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The article is the author’s reflection on an interdisciplinary collaboration between cultural anthropology and psychotherapy, during which the workshops addressed the dissonant and traumatic memories of the society along the Slovenian-Italian border. It addresses the plurality of voices in the frame of contested and divergent memories, caught in a competition of victimhood. The author argues that the past and the future are inevitably intertwined; by changing the narratives of the past, changes in the present and future can be obtained. In the concrete case study, the question is if, by opening a space where people can listen to each other traumatic and conflict memories, we can have an impact on surpassing the violent conflicts from the past.
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Introduction

The article presents some of preliminary reflections on the interdisciplinary project of a collaboration between anthropology and psychotherapy in the border area with silenced contested past along the Slovenian-Italian border in Istria and Karst region. The article will discuss the project entitled “My Story from Silence” (Slo.: Moja zgodb—a iz tišine), which aimed to address traumatic memories of people living on both side of the border. With this aim, five workshops with three psychotherapists and me, as a cultural anthropologist, were organized along with a final publication of the gathered personal stories, “Moja zgodb—a iz tišine” (2023), and a final roundtable.¹

The methodology was based on the story-telling method with the aim of appeasing the individual or collective traumas² caused by difficult historical circumstances

---

¹ The project application was applied in the frame of the financial scheme “Incentives for Solutions: A Long-Lived Society,” co-financed by the Istria and Karst NGO Forum – ISKRA and the Ministry of Public Administration from the Fund for NGOs (through the non-governmental organization PINA).

² The American Psychological Association defines trauma as “an emotional response to a terrible event like an accident, rape, or natural disaster. Immediately after the event, shock and denial are typical. Longer term reactions include unpredictable emotions, flashbacks, strained relationships and even physical symptoms” (https://www.apa.org/topics/trauma; Pabst 2023, 89). If we look into the definitions in the field of humanities, most of the studies on
such as fascism, the violence of WWII, exodus, immigration, socialism, etc. The reflections in this article derive from my own experiences as anthropologist of the collaboration with psychotherapists. The idea for the project derives from my discussions with the local psychotherapist Manca Švara who, after reading my book “In the Silence of Memory: ‘Exodus’ and ‘Istria’” (Hrobat Virloget 2021a), realized that she had not been aware of how many different silenced traumatic memories exist in the society living along the Slovenian-Italian border. The three therapists were from different sub-disciplines: Jungian psychoanalysis, Gestalt psychotherapy, and Reality therapy. The workshops were based on work with projection photographs, which served as a bridge for associations with the individual unconscious of each participant. According to psychotherapy, in the case of intergenerational trauma, the articulation or verbalization is usually difficult, sometimes even impossible, so it is easier to access these contents through artistic means and approaches that stimulate contents of the unconscious. These traumatic memories were not addressed directly, because in doing so resistance can be encountered. Workshops were organized on both sides of the Slovenian-Italian border, in Izola/Isola, Piran/Pirano, Sežana, and Koper/Capodistria in Slovenia and in Opicina/Opčine in Italy, with a total of 45 participants. In each of them the composition of the participants was quite different. Some participants attended the workshops because we personally invited them, others had heard about them through media and social media, while some of them were invited by local organizations, which offered us places to hold workshops. The age of participants ranged from twenty to over eighty. Three people participated in more than one workshop.

trauma and its relation to silence derive from the intersection of history and psychoanalysis and can be found in the research of the Holocaust as a traumatic turning point in history (Straub, Rüssen, ed. 2010). One of the pioneers of memory studies, Aleida Assmann, focuses on Lyotard’s definition of trauma not as extreme disempowerment, as it is often perceived, but as a cultural norm, sublimated and collectivized, a general “crisis of representation,” a definition which entered into the field of literary theory (Lyotard 1988: 38; Assmann 2010: 30).

3 I deliberately use the term exodus, although it is controversial, and despite being reproached by most Slovenian historians who strictly refer to these movements as postwar migrations or emigration. The controversy surrounding the term reflects the different national discourses in which different numbers of migrants and appellations are used (Verginella 2000; Ballinger 2003: 42–45). While Italians and migrants call themselves esuli, which means refugees or exiles (Ballinger 2003), the predominant term in Slovenian and Croatian discourse is optanti. This stems from the legal right to opt for Italian citizenship (Volk 2003: 47–50; Gombač 2005: 65; Pupo 2015). While Italian historians talked about the Italian exodus (Pupo 2015), Slovenian and Croatian researchers emphasize that the migrations included both voluntary and forced migration of Italians, Slovenes, and Croats. I use the term exodus without any political or mythological connotations, without referring to a “mononational” process (Ballinger 2003: 7), being aware of a very complex migration phenomenon. It is also a term that is best known by the general public, which is also used by some Slovenian researchers (Kalc 2019; Volk 2003) and is most frequently used in international literature. On the other hand, by using this term I do not pretend that the process was not monumental, after all it almost wiped out an entire ethnic community in Istria. By using it I also question the so greatly extolled “free choice” or option, although in a legal sense it did exist (see Hrobat Virloget 2023a).

4 For this reason, the project’s name derives from the title of my book.

5 The approach in this part has been explained by the psychotherapist Manca Švara.

6 Names in the officially bilingual areas with an Italian minority in the Slovenian part of Istria and Slovenian minority in the Italian part of Karst are written in both languages, Slovenian and Italian.

7 Discussed further on.

8 I invited some interlocutors from my research in Istria, while other psychotherapists invited others.

9 In Sežana we were helped by Kosovel’s library (Kosovelov knjižnica Sežana), in Izola/Isola by Intergenerational Centre Izola (Slo.: Medgeneracijski center Izola), in Opicina/Opčine Matija Čuk Fond (Slo.: Sklad Matija Čuk).
Written personal stories were also gathered.\textsuperscript{10} The call to write personal traumatic experiences derived from the idea that, by writing them down, a person can start the process of acknowledging and facing the trauma.\textsuperscript{11} The workshops addressed the silenced memories along the Slovenian-Italian border (Hrobat Virloget 2021a, 2023a) by people of different backgrounds, across ethno-national and migrant/“native” divides (see further on).

The article is written in the frame of the Slovenian-Croatian project Urban Futures, where we were faced with a research challenge of how to explore the future as something “that (yet) does not exist” (Gulin Zrnić and Poljak Istenič 2022: 138).\textsuperscript{12} However, the words of Hannah Arendt are reassuring: the past, the present, and the future are inextricably linked and, in fact, depend on each other. She cites William Faulkner’s words that “the past is never dead. It’s not even past.” As she reflects, “What is more, this past, which goes back to its beginning, does not pull back, but presses forward. Contrary to our expectations it is the future that pulls back to the past” (Arendt 2006: 20). I will derive from the theoretical viewpoint that “it’s the present that creates the future” (Gulin Zrnić and Poljak Istenič 2022: 36). The future can be researched with the question of how we live the future in the present because every decision is future-oriented (Bryant and Knight 2019: 17; Gulin Zrnić and Poljak Istenič 2022: 148). The future is always, in one way or another, embedded in the present (Frederiksen 2013: 17), in which “it is imagined and negotiated” (Ringel 2018, after Gulin Zrnić and Poljak Istenič 2022: 34).

But what if the present is imbued with “a past which seems to never want to pass here” (Lusa 2022; Hrobat Virloget 2022)? This was the provocative comment of Stefano Lusa, a historian and journalist from the Italian radio in Koper/Capodistria, when he reflected on a silenced part of the past concerning mass migrations after WWII in Istria. As Aleida Assmann and Linda Shortt argue, “memory is a powerful agent of change” and “the past is an essential resource for the future” (Assmann and Shortt 2012: 13). The past events cannot be changed, but our perception, narratives, and memory constructs about them can (ibid.: 13). Reflecting on the possibilities of healing a traumatized society, as in the case of South Africa, Merle Friedman (2000: 399) argues that the difficult past has to be addressed, its invisible parts have to become visible.

The main research question of this article is the influence of the conflict narratives of the past on the present and future along the Slovenian-Italian border. Can the processing of silenced traumatic memories have an impact on a better or more peaceful cohabitation in the future?

\textsuperscript{10} Published in the publication Moja zgodba iz tišine 2023 and some of them on the project’s web page: http://www.mojazgodbaiztisine.si/.

\textsuperscript{11} Due to sensitive personal memories, for most of the stories we were asked to publish them anonymously.

\textsuperscript{12} The research results of this article derive from Urban Futures: Imagining and Activating Possibilities in Unsettled Times financed by the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency (J6-2578) and the Croatian Science Foundation (IPS-2020-01-7010) and led by Saša Poljak Istenič and Valentina Gulin Zrnić (project website: www.citymaking.eu); and Migration and social transformation in a comparative perspective: the case of Western Slovenia after WWII, led by Aleksej Kalc (J6-3143; 2021-2024). The reflections derive also from my written application for the ARIS project Ethnography of silence(s), which started 1.10.2023 (J6-50198).
On the silenced past of the Slovenian-Italian borderland

The silenced traumatic narratives of the past among the different communities along the Slovenian-Italian border are mostly connected with the Istrian exodus and fascism. Our project addressed the groups most connected with these two dramatic changes in the past: the Italian minority that remained in former Yugoslavia after the exodus, the migrants of the exodus, living today around Trieste in Italy, the migrants from Slovenia and other former republics of Yugoslavia who settled in the emptied Istrian towns after the exodus, and the Slovenian minority in Italy.

It has to be pointed out that the Istrian exodus, or the massive migrations after WWII, completely altered the ethnic, social, and cultural face of Istria (Gombač 2005: 11; Kalc 2019; Hrobat Virloget 2021a; 2023a). The total registered population of ethnic Italians in the coastal towns of the Slovenian part of Istria dropped from 90% before WWII to a mere 10.5% after the exodus (Troha 1997: 59). According to the census of 1961, 44% of the pre-WWII population (186,450 residents) remained in the zones annexed to Yugoslavia (the Slovenian and Croatian parts of today’s Istria), more than 55% (232,994 residents) left, and 144,505 persons arrived (Orlić 2023: 167). The Italian and Slovenian sides have, for a long time, defended their parallel histories and various reasons for migrations; they have also come up with different numbers of migrants and differing appellations. The dominant Slovenian public discourse presents the exodus mostly as a free choice, which came from the legal right to opt for Italian citizenship, or sometimes as a means of escape for Italian fascists. In contrast to this, the Italian side perceives the exodus in the victimization frame as a national tragedy, which is expressed by the mythic appellation of “esodo,” the exodus (Ballinger 2003: 42–45; Hrobat Virloget, Goussef and Corni 2015; Hrobat Virloget 2021 etc.). If we can perceive the Istrian exodus as one strong collective trauma of Istrian society, the other one, which was much louder for the Slovenian public, was fascism. After the Italian annexation of Istria following WWI, the fascist regime (which began in 1922) wanted to completely Italianize the Slovene and Croatian-speaking populations, which meant more than two decades of violent, repressive, and assimilatory politics against the Slavs. The fascist violence left traumatic memories on the Slovene and Croatian population of Istria (Badurina 2023: 81-135), although it also operated against all Italians who opposed it.¹⁵

¹³ The Istrian exodus presents the final stage of the (mainly) Italian emigration from Yugoslavia, which started shortly after WWII. In this time, the Free Territory of Trieste (1947–1954) was created as an attempt to tackle the conflicting Italian and Yugoslavian claim to the contested area in North Adriatic, while in 1954, ethnically mixed Istria was annexed to Yugoslavia. According to censuses, in the period from 1945 to 1958, 49,132 people left the territory that was joined to Slovenia (including illegal migrants and people from the Karst, Notranjska, and Gorisk), mostly Italians, but also Slovenes and Croats. The number of true optants is thought to be 27,810 (Volk 2003: 51) and between 200,000 and 350,000 persons left the whole of Istria (including the Croatian part) (Ballinger 2003: 1, 275).

¹⁴ However, the ethnic identification of people from Istria, thus also migrants, has been recently discussed in the frame of “national indifference,” from hybridity, opportunism, and fluidity to indeterminacy. Both states, Italian and Yugoslavian, invested a lot of efforts after WWII in the processes of “nation building” (Orlić 2023: 167–179).

¹⁵ It began with the burning of the Slovene Cultural Centre (Narodni dom) in Trieste in 1920 and continued with the “Italianization” of schools. Slovene and Croatian were banned from use in public, in education, and in churches,
If the Slovene resistance to fascism and the struggle for national emancipation during this period, in combination with the national liberation struggle, represents the basis of Slovene national identity (Fikfak 2009: 359), the role played by Italians, as occupiers and perpetrators, and the fascistic violence against the local populations have been silenced in the Italian national narrative. Thereby the myth of the “good Italians” and the “victimizing” paradigm are perpetuated, which perceives the Italians as victims (of the exodus from Yugoslavia and “foibe”) and not actors of WWII (Focardi 2020: 214–58; Orlić 2023: 196–205). This national narrative affects the Slovenian minority of Italy, whose collective memory is based on the suffering under fascism, which is denied and silenced by the dominant Italian national narrative.

If fascism is silenced in the Italian collective memory, on the other side, in the Slovenian dominant collective memory, the Istrian exodus is silenced. As stories of defeat, the bearers of negative heritages and imaginaries, all these memories were uncomfortable for both scholars and societies and are therefore excluded from national narratives (Baussant 2019: 38, 155, 176; Ballinger 2012: 380; Hrobat Virloget 2021a). As the pioneer of memory research Maurice Halbwachs argued, those individual memories that do not conform to the collective view of the past are censored, rejected, stigmatized, or excluded from collective (national) discourse (Halbwachs 1925; Assmann 2007: 16). However, silence depends also on the changing political circumstances and social context. Such is the case of the silent memory of the esuli, the migrants of the exodus, which became part of the Italian national victimization narrative only in the 90s, having been previously silenced (Corni 2018: 74–78; Focardi 2020: 214–58). It is interesting to note that the memories of the Italians who remained, today’s Italian minority in Slovenia, have been silenced in both Slovenian and Italian national narratives about the exodus. Their memories do not correspond with the Slovenian dominant narrative on voluntary migrations because of the experienced violence, fear, etc. While, as stories of the ones who decided not to leave their home Istria, they do not conform with the dominant Italian narrative of “no choice left for Italians” and thus of the ethnically-based forced migrations. If memory forms the basis of collective identity (Halbwachs 2001), it could be argued that the collective identity of the Italians who remained in Istria is based on collective silence concerning the exodus (Hrobat Virloget 2021a; Hrobat Virloget 2023a). Further silenced in the Slovenian national narrative are the memories of the Slovenians from Istria and immigrants from other parts of Slovenia and other republics of Yugoslavia, who were eyewitnesses of mass migration and immigration after WWII. They do not correspond to the dominant narrative that this part of Istria has always been Slovene.

names were Italianized, land was confiscated, all Slovene and Croat organizations and institutions were banned, their press was abolished, signs in Slovenian and Croatian were removed from shops, restaurants, and gravestones, and there were violent physical attacks by fascists, individuals suffered political persecution, political parties were banned, access to public services was limited, people were tortured and murdered. There was military occupation, massacres were perpetrated and villages were burned down, and more. The aim was to completely destroy Slovene and Croat national identity in the Julian March (Pirjevec 1982; Kacin Wohinz 1998; Pelikan 2002; Klabjan and Bajc 2021 etc.).

nian. Furthermore, their memories of pressures and violence toward Istrian Italians do not conform to the image of voluntary migration (Hrobat Virloget 2021a).

However, a large part of the silence on the exodus can be attributed to the emotionally charged memories and unprocessed (mostly childhood) traumas where, according to Aleida Assmann, trauma can be seen as the “impossibility of narration” (Assman 2010: 30). If individuals and societies do not process traumas from the past, which is often the case with concentration camp survivors, rape victims, and other victims of trauma, there is a danger for a “conspiracy of silence” (Emrich 2010: 63). With this kind of silence, connected to Freudian ideas about repression in which individuals bury traumatic and painful memories in the subconscious (Zerubavel 2006; Vinitsky-Seroussi and Teeger 2010), people avoid imagination that would repeat humiliation, emotional pain, and fear (Jurić Pahor 2004: 40; Emrich 2010: 63; Straub 2010: 118; Hrobat Virloget 2021a). Silence can also be the result of shared fear and anxiety. In this case, silence means a denial of voice, “where to be silent means to be silenced” (Marković 2020: 177; Zerubavel 2006).

While the project enabled listening to one another on the level of the ordinary people, it could be said that some steps towards international political reconciliation were made, but also with some steps back. The presidents of Slovenia, Croatia, and Italy symbolically acknowledged the victimhood of the “other” by jointly laying wreaths at one another’s places of memory in 2010, an act repeated by the Slovenian and Italian presidents in 2020 (Hrobat Virloget 2023a: 54–55). But then again, a step back was taken this year when the Italian president refused to speak together with the Slovenian and Croatian presidents for the 80th anniversary of the liberation of the fascist concentration camp on the island of Rab in Croatia (Valenčič 2023). In the research on futures, an important question is how different visions of the future create a relationship with the past and how they activate the present, and above all, who has a voice and who is silenced in the in the creation of different futures. Or, to put it differently, whose futures are activated and which ones are rejected (Gulin Zrnić, Poljak Istenič 2022: 36)? As Maurizio Tremul, the president of the Italian community in the Slovenian and Croatian part of Istria (Unione Italiana) commented, the Italians in Slovenia are excluded not only from creating the past but also the future: “How much silence there is on a whole range of things, the inability to tell our history, the inability to tell our present, the inability to tell the future that we want” (Hrobat Virloget 2022: 125).

However, in the Slovenian part of Istria, even more voiceless are the unrecognized ethnic minorities, who came en masse in the 1960s and 1970s as a labor force, mostly from the southern republics of Yugoslavia (Buić 2017). This silence in Istria of those who are perceived as inferior in the dominant Slovenian society has been addressed in a recent novel by Bosnian immigrant in Koper/Capodistria, Selma Skenderović (2022) entitled, Why are you silent, Hava?

17 For more observations about the reasons for silence on the Istrian exodus, from conflict of individual and collective memories to power relations, violence, fear, repression, trauma, denial, etc., see Hrobat Virloget (2021a; b; 2023b) and Hrobat Virloget and Logar (2020).
Some preliminary reflections on the interdisciplinary project addressing traumatic silenced memories

Psychoanalysts argue that in order to erase something, in this case, the pain that produces silence, it has to first be activated and recognized, becoming present, and transferred from the unconscious to the conscious (Emrich 2010: 64). At the first story-telling events that were organized ten years ago with the aim to collect common memories of the urban environment in Koper/Capodistria, one of the organizers, Neža Čebron Lipovec (2015: 204), realized that they have opened collective wounds that they were not able to handle. She observed that such events are a matter of group psychology and she highlighted the need to work with psychotherapists in such heavily contested spaces where urban society experienced diverging experiences of the past.

The project “My Story from Silence,” which lasted eight months, concluded with a final event on the 20th of May 2023 in Koper/Capodistria. The day was chosen to mark the anniversary of the memorial in Koper/Capodistria, which is a kind of “place of oblivion” or “lieu d’oublié” (Candau 2005: 162) as an antithesis to lieux de mémoire (Nora 1984). The memorial on the street wall on Marušičeva street has a picture with Christian symbolism and a sculpture of Jesus with the inscription, in Italian, “Gesù mio misericordia, 21. maggio 1945” (“Jesus my mercy, May 21. 1945”). Today, almost nobody knows the meaning of the inscription because most of the pre-war urban inhabitants of Koper/Capodistria left with the exodus, while the new majority of the town, newcomers who came after WWII, do not have any link with the previous urban heritage. As one of the newcomers commented, they are not bound to the urban environment by “deep roots” or intergenerational memories (Hrobat Virloget 2023a: 209):

We miss that here where we’ve been... Connections, those stories, for example, what happened in a certain house, who was... This bond was severed when the majority left back then. That’s why we don’t feel a connection to certain buildings, for example. It’s different in the case of your ancestors. [...] A cut has definitely been made here.

The intention of the event was to give voice to the “place of oblivion” or a place with no meaning for the todays’ inhabitants. As Stefano Lusa commented, “[The memorial] is one of the iconic images that plastically represents the sentiments of the time in the Italian community living in the city. That plaque was posted by the father of one of the last Italian priests in Koper, who left, as did much of the Italian community, in the first half of the 1950s” (2022).

A round table on the collective traumas of this borderland was organized with psychiatrist and psychoanalyst Paolo Fonda from the Slovenian community and journalist and historian Stefano Lusa from the Italian minority. From the twenty-two stories that were received, an exhibition was organized with photos made by
artificial intelligence, and a PDF publication was published on the project website (http://www.mojazgodbaiztisine.si/).

An action accompanied the event, which attracted a lot of attention, including the media. A week before the event, we wrote parts of the received personal stories in Italian and Slovenian on shop windows in the old town of Koper/Capodistria (Picture 1, 2). At the round table, which was attended by quite a large number of people (cca. 50), Stefano Lusa interpreted the actions of public inscriptions as a big step in raising awareness of the contested past in Istria:

I didn't think I would experience something like what has happened now [with the inscriptions]. These inscriptions are not politically correct. They are very powerful. They affect you. [...] It seems to me that if you go through official channels, you would somehow institutionally try to do it, you would invest a lot of money, a lot of effort, you would have a lot of meetings, a lot of discussions, you would then realize that maybe this sign is too strong, maybe we should put something else and so on... Only you could have done that. I thought these inscriptions would be erased within three hours. I am very happy, I can’t believe that these inscriptions are still present today all over Koper. [...] We have for this coexistence an idea that you have to give a lot, in money, and projects, that you have to make an effort. [...] With 6 euro you have done something that is unthinkable for Koper. [...] And the fact that the shopkeepers agreed to it! It’s a small miracle. [...] I think we have done more this week for this idea of our common history, of what it was, than all the past decades.

As an anthropologist, such a story enabled me to think how little is necessary to raise public awareness on difficult subjects. As psychoanalysts argue, “culture plays a dual role of healing and giving meaning” (Pushkarova 2020: 147) and “it must help traumatized groups and individuals to ‘unfreeze’ and work through their traumatic contents” (Fonda 2021: 116).

As mentioned in the introduction, the participants of the five workshops were asked to choose one of the old black-and-white photos from post-WWII Istria and speak about which personal traumatic experience it triggered. From the methodological point of view, the disadvantage of this method is the selectiveness. The research included only those people who were prepared to speak in public. There were two main differences that I noted when working as an anthropologist among psychotherapists. The first one is that they did not influence the direction of the storytelling as we anthropologists usually do in semi-structured interviews. The second distinguishing point, which I see as a strong advantage, is that they manage to distance themselves from the pain of the storytellers. In contrast, most anthropologists are not educated to emotionally distance themselves from their interlocutors. This was clearly seen in my case when, during workshops, I was nervous when somebody began crying, not knowing how to help, or when I was in tears when writing my field diary. In contrast to psychotherapists, at the end of most of the workshops,
I was often emotionally exhausted, disturbed, or nervous. The difference from the initial above-mentioned story-telling events in Koper/Capodistria (which aimed to address heritage rather than trauma [Čebron Lipovec 2015; 2021: 23–25]) was that my role as an anthropologist was more passive or observative, knowing that I was not trained to handle trauma. I limited myself to the historical-social explanation of collective traumas in this area and left the management of that part of storytelling to the psychotherapists. However, it was clear that what was told in public would be much deeper if the talk were conducted face-to-face, as anthropologists do, which usually happened in informal meetings immediately after the workshops.

My main feeling from the workshops was sadness at the realization of how people create insurmountable social boundaries between groups with ethnic or migrant backgrounds and how they despise and devalue each other. They live together, yet with so many boundaries and feelings of superiority, while humiliating the other. An observation from one received personal story nicely expressed this: “There was an invisible border between us and them” (Moja zgodba iz tišine 2023: 8), between Slovenian Istrians and Slovenian immigrants. From the workshops and individual memories which were sent to us19 emerge stories of children of Slovenian families in Italy who were not allowed to play with the children of their Italian neighbors, especially the esuli immigrants from Istria; stories of the violence in Istria that have prompted people to emigrate; Slovenians who were not allowed to marry Italians; children of Italian families in Slovenia who were humiliated because of being Italians, stigmatized as fascists; Slovenians humiliated in Italy for being Slovenians; The daughter of a Serbian war veteran humiliated in Slovenian society, because of being from the south of Yugoslavia; young students in their twenties suffering because of the fascism that they had never experienced, etc. Over and over again, each ethnic group competed for greater victim status than the “other” (Hrobat Virloget 2021a): immigrant Slovenians in Istria feel more victimized than the Italians who fled or remained, Slovenians from Italy who feel victimized by Italian fascism, etc. According to Aleida Assmann (2007: 20–21; 2010), these competing discourses about who is a greater victim are one of the tactics of remembering that have been employed after WWII in European national memories. The tactic of righting injustices is actually a competition, where the only important memory is the guilt of the other, which blurs or minimizes one’s own guilt. There is also, in this case, the tactic of competition between victims, where the struggle for one’s own suffering being recognized comes to the fore. The psychiatrist Vamık D. Volkan (2001) would identify these ethnonational victimhood narratives with the term “chosen trauma.” The term refers to “a shared mental representation of a traumatic past event during which the large group suffered loss and/or experienced helplessness, shame and humiliation in a conflict with another large group” (Volkan 2001: 87). The “chosen trauma” which forms the group’s (religious, ethnic, or national) identity can be transmitted through many generations (as in the case of Serbs and Kosovo Polje) and can lie dormant or

---

19 Personal memories, among them even a literary sketch story, were sent by people attending the workshops as well as by those who had not attended but followed our actions by social media.
be reactivated in as a powerful psychological force with dramatic and destructive consequences (Volkan 2001).

Interesting was a kind of aggression towards us, the workshop leaders, in Izola/Isola, where the majority of the workshop’s participants were from continental Slovenia who had moved to Istria after the exodus. When I presented the traumatic memories of the exodus, they reacted aggressively, declaring that this is not their history, that they suffered more than the Italians, that migrations are a regular phenomenon throughout history (from the Longobards on), asking why we are forcing onto them these stories that should be forgotten. They ended with the awareness that they would always remain only forešti (“foreigners”), even after 70 years of living in Istria. Paolo Fonda interpreted this anger on the round table as, “a sensitive subject, and when someone touches it, it causes great discomfort, anxiety, and pain, and people react aggressively.” Even more, this discomfort has been accumulating over the years because it was pushed somewhere, not processed in time, because it was not allowed to spoken about, “but it remained there,” as he reflects. After this unpleasant event, we changed our introduction for other workshops by presenting the sufferings of all the addressed social and ethnic groups, living in this area, from remaining Italians to migrant Italians, esuli, newcomers, foreigners, and minority groups, all ignored and excluded from national histories (Hrobat Virloget 2021a).

Well-known writer Claudio Magris writes how Trieste is “an example of how the border can become a barrier, a wall of hatred, ignorance and rejection of others: mutual hatred and mistrust between Italians and Slovenians, provoking violence, resentment and revenge” (Magris 2007). Paolo Fonda, citing Claude Lévi Strauss, notes “humanity ends at tribal boundaries” (Lévi Strauss 1994 in Fonda 2009: 112). National identity and national belonging happen at the symbolic level of the “imagined community” (Anderson 1998), but they “are also practiced, embodied, and emotionally rooted” (Schwell 2020/21: 127). When analyzing borderland communities, we can have in mind Aleksandra Schwell’s arguments that borders “do something; they have agency. They make a difference, and they create social spaces, obstacles, classifications, and opportunities” (Schwell 2020/21: 127). They are also objects of agency and “are an essential part of social imaginaries and processes of selfing and othering” (ibid.). For Paolo Fonda, the Slovenian-Italian ethnically mixed borderland communities are an exemplary case of a paranoid-schizophrenic human condition, where collective myths about the idealization of ourselves and the projection of evil onto a collective enemy emerge. These kinds of paranoid schizophrenic states enable defense and war and the determination of a collective enemy, which reinforces positive feelings about one’s own group and negative, aggressive affect outwards. In this distorted image, the “other” for centuries has been demonized and dehumanized, deprived of any positive trait, any resemblance, and any humanity. He or she simply becomes a Jew, Slav, fascist, communist, Muslim, etc., which has nothing human anymore (Fonda 2009: 105–112). As long as both sides feel they are merely innocent victims of the “other,” reconciliation will not be achieved (ibid.: 124). A space for memory has to be created in which each nation will keep
its disgraces, the crimes it has committed, so it can slowly come to terms with them, and gradually integrate them into grieving processes above the negative aspects of our self-image. These spaces of shame and pain could save what is authentically human in us, to enable true, sincere encounters between different groups (ibid.: 131).

The reason for the success of my (sold-out) book (Hrobat Virloget 2021a), according to commentaries I have received, is its empathy, sensitivity (Fonda 2022: 334), and the plurality of different truths. This call to have respect for one another’s memory and to hear each other (Hrobat Virloget 2023a: 243) continued with these workshops by confronting and listening to each other face-to-face, under the precious guidance of the psychotherapists. This was especially the case of the workshop in Piran/Pirano, where the Italians who remained in Istria were confronted with the personal stories of an Italian migrant, esule, and of a daughter of the tenant and immigrant of Serbia. These immigrants, after WWII, initially had a higher status, but some decades later were marginalized within the Orientalizing discourse of the “Non-Istrians” from the Balkans (Hrobat Virloget 2023a: 191–200; Ballinger 2003: 245–265). In the workshop in Koper/Capodistria, the Italians who remained (rimasti) and those who fled (esuli) were confronted with the younger generation (around age 40), the children of the first immigrants from Slovenia and Croatia. It was interesting to observe the meaning that my book had for them. From reading a narrative of the past that had been silenced to them, some of them started to reflect on the stories of their parents coming to this new environment, which they did not find significant in their youth. The psychotherapist Manca Švara, the initiator of the project coming from the second generation of immigrants, commented that it was the book that helped her understand why she never really felt at home and always felt a kind of unease in her hometown of Izola/Isola.

These workshops enabled different people, for the first time, to tell and listen to each other’s traumatic memories stemming from the various events of the difficult past along the national border. Similar, albeit more professionally elaborated, workshops were done by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in South Africa, where victims and perpetrators were confronted face-to-face. The project was based on the hypothesis that, for a healing process to take place, three elements have to be fulfilled: the truth must not only be told but also heard and publicly acknowledged; the sincere apology of the perpetrator to the victim and victims’ acceptance of apology; and a form reparation where the victim feels that the oppression is over and they now have an equal chance at living conditions (Friedman 2000: 404–406). It was observed that the process of testifying and telling their own stories had not brought closure, as it was an implicit understanding, but that it evoked traumatic experiences that needed a follow-up by psychotherapists (ibid.: 409). Something similar was felt in these workshops, as some participants needed further psychotherapeutic personal talk. However, this project was only a first attempt to see how people would react to such workshops, and it was carried out with a minimum amount of money and, in reality, mostly voluntary work. After its conclusion, the psychotherapists did not have the (financial) support to continue to work with these people.
This is also probably the reason that some people attended more workshops, one after another, likely needing more time to express their personal stories publicly. It is interesting to note that the son of an esuli family attended all the workshops with the exception of the one with the Slovenian minority members, which he intentionally avoided.

The Italians who remained in Istria commented that it was the first time that they publicly told their stories, mostly linked to humiliation by the Slovenian newcomers and pain of losing their own world and social ties with the exodus. As it was argued, Italians were collectively stigmatized as fascists by the Yugoslavian collective memory after WWII, which they felt especially in their ordinary lives on the level of everyday experience. On top of that, after the exodus, with the altered social structure, the loss of their social network, the change in the dominant language, and the reversal of social status from superior to inferior, they felt like foreigners in their own home (Ballinger 2003: 207–44; Hrobat Virloget 2021a; 2023a: 31–32; 125–38).

The workshop in the Slovenian village of Opicina/Opčine in Italy had the largest and most uniform number of people (17), all from the Slovenian minority in Italy, but of different ages, ranging from those in their 20s to 80s. The main motif of the personal stories was focused on the suffering under fascism. Interestingly, though this suffering was never experienced by the two 20-year-old young students, they were nevertheless crying. It’s clear in this case that victimhood maintains the basis for the collective identity of this group. It is the victim who gives meaning to remembrance. The memory of the tragedy is established at the same time as the group’s affirmative memory, which is constructed and maintained through constant remembrance and recognition of suffering (Wieviorka 2004: 89 in Candau 2005: 82). The affective memory, transmitted across generations, that has effects in the present is encompassed by the term “postmemory.” The traumas, stories, images, and behaviors of an older generation are transmitted so deeply into the next generations that they appear as memory in their own right (Hirsch 2012; https://postmemory.net/). Sociologists and anthropologists have shown that memory is also transmitted in its silence from generation to generation via a system of signs as a form of communication of the unspeakable past in the present. In Halbwachs’ words, the transmission of (non-)memory is performed intimately as a “lived” memory interwoven with everyday experiences’ social milieu (Kidron 2009: 18; Halbwachs 2001; Wajnryb 2001; Pabst 2023). As psychoanalysis describes, the psychological present past is inscribed into the body and behavior. No matter how much time has passed from the events, next generations become victims of non-experienced past. Silenced emotions and behavior are borrowed, because they belong to the parents’ past (Straub 2010: 73, 102). This can be the case of holocaust survivors and their perpetrators, where one generational trauma and crime are kept secret and transferred onto next generations (Bohleber 2010: 80; Pabst 2022). As already mentioned, this kind of transmitted silence was clear in the case of the (non-)memories of the exodus. As one of the Italians who remained commented my book, “It made me think about the silence. My mom’s silence and the education that she gave…” (Hrobat Virloget 2022: 132).
In the German society, psychoanalysts have detected a wider phenomenon of the inability to ask, where not wanting to know is perceived as a defense strategy. In this family’s silence, something absent is experienced as massively present (Bohleber 2010: 72).

Among the spoken or written stories of these ethnically mixed border communities a recurring motif was the narrative about the loss or rejection of one’s mother tongue. These include the Italian esule migrant who is trying to learn the Slovenian language that their parents spoke that was denied when moved to the Italian environment of Piran/Pirano from the Istrian countryside and later to Italy, and stories about grandparents speaking Slovenian only some days before death, but not understood by their children and grandchildren who were never taught Slovenian. The assimilation from a Slovenian or Croatian to an Italian language identity was interpreted by historians as a strategy to get the superior social position of the townpeople before WWII or, similar to the decision to opt for Italian citizenship, to get the states help from the Italian state (Volk 2003: 32–35; Pupo and Panjek 2004: 352; Ballinger 2006). However, Mila Orlić observes after WWII the “national indifference” of ordinary people in Istria – mainly farmers – who rejected classification on a national basis. Instead, she emphasizes people’s indifference, neutrality, opportunism, and ambivalence concerning the question of national identity. Opting, and therefore the assimilation of Slovenians and Croats as well, did not solely represent the confirmation of one’s political or ideological convictions, but also the search for social and economic strategies with the purpose of acquiring material advantages or job opportunities in the search of a better life (Orlić 2019: 565–69, 571–72, 575–83; 2023). As people commented regarding the frequent assimilation of Slovenians in Italy, it is difficult to live as (an inferior) minority… Also, other kinds of stories indicated the denial of a maternal language. Such is the case of the story (written and told) of the granddaughter of a Slovenian immigrant in Italy who seems to have been so traumatized by an event with the partisans that she never wanted to speak with her granddaughter in Slovenian, only in Italian, though this changed only a few years before her death (Moja zgodba iz tišine 2023: 9). The meaning of language in identity construction can be seen in a story told, through tears, by a woman, born of a mixed Slovenian-Italian marriage, who felt ashamed of her Italian roots because of living in a Slovenian environment in Italy. By mastering the Slovenian language better than her schoolmates, she wanted to deny her Italian roots and demonstrate her “Slovenianness.” Her attitude changed only after a professor at the university commented that having both identities, Italian and Slovenian, is a value and not a shame. As Paolo Fonda, himself a member of Slovenian minority in Italy and child of an interethninc marriage, reflects, a person in such a multi-ethnic environment is expected to find his or her “purity” of ethnic identity, while the ones with “mixed” ethnic identities are looked down upon by both, Italian and Slovenians (Fonda 2009: 107).

20 Similar stories of families of esuli, who denied their maternal language, were told in other occasions. One of these stories is published by someone from the second generation of esuli (Pechiari Pečarič 2020).
Who were the ones who were prepared to speak publicly in these workshops? By far, the largest attendance at the workshops was in Opicina/Opčine, a Slovenian village in Italy. It was the most uniform group, comprising only members of the Slovenian minority (although also those from inter-ethnic marriages). As their collective identity is based on the victimization under fascism and the negative perceptions of Italians, they are not silenced in the Slovenian dominant memory (with its similar values based on the anti-fascist struggle), so it seems it was easier to speak for them. On the other side, the members of the Italian minority, the majority of whom refused to speak with me on the question of exodus during my research, attended only a few workshops. Most of them came only because of being persuaded by one of my main interlocutors and they were all crying when telling their stories publicly. Interestingly, the same person was trying to persuade other Italians to speak with me during my research with the argument that it is important that somebody who is not part of their minority community document their story. Although my book opened their reflection that they had grown up in silence on the topic of the exodus (Hrobat Virloget 2022: 132), most people are still not prepared to talk about it. The suppressed emotions still seem to be too strong. While concerning the esuli, their number was the smallest in the workshops, likely due to the strong social border they have towards Slovenes and Italians who remained (Hrobat Virloget 2023a: 150–154; Orlić 2023: 189–190). For the children of Slovenian immigrants to Istria, it seemed easier to talk, and it was for them a discovery of a concealed past, while the immigrants themselves (from the Izola/Isola workshop) reacted with aggression, reflecting a resistance towards us.

All of these people live together in this complex borderland society of “natives” and migrants with different ethnic backgrounds, but due to ignoring the pain and memories of “the other,” they live as “strangers either way” (Hrobat Virloget 2023a: 206). However, as the son of an esuli family correctly observed, these kinds of mixed borderland societies with difficult pasts are a treasure because it leaves one capable of understanding similar difficult inter-ethnic pasts in other contested areas (such as North Ireland):

What is done, is done, let’s look to the future… All this, also being borderland people, it’s a big treasure, which I feel because we have the tools, intellectual and emotional, to understand other things in other places.
Conclusions

Reflecting on the general feeling after all these workshops and the written stories we had received, I am left with the feeling that the ethnic hostilities of these ethnically mixed borderland communities never really faded away, even though the war and the Istrian exodus, when these conflicts escalated, ended more than seven decades ago. The memory and, with it, silence persist. As researchers from different disciplinary backgrounds note, in borderland societies, the different national communities live in constant conflict, which is sometimes escalated or reduced, but at the same time, they co-exist and assume fluid, hybrid ethnic identities (Fonda 2009: 106–110; Orlić 2023: 179). However, bordering and boundary-drawing are persistent and continue to define different ways of selfing and othering (Schwell 2019: 27) long after the constitutional national borders have ceased to exist. It’s their imaginary dimension that matters, constantly creating perpetrators and victims (ibid.: 27). It seems that people persistently create borders among themselves to define themselves and to make them feel secure. But on the other side, these same borders become the source of suffering, humiliation, feelings of inferiority, etc.

What was achieved with the workshops and other activities of the interdisciplinary project was the raising of awareness of the silenced traumatic memories of the Slovenian-Italian border area. The multiplicity of voices was finally heard, allowing the unilateral mono-national narratives to be overcome, at least for people attending or reading about the project. People finally heard the traumatic memories of the “other,” which influenced the transformation of the divisive national narrations. It was not directly addressed in the workshops, but people expressed the will to overcome the divisive memories between them by listening and giving space to “other” people’s stories. This mutual respect was clearly felt during the workshops. The need for such a space in this borderland area where conflict narratives can be overcome by the people listening to each other can be seen in the encouragement of the workshops’ attendants to continue with the project, as well as in the interest of other people and institutions to continue or host such kinds of events.

For concluding reflections, we return to the words of Hannah Arendt, that the future pulls constantly back to the past and that the past is never dead (Arendt 2006: 20), especially if it remains silent and unresolved. Along the Slovenian-Italian border, the different narratives of the past have long been, for more than seven decades since WWII and the exodus, silenced. As it has already been shown, the silenced contested pasts, if not articulated, can persist into the present by haunting the future, as has clearly been seen, for example, in the contemporary uncertainty and contentious discussions about how to name the Slovenian part of Istria (Hrobat Virloget 2021a; 2022) or the impression of the Italian minority that the past does not want to pass here (Hrobat Virloget 2022). Similarly, Mila Orlić observes on the other side of

27 For example, the financing from the non-governmental organization Pina from Koper/Capodistria encourages us to apply for similar projects in the future. When we asked for a place to hold such kind of workshop in Trieste, we got support from one Slovenian minority organization.
the border a contemporary obsession with the past through constant re-elaborations of the Italian national narratives about the Eastern Italian border. Both sides obsessively demand the right to victimhood because of fascism on the one side and because of the exodus and “foibe” on the other (Orlić 2023: 196–205).

I believe that it is only by giving voice to the silenced and by acknowledging other people’s truths that a respectful and peaceful cohabitation can be obtained after violent conflicts in the past. The interest in our interdisciplinary project and my book,28 where the space for different conflicts and traumatized memories has opened, indicate the people’s wish to overcome the long-term social borders, hostilities, and disagreements. However, it is not by demanding excuses from “the other” but by admitting and acknowledging our responsibilities and crimes within our “spaces of shame and pain” (Fonda 2009: 131) that we can free our present and future from the conflicts from the past. In the words of the Istrian Croatian writer Milan Rakovac:

There is this mentality, sorry brother, I killed your father, it’s my fault. Because only the atonement of one’s own crimes brings catharsis, liberation, and calmness, and not the fight against those who committed crimes against you. The fight against the crimes that you suffered, that is a matter for the one who committed those crimes. Your screaming means nothing, and nothing good will come out of it. (Pletikos 2023: 50 min)

If one of the most important constitutive elements in creating the future is hope (Crapanzano 2003; Appadurai 2013; Bryant and Knight 2019: 134; Gulin Zrnić and Poljak Istenič 2022: 149), culture and research in the humanities and social sciences can and shall bring hope by creating spaces of mutual comprehension. Researchers who care for the researched can bring together activities of remembering that make the past present and imagine the future (Ingold 2018: 28). In remembering [...], the past is not finished but active in the present. [...] It is to pick up threads of past lives and join with them in finding a way forward” (ibid.: 28). It’s memory that can be “a powerful agent of change” (Assmann and Shortt 2012: 4) that “may help to restructure and integrate societies torn in violent conflict, overcoming chasms of hatred and laying the foundation for a new future” (ibid.: 14).

---

28 This book sold out in a few months, with dozens of book presentations and media interviews on the Slovenian and Italian side, with people asking constantly about its translation into Italian.
Picture 1: Psychotherapist Manca Švara writing on the shop window in Koper/Capodistria. “They came knocking vigorously on doors shouting, Italians, go away!” (Photo: Kaja Hrobat Virloget)

Picture 2: On the shoemaker’s window, a quote from an immigrant from the former southern Yugoslavia: “There existed an invisible border between them and us.” (Photo: Manca Švara)
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Kako prekinuti šutnju o traumatskim sjećanjima uz slovensko-talijansku granicu. Primjer antropološko-psihoterapeutskih radionica

Autorica se u članku osvrće na interdisciplinarnu suradnju kulturne antropologije i psihoterapije tijekom koje su organizirane radionice usmjerene na disonantna i traumatska sjećanja društva sa slovensko-talijanske granice. Rad se bavi pluralitetom glasova u okviru osporava-nih i različitih sjećanja koja se upotrebljavaju za veličanje žrtve društva. Autorica smatra da su prošlost i budućnost neizbježno isprepletene; promjenom narativa prošlosti moguće je postići promjene u sadašnjosti i budućnosti. U konkretnoj studiji slučaja postavlja se pitanje može li se otvaranjem prostora gdje ljudi imaju priliku slušati traumatična i suprotstavljena sjećanja pridonijeti prevladavanju nasilnih sukoba iz prošlosti.

Ključne riječi: budućnost, prošlost, granično područje, Istra, egzodus, psihoterapija, kulturna antropologija