



Communicating Memory & History

EDITED BY Nicole Maurantonio
& David W. Park

Communicating Memory & History takes as its mission the job of giving communication history its full due in the study of memory. Taking three keywords—communication, history, and memory—representing related, albeit at times hostile, fields of inquiry as its point of departure, this book asks how the interdisciplinary field of memory studies can be productively expanded through the work of communication historians. Across the chapters of this book, contributors employ methods ranging from textual analysis to reception studies to prompt larger questions about how the past can be alternately understood, contested, and circulated.

Communicating Memory & History is ideal for teaching, including case studies that elaborate different ways to approach issues in memory studies. While some foundational knowledge would be useful, it is possible to use the text without extensive knowledge of the literature. This book is of particular interest to professors, graduate students, and advanced undergraduate students of communication and media studies, as well as scholars and students in cultural studies, history, and sociology—disciplines where one finds steady consideration of issues related to communication, communication history, and memory.

Nicole Maurantonio received her PhD from the University of Pennsylvania and serves as Associate Professor of Rhetoric & Communication Studies and American Studies at the University of Richmond. She has previously published in *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *Southern Communication Journal*, *The Communication Review*, and *Media History*, among other journals.

David W. Park received his PhD from the University of Pennsylvania and serves as Professor of Communication at Lake Forest College. He has previously published *The History of Media and Communication Research* (with Jefferson Pooley), *The Long History of New Media* (with Nicholas W. Jankowski and Steve Jones), *Pierre Bourdieu: A Critical Introduction to Media and Communication Theory*, and *The International History of Communication Study* (with Peter Simonson).

www.peterlang.com

ADVANCE PRAISE FOR

Communicating Memory & History

“Memory should be a central concern of every communication scholar, especially to those who work in communication history. Scholars who work in the interdiscipline of memory studies should likewise be concerned with work in communication (particularly communication history). Nicole Maurantonio and David W. Park have assembled a compelling collection that shows how much these fields can mean to each other. Putting together a stellar international roster of authors, they have curated a set of fascinating essays. I am aware of no better gateway to memory studies for communication scholars. This book should be required reading for anyone with a serious interest in understanding collective memory in today’s media environment.”

—John Nerone, University of Illinois

“This book is an essential and long overdue exploration of the relationships between communication history and memory studies. With contributions by leading scholars in both fields, it shows the usefulness of a communication history perspective to understanding the dynamics of past remembrance and the present, at a time when such a perspective is much needed. It is an invaluable resource to anyone interested in the intersection of history, communication, and memory.”

—Keren Tenenboim-Weinblatt, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Communicating Memory & History

This book is part of the Peter Lang Media and Communication list.
Every volume is peer reviewed and meets
the highest quality standards for content and production.



PETER LANG
New York • Bern • Berlin
Brussels • Vienna • Oxford • Warsaw

Communicating Memory & History

Edited by Nicole Maurantonio
& David W. Park



PETER LANG
New York • Bern • Berlin
Brussels • Vienna • Oxford • Warsaw

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Maurantonio, Nicole, editor. | Park, David W., editor.
Title: Communicating memory & history / edited by Nicole Maurantonio
and David W. Park.
Description: New York: Peter Lang, 2019.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2018018357 | ISBN 978-1-4331-4556-8 (hardback: alk. paper)
ISBN 978-1-4331-4555-1 (paperback: alk. paper)
ISBN 978-1-4331-4557-5 (ebook pdf) | ISBN 978-1-4331-4558-2 (epub)
ISBN 978-1-4331-4559-9 (mobi)
Subjects: LCSH: Memory. | Communication—Research—History.
Classification: LCC BF371 .C66 2019 | DDC 153.1/2—dc23
LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018018357>
DOI 10.3726/b14522

Bibliographic information published by **Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**.
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the “Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie”; detailed bibliographic data are available
on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de/>.

© 2019 Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., New York
29 Broadway, 18th floor, New York, NY 10006
www.peterlang.com

All rights reserved.

Reprint or reproduction, even partially, in all forms such as microfilm,
xerography, microfiche, microcard, and offset strictly prohibited.



Table of Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	ix
<i>Introduction: Remembering Communication History</i> NICOLE MAURANTONIO AND DAVID W. PARK	1
 <i>Section I: Communicating Space & Time</i>	
<i>1. Interscalarity and the Memory Spectrum</i> EMILY KEIGHTLEY, MICHAEL PICKERING, AND PAWAS BISHT	17
<i>2. Archiving ISIS: Metastasized Archives, Lieux de Futur, and Endless War</i> PIOTR M. SZPUNAR	39
 <i>Section II: Narrative</i>	
<i>3. Remarkable Coincidence: A True Story of the Liberty Bell's Myth</i> DEBORAH LUBKEN	59
<i>4. Mass Media as Memory Agents: A Theoretical and Empirical Contribution to Collective Memory Research</i> MICHAEL MEYEN	77
<i>5. Mnemonic Newswork: Exploring the Role of Journalism in the Rereading of National Pasts</i> OREN MEYERS	99
 <i>Section III: Embodiment & Materiality</i>	
<i>6. Badna Naaref (We Want to Know): The Politics of Movement and Memory in "Postwar" Beirut</i> ERIN E. CORY	131

7. <i>“Taking Back” a Post-Conflict City: Tourism, Anniversary Memory, and the New Histories of Belfast</i>	155
CAROLYN KITCH	
8. <i>Presence and Absence: The Berlin Wall as Strategic Platform</i>	175
SAMANTHA OLIVER	
9. <i>Building an Archive for Future Generations: Archival Digitization at the National Library of Israel</i>	195
SHARON RINGEL	
Section IV: Audience	
10. <i>Digital Post-Scarcity Versus Default Amnesia: Russian Political Existence and the Online Resurrection of Memories of the Dead at the Nord-Ost Theatre Siege</i>	213
AMANDA LAGERKVIST AND KATERINA LINDEN	
11. <i>Reclaiming Identity: GDR Lifeworld Memories in Digital Public Spheres</i>	243
MANUEL MENKE AND EKATERINA KALININA	
<i>Postscript: Once A Margin, Always A Margin</i>	261
BARBIE ZELIZER	
<i>Contributors</i>	271
<i>Index</i>	277



Figures

Figure 4.1:	Typology of GDR memories in Germany	89
Figure 5.1:	1994 <i>Yedioth Aharonoth</i> interview with Benny Morris	108
Figure 5.2:	1994 <i>Yedioth Aharonoth</i> interview with Anita Shapira	109
Figure 5.3:	Number of items mentioning “new historians” and “Israel,” by year	111
Figure 5.4:	<i>Yedioth Aharonoth</i> , 1968	115
Figure 5.5:	Ma’ariv, 1968	117
Figure 6.1:	Protesters outside the National Museum	141
Figure 6.2:	Map of protest route, distributed at <i>Enough Waiting</i> event	143
Figure 6.3:	Survivors hold family photographs outside the Anglo-American Cemetery in Tahwita	146
Figure 6.4:	A man photographs the portraits of the missing and disappeared, reproduced as a poster for an NGO exhibition	149
Figure 6.5:	<i>Enough Waiting</i> canvas petition, later signed by protesters	150



Acknowledgments

This volume is the result of collaborative work between the editors and the contributors. Behind the scenes one also finds numerous others whose assistance was necessary to the volume you are now reading.

The volume's origins can be traced to a pre-conference held during the 2014 annual meeting of the International Communication Association (ICA). This pre-conference, titled "Making Sense of Memory and History," would not have been possible without the assistance of Michael Haley and Jennifer Le at ICA. Rick Popp was then chair of the ICA Communication History Division, and his enthusiasm and support were integral components of this pre-conference experience. The pre-conference took place at Seattle's Museum of History and Industry (MOHAI), where Christine Kolodge worked out local arrangements.

Working with Peter Lang Press has been a most pleasant experience, in large part thanks to the editorial work of Kat Harrison, whose support for this volume has been most appreciated. Mike Doub, Luke McCord, and Jackie Pavlovic at Peter Lang performed essential work for the volume's completion. It is great to work with this team.

Our contributors are extraordinarily generous scholars, whom we thank heartily for agreeing to be part of this project and for working with us.

Nicole would like to offer her thanks to Virginia Humanities for supporting her sabbatical, as well as colleagues at the University of Richmond in the department of Rhetoric & Communication Studies, the American Studies program, and those involved with the Race & Racism at the University of Richmond Project. Nicole also thanks her husband, Justin, for his constant encouragement.

Dave would like to tip his hat to his colleagues in the Department of Communication at Lake Forest College: Liz Benacka, Linda Horwitz, Rachel Whidden, and Camille Yale. Their collegueship helped this book along the way more than they could know. Dave also thanks his wife Sarah, who always knows what's up.



Introduction: Remembering Communication History

NICOLE MAURANTONIO AND DAVID W. PARK

On August 11 and August 12, 2017, white supremacists convened in Charlottesville, Virginia under the guise of a “Unite the Right” rally, attracting neo-Nazis and members of the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) to the University of Virginia and Downtown Mall less than a mile from campus. The rally’s stated purpose was to protest the removal of a monument to Confederate General Robert E. Lee as well as the removal of Confederate monuments across the United States. The ensuing violence, enacting racism, sexism, homophobia, anti-Semitism, and other forms of hatred, culminated in the death of one counter-protester, Heather Heyer, and the wounding of several others. Like many, both near to and far from Charlottesville, we bore witness to the graphic photographs and streaming videos of the violence on television and on the internet.

While the ability to bear witness to the violence in Charlottesville as it unfolded—and re-watch it afterward—is a reality of the 21st century media landscape, one of the most profoundly disturbing facets of the violence in Charlottesville was its familiarity. The scene in Charlottesville was resonant. News reports recounted, “the weekend’s events [featuring Nazi sympathizers] [were] particularly wrenching in Germany, a nation still seared by the darkest chapters of its past.”¹ In Canada, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau took to Twitter to remark, “We know Canada isn’t immune to racist violence & hate. ...”² For some in the United States, the images evoked memories of violence sparked during the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s. The images of predominantly young, angry white men holding tiki torches on Thomas Jefferson’s Lawn outside the iconic Rotunda evoked historic images of the KKK, an organization many (whites) assumed was a vestige of the past. Yet, as the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) reminds us, there are more

than 900 hate groups currently operating in the United States.³ Organizations ideologically rooted in prejudices are not only present but vibrant. To apply an apposite truism: the past is prologue.⁴

It would be easy to pause on the events in Charlottesville as a moment of terror and tragedy suspended in isolation, yet the hatred that spurred the violence in Charlottesville was not new, nor was it unique. Similar violence unfolds daily across the world. It might just not be as visible, as highly mediated. In the weeks following the violence, editorials and op-eds flooded news organizations worldwide from trained historians, cultural critics, and members of the public. While many expressed profound sympathy for the families of the victims and shock at the sight of Klansmen operating out in the open—German Chancellor Angela Merkel dubbed the scenes “absolutely repulsive—naked racism, antisemitism and hate in their most evil form”⁵—the outpouring of commentary, across platform and the political spectrum, placed into sharp relief the very unresolved nature of the past.

What we had borne witness to was a violent collision between history and memory—between a history of white supremacy and a collective memory that denies this past, embracing in its stead so-called Lost Cause narratives of happy, faithful slaves, and a benevolent institution (slavery) in an entity, the Confederacy, protected by heroic and valorous leaders.⁶ In Charlottesville, we witnessed nostalgia for the pre-Civil War past, and a present where historical trauma is relived daily though was crystallized in a series of poignant incidents.

We begin by recounting the recent events in Charlottesville because they foreground the three keywords with which this volume engages: *communication*, *history*, and *memory*. Although the scholarly landscape has become more hospitable to theorizing history and memory as interdependent as opposed to antithetical,⁷ while also more frequently involving communication scholars in the conversation, current events suggest the stakes are especially high as we attempt to make sense of the lived experiences of individuals and collectives as they remember and reckon with their pasts in attempts to move forward.

What we witnessed in Charlottesville was a series of communicative actions enacted and narrativized, steeped in the past, and embodied in the present. While at face value the protest ostensibly addressed the status of statues, the protest and ensuing violence were about the politics and materiality of memory and its relationship to history. Immediately tethered to a place—Charlottesville, Virginia—and a nation, the United States—the communicative rituals subject to contest and negotiation can be seen across the world, from the former GDR to the former Soviet Union. These connections, however, cannot be forged without a firm grasp of the vagaries of history and the communicative processes underpinning its unfolding.

Communicating Memory & History makes the argument that the relationships between the subfields of communication inquiry referred to as communication history and memory studies have great promise for addressing the kinds of issues that are raised by events like those in Charlottesville. While communication history has rested somewhat uncomfortably on the margins of communication scholarship, with its motley crew of practitioners located betwixt and between multiple subfields, neither wholly recognized by communication studies nor respected by departmented historians, communication history has developed into a robust and diverse subfield. Rather than the “rambling interdisciplinary”⁸ whose identity has been inchoate, at best, by embracing communication studies’ broader promises of “epistemic plurality, historical contingency, and practical engagement,”⁹ communication history provides a rich intellectual space for the exploration of memory and its varied manifestations.

The goal of this introduction is to argue for the place of communication history within memory studies scholarship. By foregrounding a set of themes that can be mapped onto communication historians’ attentiveness to the twinned processes of ritual and transmission,¹⁰ including space and time, narrative, materiality, and audience, *Communicating Memory & History* emphasizes multimodal perspectives that move scholarly inquiry beyond questions of mediation in nation-centered studies to a transnational context. In so doing, we seek to reinforce the positional locus of communications studies as a discipline whose very insistence on not being tied to any one epistemic or methodological model serves as an asset. As a result, communication historians are especially well equipped to engage with the issues of the dynamic relationships between the past and present, the individual and collective, and the local and global, that preoccupy scholars of memory.

On Communication History and Memory

If the relationship between the disciplines of communication and history has been likened to a meeting of two “distant, disliked relative[s]” who “offer handshakes” but not the proverbial hug, the relationship between the subfield of communication history and memory studies has been, at least outwardly, just as cold.¹¹ The reason for this, we suggest, might stem from both communication history and memory studies’ difficulties in codifying their respective pasts, with communication historians embracing a concern David Blight has argued as endemic to the discipline of history: a fear of running the “risk [of] thinking *with* memory rather than *about* it.”¹²

A relative newcomer to the disciplinary landscape, communication is a field of inquiry without much history—at least not when compared to its humanistic progenitors.¹³ Anchored in early 20th century responses to the dominance of positivist paradigms within the academy, the story of communication can best be cast as a sort of “invention of tradition,”¹⁴ an attempt to fill historical lacunae with an intellectual trajectory, a *modus operandi*. In crafting a story of origins, communication studies would forge a narrative that might grant the field a degree of legitimacy and community afforded its disciplinary relatives, or so was the hope.¹⁵ As Hanno Hardt summarized, “After all, the perceived need for an identity involves the construction of a fiction that serves to place the institution—or the field of study—in reality.”¹⁶ Simply put, “communities of scholars need stories to bind them together.”¹⁷ They are members of interpretive communities, as Barbie Zelizer has argued; as such, they “determine[s] what counts as evidence in which ways, making judgment calls about the focal points worth thinking about and the kinds of research that count.”¹⁸

“What counts,” however, has not always been easy to denote within the field of communication. This tension, at least in part, led to James W. Carey’s famous call for work that marries the ritual and transmission models of communication, presenting a vision of communication *as* culture. While Carey identified the study of communication as an enterprise we pursue to “examine the actual social process wherein significant symbolic forms are created, apprehended, and used,”¹⁹ his words, as John Durham Peters suggests, have since been adapted, reinterpreted, and even misinterpreted.²⁰ Too often, communication scholars have taken Carey’s consideration of ritual and transmission to be a disciplinary mandate to elevate the ritual approach at the expense of transmission. The result is a false binary; ritual and transmission require each other for either to have any meaning.

Building on Carey’s call, and its place within the work of communication historians, whom we define here as scholars whose “domain includes ideas, practices and processes, institutions, materialities, and events of communicative expression, circulation, and exchange,”²¹ we then turn to the study of collective memory, which as Zelizer has argued, “represents a graphing of the past as it is used for present aims, a vision in bold relief of the past as it is woven into the present and future.”²² Such a graphing has led to memory studies’ appeal across the academy, attracting the attention of humanists, social scientists, and artists. Joanne Garde-Hansen has pointed out that this broad appeal has led to a capaciousness that, while often embraced in the name of interdisciplinarity, multi-disciplinarity, trans-disciplinarity, or even *anti*-disciplinarity, can also be imagined as a liability.²³ In these ways, memory studies shares much in common with communication history: concerned with

the past, both fields have often lacked a strict (or, factually, even a loose) sense of their own disciplinary mooring.

Yet, rather than attempt to map these histories onto one another, seeking points of conceptual and methodological overlap, this volume seeks to place the field of communication in conversation with the field of memory studies, considering the subfield of communication history with its own sense of history as a set of *histories* and its attendant biases so as not, as Josh Lauer has put it, to “disparage the significance of the past, but to acknowledge its dynamism.”²⁴

The results of these efforts to map communication studies’ history, however, many have argued, has been a sense of intellectual incoherence and fracture stemming from at once the diversity of the canon from which historians of communication draw as well as, relatedly, communication historians’ disparate areas of study.²⁵ There is, as William Eadie has argued, “the speech story,” “the journalism story,” and “the communication story”²⁶ within the field. Perhaps as a result of this lack of “unified” history, the field of communication, as John Nerone suggests, “has always emphasized the future.”²⁷

Such an emphasis might seem to make a scholarly preoccupation with the past untenable or incompatible with communication studies’ futurist gaze. In describing the field’s “powerful impulse to project historical narratives,”²⁸ Nerone pointed to three particular formations that have bridged two broadly defined intellectual arcs within communication history scholarship: the history of technology, the history of the book, and the history of the public sphere. While this fairly simple, straightforward typology might seem to offer a sense of disciplined coherence, a sense that communication history’s purview could be neatly bounded, since the publication of Nerone’s essay in 2006, it has become increasingly clear that further categories might be needed to encompass the breadth of communication scholarship—or perhaps a more explicit recognition that within each of these formations, communication historians were ultimately engaging the very thing that had gone unspoken: producing histories of memory.

The disciplinary entry points for the study of memory are vast, from sociology to psychology to anthropology, making its inheritance “complex.”²⁹ While, as Jeffrey Olick, Vened Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy note, memory is “hardly a new topic,” the study of memory has a history that is, like communication’s own story, segmented and multidisciplinary, owing not to a single discipline but to a confluence of interpretive frames. Often traced to “the decline of postwar modernist narratives of progressive improvement through an ever-expanding welfare state,”³⁰ the so-called “memory boom” offered academics an opportunity to reflect at a historical juncture when nation-states sought to restore their legitimacy, seeking unity in the wake of

global disruption. Simply put, scholars sought out memory in the service of reinstating the viability of the collective.

In the close to thirty years since historian Pierre Nora wrote in “Between Memory and History” of the oppositional nature of the two entities, scholars across the academy have, for the most part, largely abandoned the “memory and history as fundamental antagonist” trope that was distilled above so poignantly. Instead they have embraced a more generative frame that views memory and history as interdependent—entities whose conflicts and collisions are “necessary and productive.”³¹ As Astrid Erll writes, rather than the “Other of history,” memory “is the totality of the context within which such varied cultural phenomena originate.”³² If one views “history as a communication problem,”³³ this volume posits memory as a particular communication history problem. It is the contention of *Communicating Memory & History* that the subfield of communication history’s particular orientation and sensitivity to the issues inherent in narrativizing the past make it a potent force in conversations surrounding cultural memory.

A History of This Book

Communicating Memory & History originated as a one-day pre-conference sponsored by the Communication History Division of the International Communication Association (ICA). Held in Seattle, Washington at the Museum of History and Industry (MOHAI) in 2014, the pre-conference was proposed in response to concerns regarding the Division’s self-definition. Then only seven years old, the Communication History Division was born in response to a reality within the field of communication: while historical research was being undertaken in corners of the organization, communication historians lacked a community and recognition as a collective of scholars engaged in critical inquiries into the past. As with all nascent organizations and collectives, this one (initially the Communication History Interest Group—CHIG, now the Communication History Division—CHD) was concerned with defining its borders. As such, “communication history,” as defined by the Division, was determined to be comprised of three areas of inquiry:

1. History of Communication, including Media History, focusing around history of communication praxis.
2. History of the Field of Communication, focusing largely around issues concerning the institution of communication studies and the research it has yielded.
3. History of the Idea of Communication, focusing around how communication has been conceptualized alternately over time.³⁴

Embracing the arenas of social, political, and intellectual history, where much important and excellent work has been done, communication history, as initially demarcated, had not been defined in capacious enough terms. Or perhaps more accurately, the Division had left as largely implicit what had become a truism: the relationship between memory and history made memory studies a dimension of communication history scholarship that had been, to that point, largely invisible, as if we were internalizing the very debates surrounding history and memory that Nora had articulated some years before.

Beyond a simple acknowledgement, however, of memory studies' absence in our organizational documentation, we posed the question: What does communication history as a subfield offer academic inquiries into cultural memory?

A quick review of the ICA's recent conference programs reveals the presence of memory studies scholarship in a variety of divisions, from Popular Communication to Journalism Studies to Visual Communication, and rightfully so. Each of these divisions represents fruitful areas of memory study, and we do not intend for this volume to declare memory the rightful province of communication history. Such a pronouncement would be antithetical to the spirit of this volume, and to the very interdisciplinarity/transdisciplinarity we herald as one of the field's greatest strengths. This is thus not a volume focused on "media memory—the systematic exploration of collective pasts that are narrated by the media, through the use of the media, and about the media."³⁵ This volume is centrally focused on how communication historians' work in "triangulating record, transmission, and interpretation,"³⁶ can productively expand how the subfield positions itself in specific forms of knowledge production.

Overview: Communicating Memory & History

In mapping the trajectory of communication history in their volume *The Handbook of Communication History*, Peter Simonson, Janice Peck, Robert T. Craig, and John P. Jackson Jr. identify a series of trends within the subfield to be cultivated, falling roughly under the headings of materiality, depth, internationalization, social identities, digitalization, and reflective historicizing.³⁷ We take up each of these calls, albeit in slightly different ways, in attending to the themes of this volume: space and time, narrative, materiality and embodiment, and audience. Unlike previous volumes that engage with issues in the study of memory, this volume does not focus upon a particular *type* of case, such as exemplars of "trauma, conflict and turmoil" that "demand resolution, recovery and restoration, with the chance to revise old and reconstruct

new ways of living.”³⁸ Neither does this volume focus on media technologies or on the specific media platforms that have aided in the construction and reconstruction of pasts.³⁹ Rather, the chapters in this volume seize upon developments within the subfield of communication history to identify concepts and methods that offer opportunities to reconsider the issues of archives and information technologies, nostalgia, trauma, and identity formation that have tended to preoccupy memory scholars.

Space & Time

The temporal and spatial dynamism of memory constitute the point of departure for the first section of the volume. In this section, Keightley, Pickering, and Bisht bridge questions of temporality and the social by theorizing the concept of “interscality” to push beyond the individual/collective binary that has stymied scholarly discourse, arguing instead for interscalar mobility between different social, temporal, and spatial registers. By placing questions of temporality and space in conversation with the power of digital media technologies, Szpunar, like Keightley, Pickering, and Bisht, emphasizes the complexity of historical record through a case study of the recent digitization of the right-wing non-profit The Clarion Project. Excavating this case study, Szpunar places into sharp relief the ways in which communication history can, through its remaking and reinterpretation of time, emphasize the “dynamic historical record.”⁴⁰ These chapters disrupt the notion of linearity or a desired linearity in historical record and memory’s theorization.

Narrative

The next section of the volume, narrative, engages with tensions in the transmission of memory. As Peters notes in considering the work of the historian: “So much depends on an auction catalog or a royal archivist. Both history and media have gatekeepers.”⁴¹ The chapters in this section are invested in not simply acknowledging that gatekeeping occurs but rather the mechanisms that facilitate it. Deborah Lubken addresses the shifting memories of the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia, and how different narratives about the bell emerged to match new uses for its story. Michael Meyen weaves his way through a multi-method consideration of mediated narratives of the GDR and the kinds of narratives that find purchase amongst the former residents of the GDR and amongst those who live in eastern Germany today. Oren Meyers analyzes the important memory work of journalists, whose involvement in a debate over Israeli historiography demonstrates the fundamental place of journalism in establishing and securing legitimacy for different and opposing narrative

threads of memory and history. These chapters consider the historical actors who narrate, some intentionally and others not, the symbols they invest with meaning, the specific decisions made that shape the production of knowledge, and the impact these decisions have on identities.

Materiality & Embodiment

The chapters in this section, engaging with issues of materiality and embodiment, consider the varied ways memories are transmitted—through bodies and material texts that are deeply informed by a politics of representation and circulation—cornerstones of communication study. Employing a variety of methods, including ethnography, interviews, and textual analysis, as well as theoretical frameworks in performance studies, cultural geography, and spatial rhetorics, these chapters explore the ways in which pasts are alternately remembered and forgotten strategically to serve the interests of states, tourism, and politicians. In so doing, these chapters encourage an expansion of not only what is meant by materiality but how communication historians study embodied memory.

Audience

The final section, audience, considers reception, interpretation, and its human nature, posing a central set of issues for communication studies. As Peters argues, “There could be no more exacting mandate for historical interpretation than to recognize that we act in history by attempting to communicate with it. The past is open-ended because it was made in part by human beings, and human beings are worthy of respect and remembrance ... Doing violence against history is in some deep way also violence against human beings.”⁴² The last two chapters in this volume consider the use of nostalgia and experiences of trauma to consider how memory can be alternately deployed. Amanda Lagerkvist and Katerina Linden show the workings of would-be “mere” audience members who post their own counter-official memories of the Nord-Ost theater siege to social media and to other memorial sites. Manuel Menke and Ekaterina Kalinina speak with administrators and posters in social media communities dedicated to remembering the GDR. Their careful consideration of the audience members’ approaches to remembrance highlights some of the bottom-up tendencies in memory that often go neglected in memory studies.

Taken together, the chapters in this volume, through their attentiveness to a variety of case studies spanning geographic locale and political context, underscore the nuanced interventions of communication historians in the

study of memory. Invoking a range of theoretical and methodological traditions, the chapters in this volume posit memory as an entity powerfully interrogated from a communication history perspective.

Notes

1. Isaac Stanley-Becker and James McAuley, “‘We have drawn a different lesson from history’: How the world is reacting to violence in Charlottesville,” *The Washington Post*, August 14, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/charlottesville-violence-condemned-in-europe-elsewhere-around-the-world/2017/08/14/6765c0be-80ef-11e7-9e7a-20fa8d7a0db6_story.html?utm_term=.ac654442b01b.
2. Rick Jervis, “Leaders around the globe denounce Charlottesville clashes,” *USA Today*, August 14, 2017, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2017/08/14/leaders-around-globe-denounced-charlottesville-clashes/566024001/>.
3. “Hate Map,” Southern Poverty Law Center, <https://www.splcenter.org/hate-map>, accessed November 27, 2017.
4. While traced to Shakespeare, “What’s past is prologue” is a phrase most recently and commonly used to refer to racial violence in the United States and the ways it references the nation’s complicated racial history. For one such example, see Christina Paz-zanese, “What’s past is prologue,” *Harvard Gazette*, November 12, 2015, <https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2015/11/whats-past-is-prologue/>.
5. Jervis, “Leaders around the globe denounce Charlottesville clashes.”
6. Alan T. Nolan provides an excellent overview of the Lost Cause in “The Anatomy of the Myth,” in *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*, eds. Gary W. Gallagher and Alan T. Nolan (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2000), 11–34.
7. On the historic antagonism between history and memory, see Pierre Nora, “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire,” *Representations* 26 (Spring 1989): 7–24. For a call for the interdependence of history and memory, see Natalie Zemon Davis and Randolph Starn, “Introduction,” *Representations* 26 (Spring 1989): 1–6.
8. John Nerone, “The Future of Communication History,” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 23, no. 3 (2006): 254.
9. Barbie Zelizer, “Communication in the Fan of the Disciplines,” *Communication Theory* 26, no. 3 (2016): 213–235.
10. James W. Carey, *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989).
11. Barbie Zelizer, “When Disciplines Engage,” in *Explorations in Communication and History*, ed. Barbie Zelizer (London: Routledge, 2008), 5.
12. David W. Blight, “If you don’t tell it like it was It can never be as it ought to be,” in *Slavery and Public History: The Tough Stuff of American Memory*, eds. James Oliver Horton and Lois E. Horton (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 25.
13. We distinguish here between communication studies and rhetoric, while noting that there are some who would tie these two forms of inquiry together.
14. Hanno Hardt citing Hobsbawm and Ranger on the *Invention of Tradition* in “Foreword,” in *The History of Media and Communication Research: Contested Memories*, eds. Jefferson Pooley and David W. Park (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2008), xi–xvii.

15. Hardt, "Foreword," 1.
16. Ibid.
17. William F. Eadie, "Stories We Tell: Fragmentation and Convergence in Communication Disciplinary History," *Review of Communication* 11, no. 3 (2011): 161.
18. Zelizer, "When Disciplines Engage," 3.
19. Carey, *Communication as Culture*, 30.
20. John Durham Peters, "History as a Communication Problem," in *Explorations in Communication and History*, ed. Barbie Zelizer (London: Routledge, 2008), 19–34.
21. Peter Simonson, Janice Peck, Robert T. Craig, and John P. Jackson, Jr. "Introduction," in *The Handbook of Communication History*, eds. Peter Simonson, Janice Peck, Robert T. Craig, and John P. Jackson, Jr. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2012), 1.
22. Barbie Zelizer, "Reading the Past Against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12 (1995): 218.
23. Joanne Garde-Hansen, *Media and Memory* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), 16.
24. Josh Lauer, "Introduction: Communication and History," in *Explorations in Communication and History*, ed. Barbie Zelizer (London: Routledge, 2008), 15.
25. Eadie, "Stories We Tell," 161. This is a point also made by Nerone in "The Future of Communication History."
26. Eadie, "Stories We Tell."
27. Nerone, "The Future of Communication History," 254.
28. Ibid.
29. Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, "Introduction," in *The Collective Memory Reader*, eds. Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2011), 22.
30. Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Levy, "Introduction," 3.
31. Davis and Starn, "Introduction," 5.
32. Astrid Erll, *Memory in Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 7.
33. Peters, "History as a Communication Problem," 19–34.
34. See Communication History Division webpage, <http://communicationhistory.org/about/>, for further elaboration as well as detail in the Division's bylaws.
35. Motti Neiger, Oren Meyers and Eyal Zandberg, eds. *On Media Memory: Collective Memory in a New Media Age* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 1.
36. Peters, "History as a Communication Problem," 20.
37. Simonson, Peck, Craig, and Jackson, Jr., "Introduction," 7.
38. See, for instance, the work of Andrea Hajek, Christine Lohmeier, and Christian Pentzold, *Memory in a Mediated World: Remembrance and Reconstruction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 2.
39. Several excellent examples include Jill A. Edy, *Troubled Past: News and the Collective Memory of Social Unrest* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2006); Garde-Hansen, *Media and Memory*; Hajek, Lohmeier, and Pentzold, *Memory in a Mediated World*; Neiger, Zandberg, and Meyers, *On Media Memory*; Barbie Zelizer, and Keren Tenenboim-Weinblatt, eds. *Journalism and Memory* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
40. Peters, "History as a Communication Problem," 24.
41. Ibid., 25.
42. Ibid., 31.



Section I: Communicating Space & Time

Barbie Zelizer has remarked that collective memory is, among other things, partial, unpredictable, and material.¹ Memory's complex relationship to space and time continues to emphasize the variability of this work.² The result has been the scholarly pursuit, as Wulf Kansteiner notes, of a "slippery phenomenon,"³ which has fostered a current intellectual deficiency: the lack of a theoretical and methodological apparatus for engaging with memory's unpredictability.

Attempts to negotiate this conceptual and methodological challenge have historically led to a focus "on the representation of specific events within particular chronological, geographical, and media settings,"⁴ often to the exclusion of the audiences implicated. The outcome has been a corpus of rich case studies spanning the disciplinary landscape, emerging from both the humanities and social sciences that, while valuable, can only take us so far. As Kansteiner has argued, so-called "collective memory studies,"⁵ for instance, has "not yet sufficiently conceptualized collective memories as distinct from individual memory."⁶ Such a critique builds on the earlier work of historian Pierre Nora, whose theorization of "lieux de memoire," or sites of memory, posits such "lieux" as "mixed, hybrid, mutant, bound intimately with life and death, with time and eternity; enveloped in a Mobius strip of the collective and the individual, the sacred and the profane, the immutable and the mobile."⁷ Emphasizing the "lieux"'s "capacity for metamorphosis, an endless recycling of their meaning and an unpredictable proliferation of their ramifications,"⁸ Nora introduces the lieu de memoire as double: "a site of excess closed upon itself, concentrated in its own name, but also forever open to the full range of its possible significations."⁹ If, as Zelizer argues, "collective memory is predicated upon a dissociation between the act of remembering

and the linear sequencing of time,”¹⁰ then communication scholars must be equipped to address the ways in which time is negotiated. Both the works of Kansteiner and Nora prompt a series of questions for communication historians engaged in the study of memory: What tools can be brought to bear in parsing the relationship between the individual and the collective? How can we imagine “lieux de memoire” in a digital landscape? How do these conceptual and methodological tools shape communication historians’ understandings of temporalities?

The two chapters in this section take up these questions, acknowledging the blindspots the literature has thus far been loath to address, particularly as memory studies has tended to emphasize, and be structured around, a series of binaries: individual/collective; official/vernacular; and past/present. Whereas other excellent volumes have explored the temporal dimensions of memory through a focus on so-called *prospective* memory work,¹¹ the chapters in this section contribute methodological and theoretical interventions, modeling a finely grained set of moves between individual and collective experience, a deeper attentiveness to the meaning of “space,” and a closer consideration of the relationship between past, present, and future.

Picking up specifically on Kansteiner’s call for assessing the “collective” and, as Crane suggests “writing the individual” back in,¹² Keightley, Pickering, and Bisht argue for the value of an “interscalar” approach to the study of memory, attending to “the relationships between different forms and modalities of remembering ... along with their spatial and temporal modes of interaction and interdependency.” Framing their chapter in dialogue with the work of sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, the veritable “founding father” of collective memory studies whose anti-individualist approach has proven the source of much memory studies’ scholarship’s deification of the collective, Keightley, Pickering, and Bisht call for a conceptual and methodological approach that critically takes the term “collective memory” in all its ambiguity, and explores what happens to memory when different scales, operating at the so-called “micro-” and “meso-” levels in particular, interact. In making the case for the implementation of an interscalar approach within communication historians’ research design, Keightley, Pickering, and Bisht answer both fundamental critiques of communication historians’ work (namely undue emphasis on grand, totalizing narratives) as well as memory scholars’ quest for more intentional, relational study.

Envisioned as an answer to the disappearance of memory—a sense that “we must deliberately, create archives, maintain anniversaries, organize celebrations, pronounce eulogies, and notarize bills”¹³—lieux de memoire, Nora wrote, are “created by a play of memory and history, an interaction of two

factors that results in their reciprocal overdetermination.”¹⁴ As Zelizer has summarized, such “mnemonic sites—burial places, cathedrals, palaces, battlefields—embody concrete traces of the past.”¹⁵ Examples abound of the varied ways in which memory, whether via monument, memorial, or other material form, has come not simply to exist but to *mean*—to signify for a collective an identity, a shared past. “From a house to a neighborhood to a nation, space has always helped define the boundaries of memory.”¹⁶ But how are these boundaries delineated?

Szpunar complicates Nora’s theorization of lieux de memoire in his chapter through a close reading of the work of the Clarion Project. Archiving two digital magazines sponsored by the group ISIS, the right-wing non-profit engaged in a series of practices that create the “metastasized archive,” which serves the political aims of the organization in defining its enemy. Szpunar’s theorization of the metastasized archive and the concomitant construction of threat and the enemy expands the ways in which we think about space (the archive, often reduced to a physical location) and time. Without a clearly identifiable enemy, the construction of threat, Szpunar argues, is significant in terms of collective memory—how identities are shaped and around which they coalesce. Generating what Szpunar refers to as an “autoimmunitary response to terror,” the metastasized archive transforms from a lieu de memoire to a “lieu de futur,” a “place that ensure[s] that the unexpected adheres to the past, ensuring a continuous historical narrative into a programmed future.” So theorized, the metastasized archive, in its material and embodied formations, reminds of the “assurance of conscripted continuity.” Rather than rupture, the lieu de futur fosters a continuous historical narrative.

Begging closer inquiry into questions of the relationship between space and time and memory, Keightley, Pickering, and Bisht and Szpunar both call for and model ways to expand modes and modalities of inquiry.

Notes

1. Barbie Zelizer, “Reading the Past Against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies,” *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12 (1995): 218–234.
2. Zelizer, “Reading the Past Against the Grain,” 221.
3. Wulf Kansteiner, “Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies,” *History and Theory* 41, no. 2 (2002): 180.
4. Kansteiner, “Finding Meaning in Memory,” 179.
5. For more on these various “modifiers” (e.g. individual, collective, social, public), see Carole Blair, Greg Dickinson, and Brian L. Ott, “Introduction: Rhetoric/Memory/Place,” in *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*, eds. Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010), 1–54.

6. Kansteiner, "Finding Meaning in Memory," 180.
7. Pierre Nora, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire," *Representations* 26 (1989): 19.
8. Nora, "Between Memory and History," 19.
9. Ibid., 24.
10. Zelizer, "Reading the Past Against the Grain," 222.
11. Andrea Hajek, Christine Lohmeier, and Christian Pentzold, eds. *Memory in a Mediated World: Remembrance and Reconstruction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 6.
12. Susan A. Crane, "Writing the Individual Back into Collective Memory," *The American Historical Review* 102, no. 5 (1997): 1372–1385.
13. Nora, "Between Memory and History," 12.
14. Ibid., 19.
15. Zelizer, "Reading the Past Against the Grain," 223.
16. Ibid.