Several questions arise when addressing the issue of the ‘memory of socialism’ in Bulgarian postsocialist documentaries. After 1989, how have new social positions and new regimes of truth about socialism emerged in the public space, and how much influence have documentary filmmakers had on public debates about the past? Following the end of socialism, they did play an important role in the first phases of the ‘war on memories.’ They took part in the dismantling of the visual monopoly formerly held by the One-party state, and displayed new perspectives on familiar events, faces and ‘places of memory.’ Yet, one might wonder to what extent their films have contributed to a better understanding of the history of socialism, of its dynamics and its real contradictions. Having in mind the specific use documentary filmmakers make of archives, one may also wish to examine the practices of reframing and editing through which the official and unofficial spaces of communism are presented today. What is the ‘political-aesthetic’ canon underpinning film editing? Can one trace the genealogy of today’s sanctioned visual narratives about the past? What ‘visual slips’ reveal the ‘ideological unconscious’ of the authors, and act, nowadays as in the past, as a form of censorship? How do they affect the notion of ‘documentary truth’? These are some of the questions I shall address in this talk.

‘Film memory’ itself has a history. Immediately after 1989, the stress fell on the traumatic experiences of the recent past. As the ‘transition to capitalism’

---

1 These questions were addressed in 1999 in a study on “Weekly Newsreels: Toward a Historical Sociology of Socialism” conducted by the Institute for Critical Social Studies (ICSS). Together with some colleagues, we analyzed film chronicles from the period 1944-1981. Based upon this visual material, we constructed visual ‘serial data’, as Furet calls them. These series were dedicated to such themes as the representations of ‘the leaders’ in the newsreels, ‘consumption under socialism’, ‘the national past,’ and ‘the capitalist West’. Our sequential analysis of visual and discursive configurations was influenced by the visual sociology of the University of Konstanz (J. Raab, H. Soeffner), as well as by our own research at the ICSS on the practical logic of ideological discourses. For further information, see N. Nikolova, S. Sabeva, “Upalnomochtenoto tialo. Politestetika na montazha v sedmichnite kinopregledi,” Sociological Problems, 1-2, 2005, pp.7-33; Liliana Deyanova, “Les images cinématographiques du passé national,” in: I. Ndaywel è Nziem and E. Mudimbe-Boyi (eds.), Images, mémoires et savoirs. Une histoire en partage avec Bogumil Koss Jewsiewicki, Paris : Karthala, 2009, pp. 281-299.
moved forward, and faced several crises, a phase of ‘nostalgia’ gathered momentum. In the recent years, ways of remembering the past through films have been interpolated and framed by a diversity of resolutions and memorial laws (*lois mémorielles*) adopted in several international arenas, including at the level of the European Union. The decisions categorically condemn the former communist regimes; some observers even call it ‘a regime more perverse than Nazism.’\(^2\) In brief, one should not forget that the truth of the images is the product of specific social conditions. Moreover, it would be misleading to believe that the long history of the ‘memory of communism’ began with the ‘fall of communism.’\(^3\)

**Documentaries, social critique and political opposition in late socialist Bulgaria**

A strong and influential wave of critical interpretations of socialism appeared in Bulgarian documentaries before 1989. Long before the Soviet perestroika, several films portrayed some facets of ‘real socialism’ that were no less real than those exposed by the regime. These facets included the depressing and bleak life of miners (*Sheshkingrad*, Vassil Zhivkov, 1975)\(^4\), the disappointment of the ‘heroes of labor’ with what they felt was a betrayal of revolutionary ideals (*The Farm*, Malina Petrova), the absurd efforts at turning citizens into socialist citizens and the grotesque forms of social control exercised under the guise of free and


\(^3\) The images we remember from the sacred beginnings of the socialist Revolution, i.e. the assault on the Winter Palace in 1917, are actually cinema frames. These frames were staged later with 10 000 extras enacting what was reportedly a night-time event with no surviving authentic images. Another example is that the construction of the Moscow metro was not completed yet when the first memories of those who had participated in the project were published in Russian under the title *How We Built the Metro*.

\(^4\) The film won the Bulgarian award for ‘best documentary film’ in 1975. Its depiction stands in sharp contrast with the image of the miners offered in *The black gold of the republic*, a documentary made in 1948.
joyful celebrations (*House N°8*, Nikolay Volev, 1986)

5 Created in 1986, this film was much disputed at the time of its release. The documentary tells the story of mentally challenged children in a specialized institution, House n°.8, who are rehearsing a musical gymnastic composition for the Day of Peace. Volev's post-socialist film, *Kremikovtsi: A Souvenir Photo*, has attracted much less attention. This is the fate of many films similar to his. *Kremikovtsi* depicts the human and non-human ruins of one of Bulgaria's largest socialist metallurgic plants, and the arrogance of the elites (some of them former communists) who privatized the enterprise.

Films had a strong influence on public life. In fact the Committee for the Ecological Protection of the City of Rousse, one of Bulgaria's most influential dissident organizations, was created in the House of Cinema in March 1988, following the screening of Yuri Zhirov's film, *Breathe*, and its euphoric reception with the audience. The movie documented the existence of an authentic civil protest for ‘more air.' According to renowned documentary filmmaker Malina Petrova, then the head of the Union of Young Cinema Makers – the Union was known for its oppositional ideas — who initiated the screening

6 I am not going to discuss here the relations between official vs. unofficial art, ideological vs. non-ideological expression. Nor am I to delve into the canon of ‘socialist realism’ (quite an elastic concept) and the adoption of a ‘critical social position.’ I am, however, inclined to agree with Gyorgy Lukacs that Solzhenitsyn’s *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* is a work of social realism ‘because the main task of art at that time was to expose and criticize the failures of Stalinism.’ The same can be said about many of the allegedly oppositional films on everyday life and ‘way of life' directed in Bulgaria and elsewhere. In Bulgaria, however, such opinions are much more acceptable like that of Alexander Kiossev: ‘The official, the public culture was supposed to reproduce the communist ideology – it was, in fact, a powerful party-state institution. The unofficial culture had a whole spectrum of variants and degrees of being in opposition but, as a whole, one thing was common in it: it had little to no access to the public space. This is why the specifics of Bulgarian totalitarian culture are to be sought in the peculiar flexibility of the official-unofficial relation. While in other countries the one standing on a dissident position was automatically excluded from different official publications, this was not the case in Bulgaria...’ On the history of socialist and post-socialist cinema, see the subtle analyses by Nadège Ragaru, “Les écrans du socialisme: micro-pouvoirs et quotidienneté dans le cinéma bulgare,” in: Nadège Ragaru and Antonela Capelle-Pogacean (eds.), *Vie quotidienne et pouvoir sous le communisme. Consommer à l'Est*. Paris: Karthala & CERI, 2010, p.277-348. See also Nadège Ragaru, “Bulgarie. Vers une renaissance du cinéma?,” *Grande Europe*, 11, August 2009.
not simply a handful of critical movies (the so-called ‘black films’, ‘films of moral anxiety’, etc.). They bore the stamp of a new generation of filmmakers: “[B]efore 1989, there was a whole wave of young people, who stood firmly by their position. These were not separate individuals but a whole team of youngsters.” Twenty years later, she laments the absence of a group of same-minded filmmakers: ‘We are long past that phase, we have no team, there are a few individual players who take part in festivals.’

The early years of postsocialism: (Dashed) hopes for a documentary look at the past

The years immediately following 1989 were full of hopes for artistic freedom and for the removal of censorship. Things, places and people were to recover their true names. At last, forgotten, repressed, and censored frames were being shown to the public. Familiar propaganda images were presented in a new way, while the actual names of the protagonists – such as that of the famous work hero Alexey Stakhanov — were being restored. Frames of the cheering masses, the euphoric and united people, which had contributed to the staging of power were deconstructed... The old continuums between spatial and temporal planes were broken, as was the propaganda teleology of images and characters. New

7 Malina Petrova is the author of documentary films that were critical then and are critical today. Her works were half-forbidden at the time and tend to still be today. The documentaries she directed before 1989 include Pantheon (1988), The Farm (1988) and Tetevenska 24 (1984). After 1989, The Heart Dies Last (1991) was dedicated to the 1949 show trial against communist leader Traycho Kostov. The film has received only limited attention. In Case expired (2009), she follows in detail a legal case on the fire in the Bulgarian communist Party House in August 1990 and the ensuing destruction and/or plunder of large bodies of Party archives. She unmask the ways in which some former communists endeavored to erase the traces of their crimes that were documented in the archive, and argues that the judicial case was intentionally suspended. The film received an award from the Bulgarian National Film Archive ‘for its extraordinary cinematographic and analytic perspective of the author on the burning of the traces of the recent past.’ This documentary – as the film on Traycho Kostov – is rarely shown on television or in movie theaters. In a review of one of Malina Petrova’s productions, Iskra Dimitrova has lamented the disappearance of quality documentary films “from the disappearing cinema theatres”. See Iskra Dimitrova, Kino, 4/2009.

8 His actual name was Andrey, not Alexey. Following an unfortunate misprint in the Pravda, Stalin is reputed to have ordered that the name be changed, because the Pravda (Truth) could never be wrong. The anecdote might be apocryphal, but it offers an eloquent allegory of the regime.
relations began to be created between close and distant, central and peripheral, dark and light zones in this historical narrative; new sequences were shot, and new links were established between these sequences. In 2012, for instance, Svetoslav Ovcharov shot a movie titled *The Man and the People* (*Choveka i naroda*), a direct reference to a famous propaganda socialist documentary, *A man from the people* (*Chovek ot naroda*, Hristo Kovachev). In his work, Ovcharov used and edited frames from the older socialist film so as to offer a new narrative of the life and deeds of Bulgarian party leader, Todor Zhivkov. An enormous mass of documentary frames bear witness about faces and events, which used to not be allowed in the public space, and were censored.\(^9\)

Apart from these documentaries, one should note that the production of TV films addressing historical issues is now on the rise. More often than not, these films resemble reportages. Their power as propaganda tool, however, is enormous. Due to their ‘low cost sociologism’ (to borrow François Niney’s formulation), they provide easy formulas for the shaping and the accelerated transformation of the visual public sphere, and tend to be cited on and on.

### The crisis of the images of socialism: Memory battles and the erosion of a critical public sphere

In today’s Bulgaria, several competing groups are striving to impose their memory of the past, and to turn it into an official past. These include political actors, journalists, essayists and amateur historians. Their strategies comprise an endeavor to influence and to control the writing of textbooks, the building of museums, the glorification of selected historical figures and... the making of images. They are trying to establish a monopoly over legitimate symbolic violence through the shaping of the interpretations of the ‘memory of communism.’ Their struggles take place in a context in which two contradictory narratives of the communist past and the national history still dominate in the public space. These narratives rest on two different selections and montages — conscious or not — of remembered events and places of memory. They emerged right after 1989. At the time, they were used in the struggle between the two main political protagonists, the ‘pro-communists’ (‘leftist’) and ‘anti-

---

\(^9\) The internment camps for ‘politically unreliable persons,’ most prominently the camp located on the island of Persin near Belene, the violence associated with the collectivization of agriculture, the nationalization of industry and all services, the elimination of political opposition, the invasion of ‘brotherly’ troops into Czechoslovakia in 1968 or the forceful name change of Bulgaria’s Muslims in 1984-1985 were publicly censored during socialism.
communists’ (rightwing’) groups.\textsuperscript{10} That these narratives should have remained dominant up to this day is more surprising.

The ‘absence of the social conditions of a critical public sphere’ in the sense of Habermas is what I call a ‘crisis of the images of socialism’\textsuperscript{11}. A worrying political trend over the past few years is the portrayal of socialism in black and white colors, eschewing earlier attempts at offering a more nuanced and complex rendering of the communist past. This trend transpires in the wide distribution of documentary movies that address such themes as the ‘communist concentration camps,’ the ‘secret services,’ and the ‘mass massacre’ of opponents. By contrast the documentaries, which present a different vision of socialism tend to be marginalized\textsuperscript{12}. The evolution of the sanctioned images of the past can also be discerned in the topics that receive public and/or private funding, take part in film competitions, and are granted awards in Bulgaria or abroad. The selection of documentary movies used to teach the history of

\textsuperscript{10} The notion of ‘memory’ is not an analytic concept. This notion does not explain anything; rather it is what needs to be explained. Therefore the historical sociology of memory is a critique of memory, which addresses such questions as: What makes memory possible? What social conditions give birth to certain forms of collective remembering? Why and how do regimes of memory and regimes of history change?

\textsuperscript{11} Having said this, my assumption is that there is an “ideal type” of modern public sphere of history, i.e., that the modern sites of memory - in Pierre Nora’s sense, lieux de memoire - are common sites of memory, even though they are not sites of common memory. They are common places of memory, but they are no one’s; although they are no one’s, they are, by definition, at stake in the battle of conflicting interpretations (which, however have equal access to the public sphere), and a possibility for the state, “Europe,” various groups, etc., to assert their symbolic monopoly over these interpretations. This does not mean that there are no hierarchies of historical facts and objective causalities. But the work of the historian and the expert is to arrange them, to look for the archives that some groups want to discard or at least to devaluate, and to organize testimonies in a meaningful way. This is the reason why Hobsbawm defines historians as ‘the bearers of that memory which their fellow citizens want to forget.’ Therefore only those ‘multiple images of the past,’ dialogizing between themselves, provide a guarantee against the disappearance of past crimes and guilt.

\textsuperscript{12} On ‘Bulgarian totalitarianism’ as a big prison containing ‘smaller prisons,’ on the ‘mass communist massacres’ and the ‘survivors,’ on the murder of Bulgarian writer and dissident, Georgi Markov, by the KGB, I have in mind the documentaries of Atanas Kiriakov (\textit{The Gorians}, 2011, \textit{The Survivors}, 1990, \textit{The Doomed Ones}, 1994), Ilya Troyanov (\textit{Ballad for the Bulgarian Heroes}, 2007, coproduced by the German ZDF), Hristo Hristov (\textit{The Secret Case of the Camps}, 1999), Stoycho Chichkov (\textit{The People’s House of Terror}, 2015), Tamara Pechterska (\textit{The Monument and his Brother}, 2012). See also the ‘anticommunist website’ – as its authors call it – desebg.com.
socialism is also revealing. Consider for instance the project *Documentary Cinema in the Teaching of 20th C. History in Secondary Schools* funded by the *Razum Foundation* in Sofia. The controversial handbook for teachers complied within the framework of a project funded by the *Hannah Arendt Foundation* is another case in point.\(^{13}\)

**The post-‘communist treatment of communism’**

What is the post-‘communist treatment of communism’ offered in these documentary films (I am paraphrasing here the manifestoes on ‘kinopravda’ (‘film truth’) of Dziga Vertov)\(^{14}\)? What ‘work of memory’ on communism can we see in these documentaries? I have to stress here that while I am looking for large-scale sociological causalities, I do not claim that the new cinema images are a mere reflection of political images. Nor do I claim that they are a direct result of European prescriptions and the distribution of available funds. I also have in mind that we are talking about a period of a quarter of a century, and that this period has witnessed other important developments in the creation and reception of documentaries. Attempting to make generalizations in these circumstances might be tricky.

Two parameters, in particular, need to be singled out. First, one needs to consider the issue of ‘regimes of historicity’, to borrow François Hartog’s expression. In the late modern era, in the period of what he calls ‘presentism,’ we are facing a crisis of the witnesses of the past. This crisis results from the privatization of archives, the commercialization of monuments, and the fragmentation of scholarship. Researches devoted to the communist past — and to other time periods — remain segmented. Meanwhile, a new generation of ‘pure’ experts has emerged who are not bound by any nation-centered or political bias, and who call themselves ‘applied historians.’ Parallel to that, there is also against all odds a new generation of documentary film directors who are not engaged ideologically and who have their own version of ‘documentary truth’, of ‘duty to remember’, and of ‘ethics of the camera.’ *The Mosquito Problems and Other Stories* by Andrey Paunov — one of Bulgaria’s best documentary films

---

\(^{13}\) In June 2013 the National Centre for the Study of Public Opinion conducted an opinion poll on the citizens’ knowledge about communism. 49.5% of the respondents declared they had learned about the communist past through documentary films, and 56.0% from school textbooks. For a critical analysis of the history handbook for teachers funded by the Reason Foundation, see Georgi Medarov, “Communism is an Evil,” *Sociological Problems*, 1-2, 2015, pp. 227-251.

on socialism — deserves special mention here. The documentary deals with the memory of one of Bulgaria’s largest internment camps for ‘political enemies’, that of Belene. It was awarded several prizes at prestigious international contests.\(^{15}\)

The documentary milieu in Bulgaria remains quite diverse. Within the framework of this talk, I shall only try to bring out the differences between the ‘post-communist’ and the ‘anti-communist’ visual narratives. Both contain a myriad of possible ways of reorganizing our current experience of ‘communism’ — even if it was not personally lived\(^{16}\) —, of the society of socialism and its history. As several scholars dealing with documentary cinema have noted, documentary films leave some ‘breaches of doubt’; they do not inform us only, nor do they try to mobilize us by resorting to a heavy and homogenous mass of ready-made images of socialism and post-socialism. The story on the screen is replete with rupture points, and does not flow in a linear way.

By contrast, in the films I deal with, these visual products intended to promote a thesis\(^{17}\), one axis of analysis and one truth only\(^{18}\), the frames on the ‘total power’ of ‘totalitarian socialism’ are homogenous and teleological. They draw a straightforward line between ‘the communist slaughter of the People’s Court’ in 1944-1945 and the ‘communist and banking conspiracy,’ through which political capitals were converted into economic capitals after 1989. “During totalitarian socialism, they contend, the whole country was an enormous prison;...
it comprised smaller prisons within itself”\textsuperscript{19}. The visual clichés from the times of the Cold War are left almost unchanged. One is presented with an endless chain of uniform, decontextualized and de-historicized images. The voice over copes easily with the often visible contrast between picture and sound, as well as between the images and the words through which they are designated and fixed\textsuperscript{20}. The voice over molds the visual materials, ties them up in a specific way, projects specific meanings onto them, and finally sums up “what it is exactly all about”\textsuperscript{21}. Thereby, no room is left for alternative interpretations, nor even for a conflict between competing interpretations\textsuperscript{22}. In the era of ‘post-communist revisionism’ the testimonies of the ‘Others’ are called ‘lies’ or statements

\textsuperscript{19} A Ballad for Bulgarian Heroes (Troyanov, 2007) opens with these words. People’s House of Terror (2015), a documentary which was awarded – unexpectedly and, according to many critics, in a scandalous fashion – the Golden Rhyton, the highest award at the biggest Bulgarian festival of documentary films, is a film whose (low quality) images and (powerfully ideological) voice over deserve detailed analysis. For it is the culmination of a series of films created within the so-called “totalitarian paradigm”, despite the fact that it pays no respect to the results of researches conducted by professional historians, even by those who belong to the same ‘paradigm.’ The making of such propaganda films reflects the wishes of a large, albeit heterogeneous, group of citizens and political actors in Bulgaria to see the memory of communism ‘as a regime more perverse than Nazism’ received a legal sanction. The phrase itself comes from a January 2006 draft resolution of the Council of Europe. The People’s House of Terror was also acclaimed by several websites and blogs. A petition titled ‘Until communism enters the history textbooks’ circulated on the web, which cited the documentary as a valuable source of information. For a wider discussion of the debates surrounding the new anti-antifascist consensus and the teaching the two ‘genocides’ of the 20th century’s totalitarian regimes, see for. ex. Enzo Traverso, L’Histoire comme champ de bataille. Interpréter les violences du XX siècle, Paris: La Découverte, 2011.

\textsuperscript{20} Thus the forced displacements of the ‘enemies of socialism’ from the capital city to the province are called ‘deportations’ and ‘extermination.’ In a similar way, the film shows enthusiastically manifesting crowds, using frames from the Stalin era, to depict socialism in the 1980s.

\textsuperscript{21} I here refer to Roland Barthes’ classical analysis of the rhetoric of the image and the relations between the iconic and the linguistic messages. See Roland Barthes, “Rhétorique de l’image,” Communications, 1964, 40, pp.40-51, page 43.

\textsuperscript{22} One of the best documentary films dedicated to the Bulgarian poet, Nikola Vaptsarov, who was sentenced to death and executed in 1942 for taking part in a ‘communist conspiracy’, adopts an opposite strategy. This is evidenced in the title of the film (Nikola Vaptsarov. Five Stories about One Execution, Konstantin Bonev, 2013), as well as in the combination of the original documents, many of which are shown for the first time.
extorted by violence and fear; their images are accused of being ‘manipulative,’ discredited and doomed to disappear from the public sphere. (Similar strategies are used in the films and the texts whose authors hold dogmatically pro-communist positions).

Of course, what I have sketched here is a kind of ideal-type, which is useful only to the extent that it captures some tendencies in the filmic rewriting of socialism. In this literal form, it does not exist in any film. However, this logic has a social significance that ranges beyond the Bulgarian post-communist ‘transition’. This is why I have decided to put the emphasis on it, and to show how it operates in a few documentaries.

Renouncing the search for grand narratives and a teleological writing of history

A significant group of documentary films have adopted alternative strategies for “seeing socialism.” The directors have deliberately abandoned the teleological grand narratives of communism and fascism. They approach the former regime through the angle of everyday life, the chaotic dimensions of everyday practices, the element of bricolage and the negotiation of meanings involved in daily live. These authors of such films are often accused of ‘minimizing the criminogenic nature of communism,’ of seeking to ‘normalize’ communism, and of failing to understand that one of the greatest crimes of communism was precisely a crime against everyday life, against ‘the normalcy of life.’

One of the venues this group of filmmakers has used is the resort to the enormous cinema archive dating back from socialist times. The extremely rich body of newsreels available offer the possibility to deconstruct established visual configurations and meanings. In the 4-part documentary film, News from

23 Sometimes, this disappearance of archives is a literal, physical process. Ivan Traykov has documented in 35 Millimeter Memories (2002) the material destruction of kilometers of images due to the fear that aging film tapes might explode.

24 In The Left Side of History. World War II and the Unfulfilled Promise of Communism in Eastern Europe (2015), Kristen Ghodsee says of such interpretations of the communist and Nazi genocides that ‘the double side genocide thesis and is production of the ‘victims of communisms’ discourse not only aims to prevent a return of leftist politics. It can also be used to justify acceptance of neo-fascism.’ She also notes that ‘the European Union’s uncritical embrace of this double genocide ideology is designed to protect the interests of the political and economic elites in both Western and Eastern Europe.’ See Kristen Ghodsee. Tale of ‘Two Totalitarianisms”. The Crisis of Caitalism and the Historical Memory of Communism. History of the Present: A Journal of Critical History, 4, Fall 2014, p. 117, 134-137.
the Past by Valentin Valchev (2000), based upon about 230 newsreels from 1944 to 1981\textsuperscript{25}, socialism is chiefly remembered through a mosaic of details – events, faces, things, and ‘bodies’ that form no coherent and consistent story. This temporal and spatial fragmentation of the socialist past, and the remembrance of things ‘create a stabilizing effect of tangibility, because it decontextualizes identities, and sameness’\textsuperscript{26}.

Scholars of post-Soviet Russia have studied how Russian documentaries have engaged in the ‘decomposition of the visual monolith’ of socialism. Sergey Oushakin, for instance, has examined several large-scale Russian documentary projects for television, which are based on Soviet cinema chronicles. He has described how they work with details in order to reconstitute the agency individuals enjoyed during socialism. In these films, history is shown through the prism of biographies but, as the author puts it, “the glue between facts is not ideology but the calendar” (e.g. “people born in the year of Stalin’s death”). As Oushakin makes it plain, the purpose of these documentaries is not to decipher ‘the world of communism’ but to de-focus the socialist totality. This totality, he argues, was never monolithic in the first place. Moreover, biographies were produced in situations where meanings were unclear and unstable.\textsuperscript{27} In these kinds of documentaries, the viewer is invited to unveil the multitude of singularities contained in every single event. Instead of assuming the existence

\textsuperscript{25} Within the ICSS study mentioned in footnote 1. A debate on this project and the film see in: Zelma Almaleh, Deyan Deyanov. “Eyewitnesses,”, Kritika i Humanzam, 6, 2001, pp. 243-248.


\textsuperscript{27} This situation provides a particularly comprehensive and important microhistorical perspective to the analysis of a whole range of films that document biographies. Ordinary…(socialism?) by Nikola Kovachev, for instance, is, as the film’s author says, ‘drawing the balance through the montage of one’s own creation.’ A very different type of biographical narrative may be found in My father, a personal document by film director, Andrey Slabakov. A even more personal document - almost devoid of the density and the historicity of the parallel social history – can be found in Tsvetanka by Yulian Tabakov (2012).
of a single truth, one is led to retain the many possibilities of the past. Ultimately, these pieces of work provide the opportunity to reorganize one’s own experience. Thereby, they invite a more subtle and creative writing of the history of socialism in which the diversity of individual and collective experiences can be reflected.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{28} L’auteur remercie le traducteur Todor Petkov et Nadège Ragaru pour le précieux travail éditorial sur ce texte. Merci aussi à Grif Peterson pour sa relecture.