

---

# BERICHT

---

**Katja Naumann / Michael Mann**

**Conference Report:  
“1989 in a Global Perspective”  
14.10.2009–16.10.2009, Leipzig**

**Organisers:**

**Global and European Studies Institute, University of Leipzig; in cooperation with the Centre for East-Central European History and Culture, the European Network in Universal and Global History (ENIUGH) and the Graduate Centre for the Humanities and Social Sciences of the Research Academy Leipzig (RAL)**

## **1. Introductory Remarks**

A conference report as long as the following requires a word of explanation at the beginning: It was indeed a remarkable conference, so it deserves a more detailed discussion of its purpose and accomplishments rather than merely a description of some of its presentations. The report therefore starts with introducing the wider conceptual background. Thereafter selected papers and the central aspects of the final plenary debates are presented. The report concludes with a summary of its achievements and future tasks will be pointed out.

It goes without saying that the year of 1989 is an intensively debated historical subject, especially in conjunction with its 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary. The significance of 1989 as a marker of global change however is even more under discussion. Without forestalling, all papers held during the conference attested to the importance of the events of that year from a global historical perspective, although – in contrast to other modern large-scale transfor-

mations – a consensus as to its interpretation, be it a revolution or not, or a final judgment is as yet not apparent.

Let us begin, however, with the observation that was the starting point for the conference. Without any doubt historical jubilees mark events at which a given society reflects upon its past as well as upon the present state of affairs. Generally these debates go hand in hand with a reflection of the preferred societal order, for the present as well as for the future. And so it was in regard to the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary remembrance festivities of 1989, which played a large role in public debates in Germany last year. The transformations in the former GDR and Eastern Europe and the question as to whether what happened in Leipzig in October 1989 is to be remembered as the beginning of a change with an open end including the option of the socialist order to be reformed, or whether it should be better described as a “peaceful revolution” which would invoke an all-German notion in the sense that it would present the first ‘Freiheitsrevolution’ in German history dominated the debate. At the margins of these discussions, remained the international dimension of the developments including the relations to the processes in neighbouring eastern states.

More striking is a second omission: As early in the late 1980s Mikhail Gorbachev had begun speaking about a “common European house” as a new political order to be built in the years to come. In September 1990 the then president of the US George Bush went even further when he stated in a speech before Congress that the collapse of the communist system in the GDR, in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union made the construction of a new world order necessary. These broad interpretations stand aside of a narrower one that perpetuates an Cold War world-view. Following his understanding and action twenty years ago the former foreign minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, recently interpreted the protests in Leipzig on October 9, 1989 as well as the transformations in Eastern Europe as the beginning of a European emancipation movement and revolution against the Soviet regime dominating Eastern and Central Europe.

According to this narrative Eastern Europe was finally catching up with the development of Western Europe and thus in 1989 the foundation were laid to a united Europe of democracies and liberal economies.<sup>1</sup> This difference in language and interpretation of “1989” was neither mentioned during the celebrations nor was it dealt with by historical analyses. Therefore the changes, which promulgated the end of the twentieth century, are seen as a global caesura, but its historical-cum-global interpretation seems separated from the signifiers of a changing world situation, among others the North-South conflict replacing the model of the ‘three worlds’ or the transformation of a bipolar into a polycentric world.

1 Hans-Dietrich Genscher during the plenary discussion „Revolution ohne Gewalt? Rückblicke auf ein unwahrscheinliches Ereignis“, University of Leipzig, 9.10. 2009. Also during his Introductory Speech of this conference, titled “Auf dem Wege zum und im Epochenjahr 1989” on October 14, 2010, University of Leipzig.

Consequently certain questions have not been raised, for example: Is it that the events of "1989" indicate the emergence of a new world order, or is the global transformation a result of how this year of change was interpreted and remembered afterwards? If both is the case one may ask, how the 'global quality' of these processes relates to the predominating historical interpretation. What is included, what excluded in the dominating master narratives, and with which consequences for a general interpretation? These and connected questions formed the basis of the conference entitled "1989 in a Global Perspective" that took place at the University of Leipzig between 14-16 October, 2009. It was organised by the Global and European Studies Institute (GESI) of the University of Leipzig, in co-operation with the Centre for Eastern-Middle-European History and Culture, the European Network in Universal and Global History (ENIUGH), as well as the Graduate Centre for the Humanities and Social Sciences of the Research Academy Leipzig (RAL). Funding was provided by the Bundesstiftung Aufarbeitung der SED-Diktatur and the University of University.

## **2. The "Global Quality" of 1989 and the historical theory of "Critical Junctures of Globalization"**

In their introductory comments, the three main organisers, Ulf Engel (Leipzig), Matthias Middell (Leipzig) und Frank Hadler (Leipzig), observed that the changes of 1989 were by no means restricted to East Central Europe and are too narrowly interpreted as the end of the Cold War period. Consequently, it has been falsely seen as the victory of one system over the other. They suggested instead to take into consideration all the conflicts that culminated worldwide and then to ask whether the convergence of these events account for global-historical dynamics and, if that is so, whether this does not open up, maybe even demand, a different view on these developments.

As indicated in the conference program<sup>2</sup> events in Cuba, China as well as in Zambia and Kenya do not fit into the well-known argument according to which the political transformations of 1989 resulted in a global breakthrough of western democracy and economic liberalism. Such a perspective fails in taking into account the multitude of interests and visions that were articulated in the transformative movements around the world, of which many differed from, if they were not even opposed, to the Eurocentric narrative of westernisation. Furthermore there is little evidence for what is also claimed by this view, namely that these transformations originated in internal conflicts and dynamics leading forthright to the collapse of socialism and the victory of capitalism. This account is thus based on a limiting Eurocentric perspective. Moreover, it ignores the convergence of the synchronic processes of transformation and consequently it leaves out their systemic causes and results.

2 The programme is listed under: <http://www.uni-leipzig.de/gesi/>

Looking more closely at events in Africa, Asia and Latin America it becomes clear that around 1989 hitherto well-established political and economic structures were shattered without clear alternative concepts being at hand. International processes and local constellations were interdependent; in each case in its own terms. The perception of external dynamics and their local acquisition did not follow one pre-thought, clear-cut scheme rather the occurring cultural transfers brought about a plurality of intellectual responses and social actions. Obviously 1989 did not trigger the homogenisation of social orders nor did the 'South' join univocally and in unison with the 'North'. Instead, as Engel, Hadler and Middell emphasised in their introductory remarks, established political, economic and social orders were contested and structures of international system became fragile by the converging events of 1989.

To comprehend the events of 1989 in their global significance, (both spatial as well as structural) and thus to prevent Eurocentric patterns of interpretation, the conference was organised along three parallel sections. Papers under the heading '1989 – Events, Places, Comparisons' gave an overview of events in various world regions pointing out differences and similarities. The section 'Towards an Entangled History of 1989' was conceived to reconstruct trans-local processes of transfers and interactions to gather the empirical material for an entangled history of 1989. The section 'Processes of Remembrance and Re-Conceptualisation of the World' focused on those historical actors who were successful in enforcing their interpretation of what happened, on their interests and their strategies of gaining dominance in an open and complex situation. It would have been beneficial of the organisers to emphasise that this structure was meant not just as an organisational scheme but that in it the main positions of current international academic research on 1989 were reflected: First, that 1989 is interpreted as the end of the Cold War era; second, that events of 1989 are, recently, understood as being globally entangled; and third, that a new mode of analysis and interpretation is required to ultimately establish 1989 as a global category.<sup>3</sup>

Beside this general framework the conference was intended to discuss and to test the interpretative approach the three organisers have been developing over the last years for capturing the global dimension of 1989. Engel, Hadler and Middell analyse the dynamics and mechanisms of worldwide integration with regard to the spatialisation of political sovereignty, but also in view of cultural and economical organisation. Processes of globalisation are to them de- and re-territorialisations, i.e. the formation, concussion and replacement of the spatial enclosure of politics and societal life. They argue, together with others, that in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century a worldwide correlation of economical, cultural, social and political spaces emerged which simultaneously supported and challenged territorialisation within the nation-state framework. Evidence for this is the balance, which can be found between the preservation of sovereignty and autonomy,

3 Recently Timothy Garton Ash described some of those perspectives that henceforth are to be studied for a global interpretation of the changes that occurred in the year: 1989!, in: *New York Review of Books* 56 (2009)17, online unter: <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/23232>.

usually in the national demarcation of power and identity, and the involvement in global entanglements and interactions.

This dialectic consolidated for certain periods into stable spatial relations, while in others these orders lost their persuasive power. When once established patterns of territorialisation lose their effectiveness and become porous crises break out. Furthermore, when these crises solidify and emerge worldwide they turn into a structural challenge for the respective order of things and the world order begins to change. The organisers conceptualise such phases of change as "critical junctures of globalisation".<sup>4</sup> As to its temporal dimension these junctures are not limited to single events or years, but they culminate in 'global moments'. These are times in which ongoing crises are accorded with meaning by statements of visions concerning a new territorial order. 1989 can be understood as such a global moment, as in almost all regions of the world phenomena of crises gained momentum and were interpreted as thoroughly contesting of the state of affairs with the resulting processes of change becoming increasingly synchronised. While they were before restricted by and within a national framework, henceforth their global power becomes obvious. Consequently, interpretations as to what the old world order was like and the new one would be are formulated and discussed. Assertive, at least for a short period, was the interpretation of the enforcement of western democracy and economic liberalism. In fact in diverse ways and in very different contexts new political actors demanded participation according to their own interests: transnational social groups challenged the demarcations of nation-states, protest movements against the Soviet power emerged, and in the non-European world post-colonial positions were emplaced against the western hegemony. In the end, it seems, the dominating patterns of territorialisation became to an extent so porous in 1989 that they were openly and successfully challenged.

### 3. Conference Report

In view of the wide range of topics and approaches usually presented at conferences the specific focus of this one raised high expectations. Without doubt many of the previously asked questions were debated during the presentation of papers. However, the speakers would have benefited from an outline of the conceptual framework before the conference, not merely in the program and the introductory remarks. So many interesting questions were posed at the outset, yet since there was little opportunity for incorporating them into the presentations and comments, only few were addressed during the panel sessions. Some papers even passed over the requested contextualisation of their case studies in the global framework. Christoph Boyer (Salzburg) argued along the lines of the traditional transformation studies showing that the unrest in East Central Europe was provoked by a structural backwardness of these countries and their incapability to modernise accord-

4 Cf. Ulf Engel/Matthias Middell, Bruchzonen der Globalisierung, globale Krisen und Territorialitätsregimes. Kategorien einer Globalgeschichtsschreibung, in: *COMPARATIV* 15 (2005) 5-6, S. 5-38.

ing to western standards. In comparison, Stefan Troebst (Leipzig) and Michael Zeuske (Cologne) reconstructed the history of events in 1989 without any normative judgment in their respective talks on Yugoslavia and the Caribbean. However, they did not engage in a reflection of what can be taken from these cases for any global history of 1989.

In general more emphasis concerning the global implications of the local and regional crises would have been desirable, such as was undertaken by Chris Saunders (Cape Town). He convincingly demonstrated the influence the imploding and collapsing GDR had on the parliament of Namibia constituting in March 1990 (when the country gained independence from South Africa after decades of struggling) and on the negotiations between F. W. Klerk and the ANC in South Africa.

Particularly as scholars from all world regions attended the conference, one would have wished that the developments of 1989 had been focused on more indepthly in their transnational dimension. Illuminating this fact was the paper by Scarlett Cornelissen (Stellenbosch) who demonstrated that the Anti-Apartheid-Movement in South Africa constituted a transnational movement based on a network transgressing national borders. In this way, internal political affairs were directly linked with international politics. Likewise, Klaas Dykmann's (Leipzig) case study on El Salvador made clear that the general elections in spring 1989 as well as the escalating violence in autumn that year marked a *wendepunkt* in the still ongoing civil war (1980–1992). Since then the US and the UN, in addition to many other transnationally operating non-governmental organisations, have engaged themselves in the conflict suggesting solutions on the basis of international values such as democratisation as a means of securing worldwide peace.

The debate on the relationship between national and regional developments and international relations produced ambivalent results. On the one hand, linkages between local processes became clear. Among others they were all framed using a transnational language. The vocabulary of 1989 – freedom, democracy, disarmament and inter-cultural dialogue – had inspiring power in many places of the world and created the hope for a new political, economic and social order. Furthermore, the observation of emancipation movements taking place at a distance often enough induced dynamics locally. On the other hand most of the papers argued for a primacy of internal causes of political crises rather than accentuating a transnational inter-connectedness. For example John French (Durham) stressed in his paper on Brazil the national context of the general elections in autumn 1989 and pointed out that South America and East-Central Europe may have been connected by some kind of peripheral status within the hierarchies of the Cold War, yet no (direct) connections could be drawn between the processes in these areas which is why a global 1989 is nothing but an *ex post* historical construction. In a similar way Heidrun Zinecker (Leipzig) argued that Columbia contradicts the thesis of a global moment in 1989 because internal social tensions were the real causes for demanding democracy and its ultimate realisation.

Interestingly enough in some cases global inter-connectivity was rejected based on the argument that such an emphasis would again support a perspective in which Western concepts of democracy and marked-orientated economy are assumed as having been

imposed and transferred to non-European countries. In particular the papers on Latin America stressed that the events in Europe did not have any influence on the history of their countries. By generalising their statements one would assume that the same would be true for a region like South Asia. By looking at the academic research on that world region one is persuaded by the initial impression, Yet on taking a closer look at the region's development it becomes clear, as Michael Mann (Hagen) demonstrated in his paper, that India (as the largest nation state in South Asia) fits very well into a global scenery, although developments elsewhere did not have any immediate impact on the country. However, after the collapse of the Soviet Union the US missed her chance as the only remaining super-power to include the Indian Union in a global peace order, or, at least, to incorporate the country into a global security concept. Instead she concentrated on the expansion of NATO into the eastern countries of Europe. The Indian Union which had affiliated to the Soviet Union by a treaty of friendship since 1971, yet, at the same time, was one of the most powerful states within the league of non-aligned countries, was left out of the globally oriented military strategy and political concept. (Strangely enough, the then Bush-administration realised the global importance of 1989 demanding a new world order without including India in such a re-oriented geo-political strategy.)

Left on her own, at least that was the impression of the Indian government and military, India developed her own security concept in the 1990s including the development of nuclear weapons. In 1998 the then Hindu-nationalist BJP-government led by A. B. Vajpayee officially tested the first atomic bomb (followed by Pakistan's a couple of months later) catapulting the country into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. On the one hand this was the result of an explicitly nationalist policy; on the other hand it was the result of the geo-political bias. Consequently the US had to abandon their non-proliferation policy and to co-operate with the Indian Union. Thus the missing US global strategic concept offered India's military and her three governments of the 1990s exactly the kind of agency that was needed to establish her as a "global player" in South Asia and the Indian Ocean Area.

Mark Jürgensmeyer (Santa Barbara) plausibly argued in his paper that in Western Asia and North Africa – one may well add South Asia – the radicalisation of politics, be it through Islam or Hinduism, gained decisive momentum and religious fundamentalism emerged. Similarly, in the US a shift in politics took place, the Bush (jun.) administration being dominated by evangelical fundamentalists. This kind of converging of fundamentalist and nationalist developments must also be integrated into the interpretations of 1989. For example, the Indian Union saw the regionalisation of her territory leading to the founding of three new federal states at the turn of the millennium, precisely at the same time when the territory of the European states and the European Union was being reorganised. Evidently then, processes of reterritorialisation were enfolded in two distant world-regions.

Finally let us mention two papers that put the global meaning of 1989 into the centre of their argument and thus tried most clearly to transcend a Eurocentric perspective. Michael Geyer (Chicago), speaking about the US and the administration of George Bush (sen.) (1989–1993), pointed out a tension which makes the year difficult to in-

terpret: on the one hand this year did not imply major change for the country, on the other the administration intensively discussed a strategy on how to react to the changing global situation. Two options seemed to develop: First, the continuation of the country's global hegemony by applying imperial strategies. Second, the enforcement of geo-political domination camouflaged by promoting democracy and liberal economy in the rest of the world. Relatively early, however, the limits of both options became obvious. The 21<sup>st</sup> century would neither be one of empires, nor did political and economical development continue to parallel and accompany each other. Thus the US-administration was negotiating visions of the future which did not transpire without having a more promising alternative at hands. This indicates that, also seen from the US the situation, 1989 was much more open than it appeared in the years to follow. The 'Americanisation' of the world was not the only issue that was at stake. In particular the country's foreign politics gives evidence of the indecisiveness that circulated at the outset. Management of the crises that broke out almost everywhere was the prevailing stance at first, as later, strategies of preserving the hegemonic position in a changing world order dominated the considerations. This rather cautious and contained position can be explained, according to Geyer, by the fact that the US-American society was in a process of fundamental transformation at least since the beginning in the 1980s. With the collapse of the corporatist and Fordist organisational patterns society became highly fragmented. Both Bush administrations tried to halt these tendencies, to which a strategy of delay with regard to geo-politics corresponded. In general there was a high degree of uncertainty reaching back into the 1960s and 1970s when the post-war order shattered.

Taking Africa as an example Ulf Engel (Leipzig) in his paper on the transformation of financial politics during the 20<sup>th</sup> century argued a similar stance. In his understanding, a dialectical process of border-transgression and border-setting has characterised the last century. On the one hand, independent actors and uncontrollable movements increased within the financial sector ('casino-capitalism'). On the other hand, nation states and supra-national organisations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund tried to politically regulate the trend of de-territorialisation to maintain their sovereignty over the increasingly unmanageable financial markets. Interestingly the Washington Consensus which sought to mitigate consequences of globalisation, like poverty and exploitation, by initiating economic reforms and by developing mechanisms for distribution of wealth (as limited they might have been) to stabilise the political order finally ended to the contrary. It caused global political change. In South Africa the Apartheid system collapsed because of post-colonial challenges, which were used to challenge and finally erode the global financial order, the latter up to an instrument of western control over the rest of the world. Seen from this perspective, 1989 pointed towards the established global financial and economic sector as it marked a moment at which those structures were negotiated anew.



#### 4. Summary and Prospects

From the two plenary sessions of the conference two aspects are to be mentioned. Some irritation among the participants was voiced that the main organisers had suggested 1989 as a decisive marker for a global transformation with regard to territorialisation of political orders and international relations. Yet the question whether this process was to be characterised as a revolution was not posed. The discussion at the end of the conference however addressed this issue, although without any clear result. Not even the events in East-Central Europe were unanimously interpreted as revolutions, although in comparison with occurrences in other world regions they were ascribed the biggest revolutionary potential.

Second, the relevance of the interpretation of 1989 for current political debates was again called into question after Michael Geyer had argued that the end of the Soviet Union should not be merely limited to an implosion but, in fact, was a revolution because social actors set their agency against the communist ruling structures. This soon spilled over borders and inspired demand for freedom rights on a global scale. Since this process has far from ended further revolutions remain a distinct possibility. With that consideration a line was drawn to the basic question of the conference, namely: Does 1989 really mark "the end of history" in the sense of whether it confirms western political and economic patterns or does it mark more convincingly a new period in the structuring of the world?

Three aspects seemed to become clear at the end of the conference: First, it is advisable to start with the historical actors' understanding and the following processes of remembrance for analysing the global quality of 1989. Otherwise one tends to simply reproduce the view that has been ultimately enforced, namely the Cold War perspective of a victory of capitalism over socialism. This perspective, however, despite writing the history of the winners, loses two aspects of the developments that culminated in 1989, namely the challenge of the nation state model for preserving sovereignty and the subjugation of most parts of the world through western European and north American states. Second, diametrical processes have also been emphasised – for example the demilitarisation of Europe within the context of the global proliferation of nuclear weapons, which can even be taken as a starting point for the efforts of provincialising Europe.

Third, it once again became obvious how difficult it still is to overcome established historical narratives such as reproducing the Eurocentric logic of the bi-polarity of the Cold War instead of arguing for the acknowledgment of the poly-centric world of today. The conference has made it clear that the second perspective had already been voiced in 1989 but became forgotten once it was overshadowed by the first. In addition to that we would like to point out that although not intensively discussed, one could gather from the presentations over the two days that given the historically uneven distribution of power the transformations that took place in 1989 could not produce solely winners. The integration into the world economy of East-Central Europe, for example, caused a massive decrease of power and agency in other parts of the world. In this view the continuing

economic crises in many countries of Latin America at the beginning of the 1990s corresponds to and stands in clear connection with developments elsewhere.

Although the conceptual framework of the conference was only sporadically taken up in the panels, the conference was successful regarding the formulation of an empirically founded critique on the present-day prevalent Eurocentric interpretations of the 1989.

The argument concerning the development of the hegemonic pattern of territorialisation since the end of the 1970s starkly emphasises socio-economic structural development as an integral process of the last third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Currently, it seems, two interpretations stand in opposition with each other: Primarily that focused on tracing the annulment of the bipolar pattern of organisation with its consequences, developments and necessities this re-adjustment entailed for all regions of the world. This confronts attention given to the structural crises and the learning process that industrial societies underwent in both eastern and western Europe which was catalysed by the events of 1989 without fully grasping the global meaning of the year.

In reflection, the intended publication of an edited volume of papers from the conference should document, on the one hand, the debates raised and, on the other hand, papers should be improved with respect to clearer arguments including a reference to the triple concept of the conference. This conference report may serve as a guideline stressing once more the original intention of the conference. Should the edited volume strive to widen and, even more ambitiously, to open up new horizons, its publication should go beyond the mere presentation of the given papers. Paper presenters should be asked to discuss their case studies more thoroughly with regard to the global dimension of the 1989 and to respond to the intellectual challenge the conceptual ambition of the conference had posed. Moreover, besides an edited volume, a further conference dealing with the same questions within the next years would be desirable. Until then, one may hope, the presently dominating master narrative on "1989" as the end of the Cold War may have already given way to a globally oriented historical narrative stressing transnational entanglements and the global dimension of "1989".

## Conference Program

Key note lecture (Oskar-Halecki-Lecture of the GWZO)

*Hans-Dietrich Genscher*, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany: "Auf dem Wege zum und im Epochenjahr 1989"

Introduction: *Frank Hadler* (GWZO)

Words of Welcome by

*Rainer Eckert*, Director of the Zeitgeschichtliches Forum

*Franz Häuser*, Rector of the University of Leipzig

*Burkhard Jung*, Mayor of the City of Leipzig

*Bernd Faulenbach*, Bundesstiftung Aufarbeitung der SED-Diktatur

## Introduction:

*Ulf Engel* (University of Leipzig), *Frank Hadler* (GWZO, Leipzig), *Matthias Middell* (University of Leipzig): Global structures and the events of 1989

*Ivan Berend* (UCLA): Global financial architecture before and after 1989

## Parallel Sessions of Sections

### Section 1: 1989 – events, places, comparisons

Chairs: *Frank Hadler* (GWZO, Leipzig), *Amanda Gouws* (U Stellenbosch), *Colin Lewis* (London)

*Konrad H. Jarausch* (U Chapel Hill): Germany 1989: A New Type of Revolution?

*Alexandr Shubin* (Moscow): International Influence on Gorbačovs Reform and on Civil Movement

*Oldrich Tuma* (Academy of Sciences, Prag): Czechoslovakai in 1989

*Chris Saunders* (U Cape Town): 1989 and Southern Africa

*Ulf Engel* (U Leipzig): A Structuralist Interpretation of the Making of Synchronicity: Re-contextualising 1989 in the Finance Politics of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century

*John French* (U Duke): Without Fear of Being Happy: The 1989 Presidential Election Campaign of the 'Brazilian Lech Wałęsa' Luis Inácio Lula da Silva

*Heidrun Zinecker* (U Leipzig): Where 1989 did not Happen: Colombia in 1989

*Klaas Dykmann* (U Leipzig): El Salvador in 1989

### Section 2: Towards an entangled history of 1989

Chairs: *Ulf Engel* (U Leipzig), *Michael Mann* (U Hagen)

*Christoph Boyer* (U Salzburg): The socio-economic causes of "1989" in a comparative perspective

*Michael Mann* (U Hagen): India in 1989

*Stefan Troebst* (GWZO, Leipzig): A Turn to the Worse: 1989 in Yugoslavia

*Rüdiger Steinmetz* (U Leipzig): Television as a Universal Therapist and Entertainer. An Analysis of Programmes in the Transition Period between the Opening of The Berlin Wall and the Unification of Germany

*Mark Juergensmeyer* (U California, Santa Barbara): Storm Clouds of Global Religious Rebellion in 1989

*Scarlett Cornelissen* (U Stellenbosch): Resolving the South African Problem: Transnational Activism, Ideology and Race in the Olympic Movement, 1960–1990

*Hartmut Elsenhans* (U Leipzig): Rising New Cultural Identitarian Movements in Africa and Asia in the Emerging Multipolar World

### Section 3:

1989 in processes of remembrance and re-conceptualisation of the world

Chairs: *Matthias Middell* (U Leipzig), *Michael Riekenberg* (U Leipzig), *Beata Ociepka* (U Wrocław)

*Michael Geyer* (U Chicago): The United States in 1989 – A Brief History of the Future

*Bernhard H. Bayerlein* (U Mannheim): Communism – A History of Erosion

*László Borhi* (Budapest): The International Context of the Hungarian Transition, 1989

*Michael Zeuske* (U Köln): 1989 in the Carribean: Social Rebellion in Venezuela and Conflicts over Reforms on Cuba

*Pierre Grosser* (EHESS Paris): The 1989 Moment: Rethinking the demise of East Communist Europe in a Global Context

*Jie-Hyun Lim* (U Seoul): Where Has the Socialism Gone? Korean Lefts Looking at the Post-Communist Eastern Europe

*Claudia Kraft* (U Erfurt): Remembering the End of Polish Communism

*Mihai Manea* (U Bucharest): 1989 in Romania. A Violent Popular Oust. Different Interpretations

Plenary Section: Reports from the Parallel Sections

chair: *Erin Wilson* (U Melbourne)

Concluding plenary session

chair: *Mark Juergensmeyer* (U California, Santa Barbara)

Introductory comment: *Dietmar Rothermund* (U Heidelberg)