

Haag von ihrer politischen Verantwortung für das begangene Unrecht freigesprochen. Zudem honoriere die politische Nachkriegsordnung der Region die jeweiligen Aggressoren für ihre Gewaltverbrechen. Laut HARTMANN liege die Verantwortung für diese Entwicklung bei der internationalen Gemeinschaft, und zwar zum einen beim Internationalen Strafgericht für das frühere Jugoslawien, weil dieses durch seine Anklagepolitik nicht das Wesen der in den Kriegen der neunziger Jahre begangenen Verbrechen erfasst habe, und zum anderen bei den Friedensmissionen, weil diese keine alternative Friedensregelung durchgesetzt hätten.

Die externen Akteure könnten und sollten nach Ansicht der Rezensentin den Menschen vor Ort nicht alle Schritte im Umgang mit der Vergangenheit abnehmen. Das Tribunal in Den Haag hat die Gewalttaten in den Kriegen zwischen 1991 und 1999 in vielen seiner Urteile als Verbrechen gegen die Menschlichkeit und im Fall Srebrenica sogar als Völkermord eingestuft. Es ist die Entscheidung der Politiker vor Ort, ob und wie sie sich zu diesen Urteilen stellen. Wie DRAGOVIĆ-SOSO in ihrem Beitrag richtig bemerkt, sollte am Ende transitorischer Justiz eine neue politische Kultur stehen, die mit vergangenen Mythen bricht. Dieser Weg steht den Gesellschaften des ehemaligen Jugoslawien noch bevor.

Der Sammelband ist vor allem für Leser und Leserinnen interessant, die sich für die Aufarbeitung von Vergangenheit in den Nachfolgestaaten Jugoslawiens interessieren. Sie finden in den länderspezifischen Essays viele Informationen und Anregungen für weitere Fragen und Problemlösungen. Die Struktur des Buches ermöglicht es, sich die relevanten Kapitel schnell herauszusuchen. Leider fehlt der Essay-Sammlung ein Beitrag zu Kroatien. Auch dort prallen schließlich unterschiedliche Erfahrungen und Sichtweisen über die jüngste Vergangenheit aufeinander.

Gelungen ist der Ansatz der Herausgeber, den Zusammenhang von Konflikt und Erinnerung nicht nur als Problem der Länder Südosteuropas zu verstehen, sondern ihn in einen gesamteuropäischen Rahmen zu stellen. Durch diese Herangehensweise zeigt sich, dass nicht nur die Menschen in den postjugoslawischen Nachkriegsgesellschaften von den europäischen Erfahrungen lernen können. Umgekehrt können die besonderen Herausforderungen, denen sich diese Gesellschaften in der Auseinandersetzung mit ihrer Geschichte stellen müssen, den anderen europäischen Ländern dienlich sein, Fragen zum Verhältnis zu ihrer Vergangenheit neu zu stellen. Egal ob die Auseinandersetzung mit der Vergangenheit in Deutschland, Österreich, Polen, Serbien, Bosnien und Herzegowina oder in einem anderen europäischen Land stattfindet: Aufarbeitung von Vergangenheit muss auch heißen, die eigenen Erinnerungen in einen größeren historischen Kontext zu stellen. Dieser Gedanke ist in mehreren Beiträgen des Buches zu finden. Nur ein kontextverhafteter Weitblick auf die Vergangenheit mache sichtbar, dass Krieg, Vertreibung und letztendlich Völkermord auch ein Erbe der gesamteuropäischen Geschichte sind.

Ute Möntnich (Marburg)

Damir ARSENIJEVIĆ, *Forgotten Future: The Politics of Poetry in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Baden-Baden: Nomos 2010. 212 S., ISBN 978-3-8329-5700-1, € 39,00

The continuous rise of the ethnonationalist discourse in Yugoslav politics from the late 1980s onward led to a crowding out of many alternative voices from the political and cultural spheres. Since the political and cultural elites presented this discourse as the only alternative dissident articulation to the previous communist/

socialist ideology, its hegemonic power became overwhelming. After reaching their zenith in the early 1990s, however, these extreme forms came under increasing pressure from the international community and were eventually officially discredited. Nonetheless, the ideological postulates of the ethnonationalists continue to play a dominant role in both politics and culture, especially in the divided polity of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH).

In his ground-breaking study, Damir Arsenijević highlights alternatives to the ethnonational ideological paradigm. By presenting a critical evaluation of cultural production and struggle through an in-depth analysis of the literature produced in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) from the late 1980s until 2006, the author gives voice to these alternative discourses. The author names these alternative discourses the *poetry of differences* (POD). He acknowledges that decisions regarding the inclusion of certain poems were necessarily subjective, given the vast amount of available texts and their subsequent translations into English. While some of the poems are presented, the bulk of the selected and translated texts are published in a separate annex, not included in the reviewed book (12). Arsenijević clearly positions himself as sympathetic to the discourses presented in the POD. Thus his book conveys not only an ideological stance, but also the analytical prism present throughout the book.

Arsenijević develops the analytical tools for his "reconstruction of cultural memory" (13) in BiH using a materialist critique of culture and ideology based on the works of Slavoj Žižek, Terry Eagleton, Alan Sinfield, Raymond Williams and others. He assesses the potential for dissidence by deconstructing the myths and postulates pervading what Arsenijević calls the *poetry of re-ethnicization* (PORE). These monistic and hegemonic discourses celebrate the values of patriarchal society and promote

a teleological vision of an "ethnically pure" community. He then presents alternative cultural articulations expressed by those who have remained excluded from the symbolic order of society on the grounds of their being different from the ethno-cultural mainstream. Poets challenging the dominant ideology by active and deliberate dissidence include those who are anti-nationalist, feminist, pro-gay/lesbian or otherwise socially critical. Such poets, which constitute what Terry Eagleton has called the "pharmakos" of society, represent "scapegoats" or the so-called "bone in the throat" of ethno-nationalists because their very existence demonstrates the impossibility of achieving a full closure of the societal discourse.

What Arsenijević means by active and deliberate dissidence is revealed when the POD is further contrasted to the *poetry of false universalization* (POFU). Arsenijević defines false universalization as the over-abstract universal politics that seek refuge in the apolitical domain of the private; it therefore fails to provide a significant ideological counterweight against ethnically coined monistic postulates. According to the author, this sort of poetry in fact cements the existing ethno-nationalist ideology by tacitly accepting it and "merely pacifying social antagonisms into incommensurable differences" (67). This corresponds, the author argues, to a conformist liberal logic that avoids the political and with it a clear and critical dissident stance (41, 48, 51f.).

The subsequent three chapters are structured in a chronological manner – before, during and after the war. Arsenijević discusses the respective three streams of poetry on the basis of selected representative works. The third chapter addresses cultural productions during the late 1980s in Yugoslavia and in BiH in particular. The author shows how alternative, non-ethnonationalist works from Slovenia chal-

lenged the communist party establishment, especially in BiH, but were ultimately not strong enough to promote sustainable alternative discourses (75f.). In the fourth chapter, Arsenijević demonstrates how re-ethnicization became the dominant ideology despite the atomized character of cultural production within BiH during the war period (116), as evidenced by the disproportionate number of publications penned by ethnonationalist poets at that time (117). The fifth chapter focuses on the ways in which radical ethnic agitation has been curbed under the pressure of the international community. Now each ethnonationalist group concentrates on mourning its own victims in its respective PORE, while the poets of the POFU support a of social amnesia by promoting a standpoint free of ideology that could be called post-political (158f.).

The categorizing scheme is coherently applied throughout the book. Arsenijević defines the works of Radovan Karadžić, Rajko Petrov Nogo, Džemaludin Latić, Boro Kapetanović, Stevka Kozić Preradović, Atif Kujundžić, Miro Petrović, Vesna Cimbalević, Nedžad Ibrišimović, Mira Šubašić, Mihajlo Orlović, and Branimir Arapović as part of the PORE. He shows how these writers attempt to create an image of a homogenous community based on a closed value system that does not accept any criticism to its postulates and in which all struggles are subordinated to the cause of the ethnos. These works are then contrasted to those of the POFU, represented by the works of Husejin Tahmišić, Dara Sekulić, Mubera Pašić, Ivan Kordić, Senadin Musabegović, Tanja Stupar, Ranko Risojević, Vojka Smiljanić-Đikić, and Ranka Peulić. These writers chose capitulation and retreat into the safety of the personal by expressing their alienation from a detached position, attempting to restore a sense of "common humaneness", but ultimately lacking the potential to fully ar-

ticulate a dissident stance (89, 128, 132). The term POD in turn is attributed to the works of Semezdin Mehmedinović, Ferida Duraković, Bisera Alikadić and Miljenko Jergović, Abdullah Sidran, Marko Vešović, Nermina Omerbegović, Asmir Kujović, Adisa Bašić, Sead Vrana, Šejla Šehabović, and to some works of Tanja Stupar.

Throughout the book, Arsenijević provides a competent in-depth analysis of the selected poems. Their fragmentary reproduction, however, often hinders the full intelligibility of the entire context. Furthermore, the lines of distinction between the POFU and the POD sometimes seem blurred, or at least not convincingly drawn. For example: In Tanja Stupar's poem *rat*, her extremely litotic ways of expression could be seen as a deliberate critique, rather than simply a retreat into the personal (130). In sum, however, the book proves to be an intellectually engaging, methodologically solid and empirically rich work.

Dareg A. Zabarah (München)

Neža Kogovšek (ed.), *The Scars of the Erasure*. Ljubljana: Peace Institute 2010, 269 S., ISBN 978-9-6164-5561-9, € 19,00

The Scars of the Erasure, edited by Neža Kogovšek, presents an important contribution to a better understanding of the problem of the so-called *erasure* in Slovenia. The expression *erasure* refers to a series of acts undertaken by the Slovenian governing authorities at the beginning of the 1990s that resulted in the removal of about 25,000 people from the register of permanent residents. By losing their legal status, these people were deprived of basic civil rights. They were removed from the registers on the grounds that they had not applied for Slovenian citizenship during the period proposed by the government of the newly independent country. The