and the thesis of the Potsdam Conference about the “collective guilt” of the German people was not accepted. The property of the scientific method of the Authors of the chapter is a parallel study of the political course and scientific thought at each stage. Thus, it was observed that, in contrast to M. Heidegger, K. Jaspers singled out four types of guilt, in particular, the political responsibility of all citizens for the consequences of actions committed by their state, which opened the way to changes in the self-consciousness of the German nation (pp. 62–64). It was noted that with the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany and the GDR in 1949, the second stage of historical politics came, and the Amnesty Law of K. Adenauer initiated the integration of National Socialists into state structures. Instead, the leadership of the GDR built a “socialist” state and radically broke with Nazism (pp. 67–68). It has been confirmed that the third stage, known as the “long wave” (1960 – 1989), was marked by the formation of a new political culture. Its tonality was significantly determined by the trials against Nazi criminals, which led to a public discussion and youth protests in 1968. It is emphasized that since then the attitude of Germans to the Holocaust has served as a cornerstone of the memory of the Second World War, its criminals and victims. Chancellor V. Brandt’s apology for the Holocaust in Warsaw has been identified as a breakthrough in the politics of memory. The “dispute of historians” of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1986 – 1987 was analyzed, which confirmed the position of Y. Habermas regarding the responsibility for Nazi crimes of all generations of the German nation. It was revealed that this concept became a factor in the democratic profile of Germany as a state and dominated public consciousness (p. 69). It was revealed that at the fourth stage of the policy of “overcoming the past”, after the restoration of state unity in 1990, the process of understanding the past became more intense and visualized, which was also reflected by new discussions and scandals regarding the Nazi past of some famous figures. The authors proved that overcoming the past in Germany is a multidimensional process that includes renewal of the political system, memorialization of historical memory, compensation for victims of Nazism and forced laborers, restitution, and critical “processing” of the past (p. 82). Thus, it was established that at the stage of the “active culture of memory”, despite the recognition of the people’s political guilt for the crimes

of 1939 – 1945, their legal and moral condemnation was established, as a result of which Nazism is not associated with the concept of “German people” (pp. 94–95). The authors did not limit themselves to the analysis of the evolution of the politics of memory, but went to the level of conceptualizing the process of “overcoming the past” and observed a new trend in socio-political discourse – shifting the image of Germany from a “culprit country” to one that suffered at the end of the war (pp. 256–257). Accordingly, the popularity of the right-wing forces increased (the “Alternative for Germany” party has 89 seats in the Bundestag, while the left has only 39. – V.G., O.S.). It has been rightly noted that the experience of Germany is also valuable for Ukraine, which is rethinking its past (in particular, the tragedy and heroics of the war with the Russian aggressor).

Authors of subsection 2.2. “The experience of Italy in the application of the mechanisms of the politics of memory for the formation of national unity” carried out a rather extensive review of the historical path that led in the 19th century. to the unification of the Italian lands into a single state and revealed their different traditions, cultural influences and economic structure (pp. 97–102). It is confirmed that the division between the industrialized North and the more backward South has become a permanent feature of the economic landscape of Italy. It is noted that four regions of the North (Lombardy, Piedmont, Veneto and Emilia-Romagna) pay the lion’s share of taxes and produce a higher gross regional product per capita than other regions. However, the authors denied the widespread explanation of regional contradictions only by their socio-economic inequality and established an important factor that fuels centrifugal processes – the country’s motley ethnic and linguistic structure (14 linguistic minorities), where linguistic issues fall within the competence of the regions. A 1994 sociological survey is given: in the hierarchy of self-identification markers of Italians, “local-municipal commitment” is approved by 64% of respondents (p. 104). It is emphasized that due to the policy of regionalization of the country, established by the constitutional reform of 2001, the state system of Italy acquired federal features, and the politics of memory finally ended up in the sphere of competence of the regions, as well as large revenues from tourism. It was revealed that there is still a network of monuments to fascist figures in the regions of the country (pp. 107–108), while the preservation of national memorials is insufficiently financed. The system of holidays, of which only two are nationwide historical and political, is also noted as indicative. Thus, it was established that Italy’s course towards regionalization and multiculturalism led to the actual loss of the state’s influence on the formation of national identity and increased the disintegration of the country. Thus, in 2010, 58% of the population of Italy advocated a federal system, and 61% of residents of the northern regions spoke in favor of leaving the state in the event of a rejection of the federation. It has been proven that the expansion of the rights of the regions, although it is a principle of subsidiarity recommended by the EU, however, as evidenced by the experience of Italy, inhibits the formation of national identity and harms the unity of the country. Therefore, it was emphasized that the lessons of Italy’s state policy of memory are very relevant for modern Ukraine.

In subsection 2.3. “Politics of memory in France: historical experience and national discourse” The authors characterized the features of the confrontation between progressive and conservative schools of philosophy of history as a reflection on the cyclical nature of French history in the context of “revolution-restoration” (pp. 259–260). It is noted that the theories of the politics of memory have been developed since the end of the 18th century: J. Beaudin founded the monarchical-conservative concept of national sovereignty, and J. J. Rousseau became the founder of the theory of the civil nation, the ideologist of the Great

French Revolution. A conservative vision of national history was observed: the definition of the French mentality as a phenomenon that, thanks to historical memory, has been preserved in the mass subconscious for almost a millennium. Following A. Blok, an example of the durability of the national mentality is given – the image of the Gallic cock, as a symbol of the expansive French character (pp. 114–115). The views of A. Foulmer, who criticized the fixation on revolutionary changes and ignored the historical memory of the people, and E. Renan, who claimed that the French came out of a huge furnace in which the most diverse elements were “baked” under the king’s rule, were also considered. It was revealed that F. Braudel identified other “patrimonial traits” of French history: “permanent instability” and the drive to fragmentation, caused by regional sub-ethnicity. In turn, V. Giscard d’Estaing substantiated the concept of “state conducting”. Regarding the representatives of the progressive camp, the conclusions of Zh-A are given. Condorcet, about the fact that it is necessary to rely on developed cultural traditions, starting from the New and Modern times. It is emphasized that in the end, in the XX century. in France, the ultra-conservative tradition of historical memory won. It was revealed that the victory of reaction over modernization is connected with the figure of S. de Gaulle, who relied on the Constitution of the Fifth French Republic created “for himself” and became “the king of the constitutional monarchy” (R. Aron) (p. 120). The authors expressed their impression that the French could not overcome the confrontation between democratic and absolutist trends that gave rise to the modern crisis of representative democracy and the party system (p. 122). However, the Authors, having for some reason missed half a century of the politics of memory after S. de Gaulle, immediately moved to criticize the position of President E. Macron, abandoned the entire previous tradition. It is argued that such a course undermines national-cultural forms of consolidation and explains France’s instability, such as the “yellow vest” protests (p. 124). In fact, the protests of the “yellow vests” are caused, first of all, by miscalculations in the socio-economic policy.

Subsection 2.4. “Memory politics as a tool for identity formation: transformations in the conditions of globalization on the example of Turkey and India” is an attempt to cover two scientific objects, which are two distant and dissimilar former empires and former colonies.

It has been found that the Turkish government went from unification based on the secularism of the monoethnic Republic of the time of M. Kemal (“the doctrine of six arrows”) to ethnocultural pluralism with its appeal to the times of the Empire – neo-Ottomanism of R. Erdogan. It was noted that if at the state level the search for a pan-Indian version of the politics of memory by the Indian National Congress worked, then at the ethnocultural and religious levels the identification was split into Indian (Hindutva) and Muslim options (pp. 150, 153). Regional parties promoted “their stories” and speculated on the “phenomenon of hurt feelings” (p. 261). Since then, the influence of Hindutva, expressed in the platform of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), which won the 2014 elections, has been found to have increased. Accordingly, a shift towards the spread of state-wide nationalism and Hinduism to the regional level has been found. Commemoration in the form of the highest monument in the world (210 m) to the founder of the Maratha Empire, Chhatrapati Shivaji (pp. 154, 156) was marked. It was found that along with Islamization, reactualization of “imperial memories”, there was a liberalization of the politics of memory and a dialogue with minorities began, which was illustrated in R. Erdogan’s speech in 2010 at the Jafarit holiday: “On this earth, we are all one, we are together, we are brothers” (p. 140). It is noted that the ten-year program of the BJP “Goals 2023” declares the development of “political space based on cultural consensus”, the creation of a “nation state” and the provision of citizens with

their ethnocultural and religious rights (pp. 135–136). Therefore, the Authors established that the new memory policy of Turkey is characterized by flexibility and rejection of complete Turkification, however, the fact of the Armenian genocide is still denied and the political movement of the Kurds in Syria is fighting. It is substantiated that the involvement of the historical memory of non-Turkish communities in the “Ottoman project” increases the chances of the state’s accession to the EU, and at the same time, it is revealed that Turkey has set a course for a powerful regional or even supra-regional state. The authors observed that multi-ethnic India legally and politically adheres to ethnocultural pluralism (22 official languages in the Constitution), but strengthens the memorial component of the titular ethnicity. Thus, it is emphasized that India demonstrates an original combination of two mutually exclusive cultural policies for Europe, based on the Gandhian interpretation of the principle of “sarva dharma Sambhava”, exclusivity and inclusiveness (pp. 147–149).

At the same time, L. Koenig’s opinion is given that India “inevitably contributes to the culture of the majority”. In the end, the Authors established that the transformations of the politics of memory are characterized by a leading value direction: from the unification of ethnocultural diversity (Turkey) or – “boundless multiculturalism” (India) – to the legal balancing of the components of the state and titular ethnicity with ethnocultural and religious groups based on respect for the rights of the Other. It is proved that, in both cases, the ideology of general citizen nationalism, based on historical experience and folk traditions, demonstrated flexibility and the ability to adapt to the modern world (p. 262). Thus, the Authors have identified commonalities and differences in the politics of memory in Turkey and India and established their connection with globalization influences, which is a useful experience for Ukraine.

Section 2.5. is entitled From Isolation to Globalizing Unity: Possibilities for the Politics of Memory in China, Japan and South Korea. The authors carried out a comparative analysis of the memory policy of the leading countries of East Asia, noting that since 1978, China began a period of “reform and openness” and over the course of 20 years formed an extensive cultural market (pp. 159–160). The authors established that in the 21st century a new stage has come – the realization of internal “cultural productivity” with access to the world arena and the successful implementation of the “Cultural China” program: joint festivals, “cultural seasons” are organized, the “Great Wall of China” brands, “monks” are being promoted Shaolin”, “Colorful Yunnan”, etc. Confucius Institutes operate in 154 countries (p. 165). It was found that since 2011 the construction of a “powerful cultural state” is being implemented, and China has become the world’s largest exporter of cultural products. It has been proven that the state’s strategy is aimed at the development of the “socio-cultural space” and the value-cultural Chineseization of the world by means of “soft power”. It was noted that the country’s leader, Xi Jinping, continued the course of “putting antiquity at the service of modernity” and is implementing the “One Belt One Road” project – the unification of part of the world under the auspices of China (pp. 165–166). Regarding the politics of memory in South Korea, the authors stated that only since the mid-1990s, the state program of supporting culture using the production of a competitive cultural product has been implemented. The Bureau of Cultural Industry was established to promote Korean cultural brands, primarily film, in the world (p. 168). It is emphasized that in the 21st century the government took a course towards a “cultural superpower” and the model of an “open multicultural society”.

The program is implemented by the Presidential Council and the National Branding Committee (pp. 168–169). As for Japan, it is noted that in the 1980s Prime Minister Nakasone took the course of “kokusai koka” (“international state”) (p. 170). It is noted that in 2004, the

Council for the Promotion of Cultural Diplomacy was established, which operated in three areas: new technologies for presenting cultural products; orientation to all segments of the population and adaptation to local conditions. It was noted that Japan's cultural policy gained further development with the approval of the "Cool Japan" concept in 2012 and the creation of the Office for the Promotion of Creative Industries (pp. 170–171). It has been found that a feature of the branding strategy of Japanese culture is the combination of traditional content with consumer goods, the involvement of distributors and the potential of regions. Branding of fashion, anime, cuisine and tourism has been identified among the priorities, based on which Japan is making up for the loss of "soft power" pace in international politics. As a result, it was established that globalization processes actualized the value of national cultures, and their marketing contributed to social consolidation, improved the image of Asian states and provided economic benefits. However, despite the successful analysis of the "soft power" policy of three countries, primarily China, in our opinion, the Authors did not sufficiently investigate the reasons for their delay in "coming out into the world" and the impact of the traumatic memory of the mid-20th century. on their politics. We believe that it was worth reminding about the cultural role of the world-famous Asian brands "Suzuki", "Toshiba", "Huawei", "Samsung", etc.

Section 2.6. "The politics of memory as a component of the formation of national identity and consolidation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates in the conditions of modern transformations" contains an analysis of the politics of memory in two developed countries of West Asia. It was found out that the third Saudi state has religious, tribal and secular principles (tawheed ad-daulah) in its foundation (pp. 175, 178).

It was emphasized that the basis of the politics of memory in the Kingdom is the promotion of the country's exclusivity as the homeland of Islam, which serves both the consolidation of society and the support of the state system and the House of Saud dynasty. It is noted that although the politics of memory depends on the state religion – Wahhabism, the government constantly reminds the people that they are not only "Muslims" but also "citizens". It was noted that cultural and educational institutions operate successfully in the Kingdom, Islamic and Arab historical and cultural heritage, Bedouin traditions, and pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina are supported. Considerable attention is paid to the honoring of prominent personalities, such as the first king, Abdel ibn Saud. The popularity of regular events is noted: the Jenadriyya folklore festival in Riyadh, the camel festival, etc. It has been found that the KSA's memory policy is updated in the 15-year modernization program "Vision 2030", which envisages a rethinking of Islamic identity in the direction of greater tolerance and presentation in the world. Analyzing the formation of the memory policy in the United Arab Emirates (UAE), the authors established that it is based on the traditions of Arab society, religious dogmas, and the past of the Persian Gulf region (p. 183). It was noted that with the formation of the state (1971), the authorities organized a collection of artifacts that were supposed to consolidate cultural identity and national consciousness (p. 186). It is noted that in the 1990s, in connection with the influx of migrants, the UAE faced the task of creating an image of an autochthonous homogeneous people. The practice of setting up traditional villages, which recreated the way of life of autochthons before the oil boom, annual festivals of cultural and historical heritage, camel festivals (the largest display of Bedouin life), falconry spectacles, etc. was observed (pp. 191–193). Historical and cultural institutions are active, such as the UNESCO National Archives of Abu Dhabi. The first president of the country – Sheikh Zayed bin Sultan Al Nahyan (pp. 188–190) is widely revered. The latest stage of the formation of the memory policy in the country since 2010 has been characterized, among the priorities

of which are the preservation of the identity and unity of the people based on Islam and the Arabic language, strengthening the sense of patriotism. It was noted that the government, taking into account that the absolute majority of the population is migrant workers, practices intercultural dialogue combined with strictness towards dissent and rules of conduct. As a result, it was found that the models of the historical memory policy of the two countries form Islamic values, combined with the narrative of the history of the creation of the state, and the apologia of the “founding fathers” of the country. Both states are moving towards the modernization and popularization of cultural heritage with an exit to the world, which is why similar development programs for the KSA and the UAE serve. Measures to promote self-identification of youth are outlined as a feature of the UAE’s memory policy.

The third section of the work – “Politics of memory in domestic political and international conflicts and “battles for the past” – begins with subsection 3.1 of the synthesis content: “National policies of memory as a component of modern international relations”. The authors observed that in the modern era of mediatization of memory, there has been a transition beyond the link between generations to the global dimension when each nation constructs an image of its past “in the eyes” of other nations. Former memory narratives based on images of victory and triumph are found to be giving way to narratives of historical trauma and sacrifice (“sacrificial nationalism”) and collective guilt and responsibility. The authors observed the rapid growth of memory studies and reminded that a global consensus was formed: an ethical system, the core of which was the Declaration of Human Rights, and the ethical criterion was the Holocaust. However, it was noted that there remains an ineradicable political factor that generates “wars of memory” (pp. 197–199). It is proven that, according to the logic of nation-building processes, the “nationalization of history” that the West underwent in the 19th century is taking place in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), adjusted for the differences in the post-war development of countries in two political and ideological camps. It is noted that the countries of Western Europe recognized responsibility for the events of the Second World War, while in the CEE countries this past was viewed through the prism of their post-war destinies, therefore the “existential node of memory” became the commemoration of national victims as a result of the “post-war betrayal” of Old Europe and communist terror (pp. 206–207). It has been found that the bias towards the victimization of titular nations in the discourses of young democratic countries is a natural component of the process of “working through one’s past”, which, despite some destructiveness, can develop into an awareness of one’s responsibility for the totalitarian past. It was revealed that the path to moral responsibility and consolidation of nations lies through the objectification of historical traumas and their material and symbolic perpetuation.

“The politics of memory as a tool for the formation of national states in the Balkans” is the name of subsection 3.2, the authors of which logically began by defining the concept of “Balkan countries” as a region that includes the states that arose on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire in Europe. However, it was noted that since the world has developed a negative “Balkan stereotype”, the Croats, Slovenians, and Romanians position themselves as Central European nations. It was found that the politics of memory in the Balkans, in addition to those common to Europe, has specific features, such as an emphasis on historical heredity, and the millennial durability of the nation (examples of Croatia, Greece) (pp. 212–213). The dispute over the historical heritage between Greece and Macedonia was analyzed (partially completed in 2019 with the ratification of the name “Republic of North Macedonia”. – V. G., O. S.). The conflict between Macedonians and Bulgaria, which considers Macedonians to be a

Bulgarian ethnic group with a Western Bulgarian dialect, is also noted (pp. 213–216). The second characteristic feature of the historical politics of the Balkan countries is the combination of a call to fight for freedom with a victim complex. It is emphasized that the thesis of A. Liakos's point that the concept of memory as support preserved the integrity of Greek society even with the loss of sovereignty is true for other Balkan nations. It is noted that the history of wars in this region led to the appearance of the term "Balkanization" as "fragmentation of a large political unit into several small states between which hostile relations have developed" (p. 216). It was found that the own peoples in the Balkans are portrayed as defenseless victims of the machinations of great powers and predatory neighbors, hence the desire to "cleanse" the national life of foreign elements in their politics of memory. The third feature is characterized by megalomania and provincial Balkan imperialism. It is noted that the Balkans cannot accommodate the projects of all the "Great" states at the same time, which leads to permanent confrontation and cementing the reputation of the "powder keg of Europe" (pp. 218–219). Moreover, the authors found that the Balkan model of memory politics is effective for state building and national unity. However, because of modern realities and the Author's analysis, it is difficult to agree with the generalization that in all Balkan countries "radical changes in the official historical paradigm often occur" (p. 219). At the same time, the author's conclusion about the need for Ukraine to take into account the Balkan experience and balance its memory policy seems logical.

According to the name of the subsection 3.3. "The experience of the formation of the politics of memory in Hungary: achievements and miscalculations" The authors investigated the characteristic features of the politics of memory in Hungary, which provided an example of a decisive "closure" of communism for other countries of Central and Eastern Europe (p. 221). The commemoration of commemorative dates related to the totalitarian past, such as October 23 – Republic Day or (unofficially) "the day of two revolutions", is outlined as an important direction of the memorial policy. It is noted that the theory of "double occupation" has been established in the country and the memory of the victims of both totalitarian regimes is honored (p. 223). It is emphasized that the politics of memory in Hungary received a new impetus with the coming to power in 2010 of the right-wing conservative Fidesz party, which took a course to build "illiberal democracy" and foster patriotism based on the idea of national exclusivity of Hungarians as "islanders" in Europe. It was revealed that the memorialization of the image of Hungary as a victim of foreign occupations is aimed at cementing in the nation's consciousness the idea of the unique "surplus value" of its statehood, the dissolution of which in the "all-European identity" is unacceptable. It is noted that the sacred Crown of St. Stephen was moved to the parliament building, and the Austro-Hungarian monarchy (1867 – 1918) is considered the "golden age" of national history (pp. 224–225). It has been found that the Hungarian collective memory is characterized by a gap between pride in the "thousand-year-old state" (a symbol of victory) and the "trauma of Trianon" – the memory of the Trianon Treaty of 1920 (symbol of defeat), which recorded the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and led to the loss of 72% of the territory and 64% of the pre-war population of Hungary. It has been observed that during the premiership of Fidesz leader V. Orbán, a renaissance of the "Trianon cult" is taking place as a Day of National Unity. At the same time, with the knowledge of the World Council of Hungarians, a "symbolic expansion" is being carried out, in particular, the restoration of Hungarian memorial sites in Ukrainian Transcarpathia, etc. (pp. 226–227). It was noted that Hungary is asserting itself as a civilizational "center of gravity" for the Eurasian peoples. Thus, it was found that the country's historical policy combined two traditions of identity –

the European Christian-monarchical and nationalist “pre-Danube” history of the Magyars (pp. 228–229). In conclusion, the authors found that the specificity of the memory policy in Hungary was determined by the need to overcome the totalitarian legacy and some cultural and historical circumstances, which explain the emphasis on ensuring the spiritual and cultural unity of all Hungarians in the world. Among the successes of such a policy, the following are highlighted: the effectiveness of financing according to the “cost/result” ratio; maintaining strong ties with the diaspora; development of the transcultural community “Great Turan”, etc. As a shortcoming of the memory policy, its international conflict potential, which causes disputes with states where there are Hungarian communities (Romania, Slovakia, Ukraine) is identified.

Subsection 3.4. “The politics of memory of Great Britain and the problem of migrants” begins with the statement of the growth of the share of non-indigenous ethnic groups in British society (over 10% in 2011), primarily those from former British India (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh). It turned out that, thanks to the common history, the growth of their influence (primarily from India) is perceived by the British society quite loyally, as an element of stability. Examples of this are the memorial to the Nepalese soldiers of the British army, the monument to M. Gandhi, etc. (pp. 231–232). On the other hand, it was noted that migrants from South Asia often become “more British than the British themselves” by their way of life and way of life. The role of the Afro-Caribbean community in the memorial context was found to have gained significant resonance as a result of the Black Lives Matter (BLM)-inspired “Down with the Racists” campaign with a list of 60 monuments. As the Authors noted, the BLM initiative was a manifestation of a left-liberal approach that sometimes leads to “reverse racism” when the collective memory of white Europeans is discriminated against. In the summer of 2020, the monument to E. Colston was toppled, brutal inscriptions on the monuments to Queen Victoria and V. Churchill, and counter-attacks on memorial objects of Afro-Caribbeans. The “war of monuments” is characterized as a visual manifestation of the discrepancy between the majority of native and part of non-native British people in the perception of British history and its iconic figures (pp. 233–234). Another problem has also been observed, where difficulties with integration force migrants to cluster in locations, forming trans-ethnic identities such as “Scottish Bengalis” or “Jamaican Welsh”, sometimes with a bias towards separatism. It is established that although migrants are a potential factor of disintegration, the advantage of Great Britain is that most of them have experienced common historical trials with it.

Subsection 3.5. is entitled “Conflictogenic potential of modern politics of historical memory about the Civil War of 1861 – 1865 in the USA”. The peculiarities of the politics of memory in the USA are revealed, and it is emphasized that although its priority is to educate a patriotic citizen, the state system and the pluralistic nature of society have caused different understandings of patriotism in the states. The belated and specific nation-building of Americans and the creation of a unique nation-state in the USA, not a nation-state, have been confirmed. It has been found that the transition from slavery to freedom, carried out during the Civil War of 1861 – 1865, continues to create conflict in society. It was noted that the separatists of the South sought to restore their dignity by creating in the 1860s a myth about the “lost cause” of the Civil War – about the idyll of the noble patriarchal South, which was violated by immoral materialists – industrialists. It was found that this myth is still popular as an element of the “deep culture” of a part of poorly educated Americans, cultivated by a part of politicians, intelligentsia, and clergy (pp. 243–244). The authors reminded that in the late 2010s, due to police brutality, interracial relations sharply worsened in the country, and protests took place, which led to the “war of monuments” and the demolition of memorials to leading racist Confederates. After another

outbreak of violence in the summer of 2020, up to 26 million people participated in the riots, which made them the most massive in the history of the USA (pp. 248–249).

The authors discovered another aspect of the formation of the public memory of Americans – the “Call to Action” movement, for the truth of the Civil War. Since 2020, the historian S. Hancock and his associates have started a “good history demonstration”: they set up stands on the battlefields to compensate for the silencing of racial discrimination and slavery. The authors noted that President D. Trump called for a return to “patriotic education”, which was protested by members of the American Historical Association and other scholars who, recognizing the educational role of history, insisted on reporting the truth regardless of political expediency. In the end, the Authors claim that the process of nation-building in the USA is incomplete even in the 21st century, so there are no sufficient grounds to believe that a common American identity will eventually be formed. However, in our opinion, such a statement is doubtful, as well as the fact that the identity of European nations “in many cases declines, dissolves” (p. 238).

Summarizing the review of historical policy research in different countries of the world, it should be noted that the author team of the Institute of World History performed a large and complex job and, relying on a wide range of historiographical sources, sociological and statistical data, presented a panoramic section of the modern memory policy of many countries and regions of the world. The scientists of the Institute clarified the regional specificity of the factors of historical memory and forgetting, the historical and cultural structures and forms of collective memory, revealed the consolidating and destructive potential of the politics of memory, and characterized the peculiarities of discussions on these issues in some European countries. Institutional and financial support, forms, methods, and means of actualizing historical memory as an effective component of nation-building processes and the implementation of “soft power” policy in the international arena have been studied. Considered conclusions have been made that no matter how well-established the ideas about the past of a country are, it is transformed in one way or another under the influence of internal political needs, challenges of the information society, and processes of globalization and becomes a component of modern international relations. The authors found that in general there is a selective nature of restoring the past and incorporating it into the present, and the practice of mythologizing history is most characteristic of transit societies and is conditioned by the logic of de-communicization and the unfolding of nation-building processes. The authors established that the exit of discussions about memory beyond the boundaries of state-national spaces proves that a spatial, global dimension is increasingly added to their temporal dimension as a link between generations: now every nation constructs an image of its past in the context of world discourse. Evidence is provided that a global audience, united by the recognized moral consciousness and values of democracy, exerts a reverse influence on the interpretation of the past. Thus, on the examples of Germany, Austria, Great Britain, and other countries, it is proven that the established narratives of memory, based on images of historical victories, are increasingly being replaced by the narrative of historical trauma and sacrifice, and the discourse of collective guilt and responsibility. At the same time, it is emphasized that permanent surges in the politicization of historical memory, especially acute in European countries of young democracies, lead to contradictions and “memory wars” in the international arena (Balkan countries, Hungary, etc.). In our opinion, the most well-argued and logical in the monograph are the theoretical sections, as well as the studies of memory politics in Germany, Italy, the USA, Hungary, India and Turkey, Arab countries. We consider several well-founded proposals for Ukraine, taking into account world experience, a valuable achievement of the Author’s team.

However, we believe that, in general, the logical three-part construction of the monograph, in principle the theoretical section, the consolidating potential of the politics of memory and the politics of memory as a regulator of conflicts, does not fully correspond to the content of the material placed in them, since, for example, the politics of “muscular liberalism” Great Britain (Chapter 3) has greater consolidating potential than France or Italy (Chapter 2). At the same time, the complexity of the research subject was manifested in the fact that not all subdivisions of the monograph, as is the case in large author collectives, are equally equivalent in terms of the logical dimension of thesis-argument-conclusion. Thus, despite the weighted analysis of the scientific discourse on the collective memory of France, the authors of subsection 2.3. did not take into account almost half a century of memory policy experience between the reigns of S. de Gaulle and E. Macron, in particular, the position of President N. Sarkozy, who believed that to be a welcome guest, a visitor must become part of the French nation. Moreover, the consequences of ill-considered immigration measures, the absolutization of the ideology of multiculturalism, which leads to social tension, and the strengthening of right-wing forces led by Marine Le Pen, are not considered. We also believe that the three features of the memory policy of the Balkan countries and modern realities identified by the Authors of subsection 3.2 confirm not frequent radical changes, but rather the stable nature of their official historical paradigm. Although the Authors have singled out two sections with paradigms of memory policy in the dichotomies of “consolidation-disintegration” and multiple and national identities, we believe that these relationships in different countries are not sufficiently reflected in the final part of the work, called “Conclusion” in Russian. The concluding section looks, basically, like a compendium of the content of each subsection, while the need to compare the results of the memory policy in individual countries and regions to identify the degree of its success according to the degree of resonance or dissonance of “official” and “unofficial memory” is only partially realized” (criteria of L. Festinger’s theory of cognitive dissonance). The same applies to the lack of synthetic generalizations regarding the presence (or absence) of dominant trends in memory politics at the regional and international level (for example the “old” West and East of Europe, the Arab West and East of Asia, etc. However, these complex and ambiguous problems were probably not of primary importance to the authors of the country studies, therefore, they may be investigated in the future. After all, the culture of historical discussions provides for the creation of conditions for the search for historical truth, as it brings closer the possibility of identifying and condemning past injustices, which serves as a factor in the development of the individual and society in In our opinion, J. Assman’s opposition between communicative and cultural memory, in particular, due to the “polarity of the social elite that possesses knowledge, ... and the group”, is somewhat outdated, as for the information age.

Therefore, we believe that the “knowledgeable social elite” from the Institute of World History not only competently and reasonably researched the current state of communicative and cultural memory and historical policy in some countries but also presented it in an accessible and balanced way in their monograph to various social groups and political actors of Ukraine and the world. In general, the high professional level of the author’s team allowed historians of the Institute to conduct a thorough and balanced study, which, due to its relevance and fundamentality, is a significant contribution to the compendium of Ukrainian studies of world history, therefore it needs to be continued and expanded to include other countries and regions.

The article was received June 04, 2022.

Article recommended for publishing 22/02/2023.