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Catherine Baker, and Erin Jessee
(UK) (chair):

Abstract: This paper will serve as the introduction to the panel. The authors will provide an overview of the various ways that the concept and process of democratizing history has been approached by oral historians over time before launching into its particular application to conflicted and post-conflict communities. Catherine Baker will raise questions derived from research into public history in the UK, while Erin Jessee will reflect on her oral historical fieldwork in post-conflict Bosnia, Rwanda, and Uganda. Particular emphasis will be placed on inciting dialogue surrounding the particular ethical, methodological, and theoretical challenges associated with democratizing history in these settings, from negotiating government surveillance and interference, and collaborating with community-based organizations, to using digital media to engage with a larger audience beyond academia.
Police Revolt in Postcolonial India: Violence as the Voice of Subalterns of the State.

Beatrice Jauregui (US):

Abstract: In 1973, thousands of police constables gathered across Uttar Pradesh [UP], the largest state in India, and staged an armed revolt, following failure to gain formal recognition of their labor union. Over several days, senior police officers and others were held hostage; university buildings burned; defunct forts and active armories were sieged, and the national army was called in to various parts of UP, resulting in scores of dead and wounded from shoot outs between police and soldiers. People across India called it a “national crisis...[that was] not merely political, but economic, social and moral” and blamed everything from local party politics, communism, corruption and criminalization among police, to generalized discontent caused by recession. But forty years later, even in light of the fact that other similar incidents have occurred across time and space in post-colonial India, this event has been reduced to an idiosyncratic moment of “indiscipline” provoked by a few “bad apples”. Its memory is actively suppressed among the police, and virtually forgotten among the public. The revolt and its aftermath generated no substantive structural reform, and failed to galvanize any longue durée analysis of the virtual class warfare in UP that continues to shape police practice specifically, and state functioning more generally. And yet, many police in UP today suggest that such violence is the only way they will ever have a “voice” that may improve their own and others’ living and working conditions. Interweaving ethnography of contemporary police practices, interviews with revolt participants and their associates, and content analysis of internal police memos, court documents and news archives, I explore some of the ethical and methodological challenges of taking seriously this claim of violence as voice, not least the implication that persons empowered to deploy coercion in the name of the law, the people, and democracy itself, may in fact be more impotent than dominant.
Stories about a Massacre in Budapest in 1944:
A Challenge for Canonisation.

Andrea Peto
(Hungary):

Abstract: This proposed paper is a part of my recent book project focusing on female perpetrators of WWII in Hungary. I would like to present one chapter from this book on how a story of one mass murder committed by a paramilitary Arrow Cross squad led by a woman, demanding 19 lives on 15 October, 1944, was narrated by the press, the different stages of the people’s tribunal court, by the survivors, the relatives of the perpetrators, and participants of the legal system: judge, lawyer, and a police officer. The paper is based on besides oral history interviews with survivors, relatives of the perpetrators, the analyses of court trial, and literary sources (such as autobiographies) about one important instance of the Holocaust in Hungary which is also commemorated by erecting the first Holocaust monument in Budapest in 1945. I would like to focus more on how the different conflicting narratives of the victims, the perpetrators, the investigators, the official Holocaust narratives (before and after the communism) were formed about what happened on a fateful night in a three storey high typical house in the 6th district of Budapest on 15 October, 1944? How these different narratives are contributing to the formation of a divided memory of WWII of today’s Hungary? How the different forms of remembrance are excluding the formation of “dialogic remembrance” [Assmann] today? What is the role of different institutions (educational, legal, and religious) in this process?