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It is a rare journalistic account of World War II that leaves the episode with Stalin’s blue pencil unmentioned. After the signing of the German-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Demarcation (better known as the second Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact) in Moscow on 28 September 1939, a map accompanied refreshments. The treaty, as is well known, held the key to the foreseeable future of the populations in Poland, Lithuania, Ukraine, and Belarus. The map, for its part, was meant to be Hitler and Stalin’s last word on the territories concerned. In particular, it outlined the border between the German and Soviet spheres of influence. Reviewing the course of this border, Stalin made an adjustment with a blue pencil. He extended the Soviet line further north of Rava-Ruska, a mixed-population Polish town just captured by Hitler’s Wehrmacht. The flourish of Stalin’s signature underneath proceeded to seal the fate of Poland, partitioned and stripped of sovereignty for the duration of the war, for decades to come.¹

Retellings of the anecdote attest not only to Stalin and Hitler’s geopolitical machinations or to the imperial whim (or “territorial writ”) that has long held sway over the area historically known as Eastern Europe.² Most broadly, the story’s recurrence reflects the degree to which this part of the world has been defined by its location on the map. The cartographic mandate, as we term this circumstance, refers not only to the practice of mapping itself, tied to the push-and-pull dynamic between “power and protest” and steeped in the hodgepodge of the cartographers’ dissonant traditions, languages, and political affiliations that project order, authenticity, and accuracy but rarely live up to this façade.³ Nor is it limited to popular revivals
of geopolitical determinism, which wield maps to get at the causation of crises and conflicts and argue that such documents anticipate violence in “the dusty steppe” of Kosovo and Macedonia but not in “the cultured conviviality” of Prague or Budapest. Outside journalistic writing and beyond cartography and the disciplines that it has traditionally served (statistics, economics, sociology, geopolitics), the idiom of geography, political or physical, is also deep-seated. The efficient “geographic shorthand”—admittedly less confusing than “an open-ended mélange of overlapping and incommensurable ... patterns”—functions as the all-too-rarely questioned bedrock for a wide gamut of references to the region.

Undeniably, “metageography”—the breakdown of the world into East, West, North, and South—resonates already in the region’s name. The very designation “Eastern Europe”—along with such alternatives as Central, East Central, or Eastern and Central Europe (preferred by current scholars as well as the area’s residents)—contains more than a hint at the physical coordinates. The tendency to “geo-code,” to borrow John Pickles’s term, abides as one of the Enlightenment’s holdovers. It occurs at the expense of highlighting the area’s connections to other spaces, real and symbolic. Such thinkers as Johann Gottfried Herder, once seminal for national revivals across the Continent’s eastern half, generously endowed the region’s inhabitants with a set of ties to natural geography but remained parsimonious with granting them connections to the less tangible realms. “The Slavic peoples,” their foremost Enlightenment-era advocate ruefully noted, “occupy on Earth a greater space than [they do] in history.” Herder’s sympathetic account of these Slavs proceeded to exacerbate the cliché by painting the subjects as “servile” and “obedient” peasants—in short, as antitheses of history-makers, sedentary and inseparable from their land.

In the Enlightenment’s wake, the homegrown proponents of nineteenth-century Eastern European nationalisms echoed Herder by espousing the view that precisely land, and not “the narrative space of national history,” held the greatest potential for cohesion. Subsequently, land as the crucible of familial and social structures fueled imaginations of such Eastern European natives as the Ukrainian modernist writer Olha Kobylianska (Land, 1902) and filmmaker Alexander Dovzhenko (Earth, 1930). The conflation of territory and soil only boosted the impression of Eastern Europe’s landlocked condition, in that most literal sense of being tied to the land.

Likewise, scholarly methods and frameworks have not been exempt from geo-coding. As this introduction will flesh out in more detail, two terms underpin the cartographic mandate: betweenness and contiguity. From the viewpoint of imperial history, both feed into “typologies of empire,” as Maria Todorova puts it. This is to say, they perpetuate contiguous (i.e., land)
empire as a category that is not only pertinent to Eastern Europe but, as Timothy Snyder argues, also particularly pernicious.12

From the vantage point of area studies, betweenness and contiguity justify the prominence of borderlands and neighbors as the two currently dominant accents in thinking and writing about Eastern Europe across mediums, genres, and disciplines. These two frameworks have fed off the long-term transdisciplinary groundswell of efforts to tell stories about and from the vantage point of peripheries. They have drawn especially though not exclusively on the tenets of post-structuralism and postcolonial theory while acknowledging the limits of such imported insights’ applicability to Eastern Europe. In this region, borders, as Eagle Glassheim points out, have often gone unnamed as such. Borderlands, for their part, have been a far cry from “the lively ‘contact zones,’ ‘crossroads,’ and ‘fluid transitional spaces’ associated with scholarship on North American border regions, which dominates the vigorous subfield of borderland studies.”13 Without a doubt, there have been good reasons for the prolonged scrutiny of borderlands and neighbors—as well as for the current dominance of the so-called borderlands paradigm in historical research and beyond.14

Borderlands contain the alluring promise of diversity and hybrid post-national coexistence. Yet the promise often falls flat when the “proximity and familiarity” of their populations unravel into “the kind of ruthless brutality that will transform friends and colleagues into faceless outsiders” or, worse, victims of violence and ethnic cleansing.15 The promise further shatters against the seemingly unending “memory wars”—among them, the conflicts over the ownership of the material legacy of the past, the less tangible victimhood contests, and historical amnesia.16 Ordinarily, these eclipse the much less overdetermined models of remembrance: the so-called knots of memory, for instance, which trade “geocultural hierarchies” for affective or ethical affinities between places, cast doubt on “the self-sameness of any site,” and connect, to cite Michael Rothberg’s example, a place like Warsaw not only with other European capitals but also with global metropolises like Atlanta, Gaza City, or Istanbul.17 In short, the promise of borderlands stumbles over the many reminders of neighbors’ un-neighborly behaviors—ethnic, racial, or religious hatred, suspicion, forgetting, and betrayal—of the kind highlighted in Jan T. Gross’s writings about Polish antisemitism and, more recently, xenophobia.18 The relatively recent backlash against Gross himself, accused of lacking patriotism by Poland’s Law and Justice government, proves that the relevance of studying borderlands and neighbors knows no expiration date.19

At the same time, the “borderlands paradigm,” refer as it may to the effects of mixing between ethnicities and traditions, implies and reinforces
territorially limited engagements. Even as it eschews geopolitics by zooming in on peripheries rather than centers, it continues to owe a debt to the “geocultural hierarchies” that tie Eastern European locales to each other or to the counterparts in adjacent Western Europe and Russia. Studies of borderlands tend to focus on the “side-by-side” of proximate and sedentary populations. To paraphrase Nick Baron and Peter Gatrell’s formulation, many privilege being over movement—or else, they delimit movement. When they do zoom in on mobility, as is the case with Baron and Gatrell’s volume, the focus is typically on the internally displaced. The result is, inevitably, only a partial ethnoscape, one with few “tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles, [and] guestworkers” that are constitutive of Arjun Appadurai’s original definition. In turn, Appadurai’s own formulations of various -scapes barely accommodate Eastern Europeans. His mentions of “Soviet Armenia and the Baltic Republics,” Ukrainians, and Albanians remain brief, fleeting, and muddled.

Therefore, we take this volume as an occasion to argue more concertedly than has been done before that geography circumscribes neither Eastern Europe’s destiny nor its history or culture. The “geographic features,” to draw on Paul Magocsi, hardly isolate the region from the rest of the world. Nor can its “global moments,” in Yaroslav Hrytsak’s formulation, “be reduced to relations between core, periphery, and colony.” And so, if Vesna Goldsworthy’s coinage “the imperialism of the imagination” exposed the tendency to substitute “real territories” with literary phantasms, we take issue with the tendency to overstate territoriality as such. For, just like Goldsworthy’s notion of imperialist imagination, the trend impacts “how people view places, countries, and societies.” Its consequences resonate far and wide.

The area’s natives, we point out, have consistently forged links to discontiguous lands and populations, whether willingly or by force. In the same month as Stalin let his blue pencil loose on the map of Poland, for example, the renegade Polish writer Witold Gombrowicz got stranded in Argentina. It was a lonely sojourn in the “land lost in the oceans,” he complained, lasting years instead of the anticipated two weeks. Loneliness, however, was not for lack of compatriots—diplomats and exiles. Many nautical miles away from Europe, the author could hardly escape them and their parochialism, which he immortalized with scathing irony in the novel Trans-Atlantyk (1953). Of course, an unforeseen “quirk of fate,” as Gombrowicz put it, accounted for his refusal to board the ship that would have carried him back to Europe: his South American disembarkation coincided with Hitler’s invasion of Poland. But in countless other cases before and after his, people’s choices were less accidental.
Examples, some felicitous and others unfortunate, are too varied to sketch out here in anything but broad strokes. Many of them follow the ebbs and flows of various political and economic integrations and disintegrations that not only link Eastern European and global histories, as Snyder proposes, but also entwine the fates of concrete Eastern Europeans with those of the world.33 Military servicemen, volunteers, and mercenaries received their baptism by fire in faraway lands, as did the eighteenth-century independence fighter and engineer Tadeusz Kościuszko when he joined in the American Revolutionary War in 1776. Emigrants moved from one continent to another in search of prosperity, freedom, and inclusion.34 Refugees fled racial, religious, political, and ethnic persecution in the hopes of reaching more tolerant destinations. Their descendants now reunite in virtual city communities, where the “chronologically, spatially, and linguistically interconnected digital pathways” take on the function of physical streets.35

Besides, for many decades, merchants, industrial capitalists, and, subsequently, socialized enterprises traded with partners far removed from local, regional, national, or cross-border markets. In defiance of maps, landlocked countries such as Czechoslovakia staked out a place in maritime commerce.36 The exports—in this case, metalwork, textiles, glass, musical instruments, costume jewelry, or furniture—served not peace alone. For better or worse, raw materials, military technologies, and scientific savvy also moved across the vast swathes of water.37

Neither were ideologies strangers to two-way transoceanic transfers. In Manhattan’s Lower East Side of the early twentieth century, Yiddish-speaking immigrants, following the anarchist mastermind Mikhail Bakunin, repudiated “the rights and frontiers called historic” and trafficked in cosmopolitan diasporism instead.38 Several decades later, disillusioned Marxists of Arthur Koestler’s and Leszek Kolakowski’s stature included anticommunism into this circuit of political ideas and influences. And after the end of the Cold War, democratization know-how became Eastern Europe’s next export-import commodity, the legacy and permanence of which remain uncertain to this day: Eastern Europe inspires with the tenacity of its recurrent pro-democracy protests as much as it appalls with the force of deep-seated xenophobia.39

Against these backdrops, writers and filmmakers plotted their own extraterritorial lives and fantasies. A country like Poland provides plenty of examples that ring a bell to publics across borders. In the 1870s, the whale of English-language literature Joseph Conrad (born Józef Teodor Konrad Korzeniowski) took and wrote about a voyage on the Congo River in The Heart of Darkness (1899). To explain his fellow Eastern Europeans’ retreat into privacy from his Cold War–era American exile, the dissident poet and
writer Czesław Miłosz reached for the Persian term *ketman*, which he borrowed from the works of the French racialist, diplomat, and author Arthur de Gobineau. Back in Poland, the internationally renowned science-fiction genius Stanisław Lem, writing “with very little reference to concrete social and political changes,” tested the limits of this trajectory by dispatching his protagonists to extraterrestrial worlds where their innermost thoughts, passions, as well as fears got unhinged—and borderlands or homelands mattered comparatively little.⁴⁰

What were the reasons for these and other leaps of faith, ventures, and entanglements, we ask as we sample a cross-section (representative although by no means comprehensive) of topics from architecture to autobiography, from literature to religion? What new affiliations did these engagements engender? What benefits and pitfalls did they entail? What limits did they run up against? What *discontinuities*—ruptures in chronologies, traditions, historiographies, memory cultures, religious affiliations—do they involve? And did territorial *discontiguity*—the term that this book advances as both a counterweight and counterpart to “borderlands” and “neighbors”—provide the distance necessary for shaping a fresh critical outlook on the past, present, and future? Or did it, on the contrary, facilitate escapes from the unresolved dilemmas of proximate histories and memories?

To tie these central questions together, here we propose to *unmap* Eastern Europe. This term, we realize, requires a careful explanation. In this volume, unmapping does not deny geography’s salience; such a stance would be both politically naïve and historically shortsighted. To clarify, unmapping here does not negate physical space. It does not fashion Eastern Europe into a utopia relegated to mental or fictional cartographies for which writers and thinkers toil as latter-day draftsmen.⁴¹ Instead, the term takes issue with the cartographic mandate by bracketing the space defined by Eastern Europe’s internal or external borders and by its relational proximity to Russia and Western Europe (including Germany and even Austria). All in all, unmapping extracts that to which “Eastern Europe” refers from the falsely exclusive contiguities ascribed to it: first and foremost spatial, but also temporal, ethnic, religious, intellectual, or cultural. It renders Eastern Europe as an entity that is neither merely a “connecting bridge” between its neighbors, nor an “intermediate region.”⁴² Eastern Europe, in brief, here amounts to more than its “situation,” to use the onetime Czech dissident Milan Kundera’s description of the area’s Cold War–era political predicament.⁴³ Our aim, then, is to “decolonize” our way of thinking about this area, to invoke Madina Tlostanova’s revision of the still-prevalent dichotomous paradigms—even if we, unlike Tlostanova, detach the process of revision from so-called border subjectivity.⁴⁴
For this reason, this book does not open with a token map. If anything, we could begin with a map of the world, dotted with interconnected points. The problem with most conventional maps, however, is that they leave no room for depth perception and thus exclude any complicated territorial and temporal coincidences and overlaps. They fail to capture how in the passage and writing of history, to draw on Serguei Oushakine, “important locations are recaptured, renamed, or even repurposed.” These rites of “stylistic gutting and retrofitting,” Oushakine and others point out, never completely hide, let alone erase, earlier eras’ traces.\(^{45}\) Alan Dingsdale echoes this observation when he speaks of the region’s “competing spatialities”: local and national, continental, and global.\(^{46}\) What map would make room for these layers? Certainly not the conventional kind.

Within the limited scope of this book, to name a few examples, unmapping amounts to asking why cultural figures who banded together under the name “the locals” remained outsiders in the country where they ostensibly belonged (as Tatsiana Astrouskaya investigates in her contribution); how a seemingly nation-centric publication enjoyed wide extraterritorial diffusion (to sum up Jessie Labov’s argument); what accounts for the “dynamic state” of such a seemingly immobile work as a mural (in Adam Zachary Newton’s interpretation); or what forces compelled Balkan Muslims—especially women—to choose pan-Islamism over Broz Tito’s pan-Yugoslavism (a central question in Piro Rexhepi’s essay). The variety of topics acts as a reminder of the region’s lack of “overarching political cohesion, cultural integrity, or even a geographical identity” and suggests that precisely these shortages render it open to discontiguous engagements.\(^{47}\)

It goes without saying that unmapping presupposes the possibility of remapping or re-spatialization. It is not a destruction but a “reconstruction of a spatial code,” to invoke Henri Lefebvre’s term for recovering unconventional (in his case, non-verbal or non-discursive) spatial practices on new terms. If anything, unmapping is an episode in “a series of separate and distinct assays of the world’s space”—the assays that recapture, prominently, “the unity of dissociated elements.”\(^{48}\)

If the notes to the preceding pages are any indication, numerous individual studies have openly or implicitly contributed to this kind of re-envisioned spatial conception of Eastern Europe. Relationships between Eastern Europeans and their non-contiguous others—and with “the globalization momentum” at large—have played a role in research on military history, intellectual exchanges, modernities and modernisms, protest movements, travel, exile and (forced) migration, the “global circulation of blackness” in musical styles such as hip-hop, \textit{samizdat/tamizdat} publishing, and Cold War broadcasting, to name just a few rubrics.\(^{49}\) This book’s greatest concern—as
well as its raison d’être—is that so far, these individual efforts have failed to shape an assertive enough counterpoint to geography-as-destiny.\textsuperscript{50} No journalist has yet written a bestseller about Eastern Europe gone global, but bestsellers about the doom of its maps continue to multiply.\textsuperscript{51} Here, we are interested in asserting such a counterpoint and asking about the causes of its limited and delayed recognition thus far.

While the afterword addresses the stakes involved in this task—be it a choice (along the lines plotted in Irene Kacandes’s essay), a postcolonial emancipatory gesture (along the lines suggest by Snyder and others), a commitment to bringing to light the typically overlooked histories and stories, or a combination of these factors—and envisions the task’s future trajectory, the remainder of this introduction explains why now is the right moment to do so. The excursion starts with the specter of Eastern Europe’s betweenness, then moves on to recap the quest for the alternatives to the interstitial position, and concludes with a note on the volume’s timeliness and a brief overview of its structure.

THE SPECTER OF BETWEEN

More than a decade has passed since the accession of the first eight post-Soviet countries—the Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—to the European Union (EU). And yet, they are rarely described as being solidly within this alliance, both by outsiders and by their own political and cultural elites. Instead, they are perceived, in the words of the German weekly Der Spiegel, as “stuck in between”—in this case, between the East and the West.\textsuperscript{52} The by now familiar specter of betweenness haunts also their neighbors to the immediate east and southeast:\textsuperscript{53} the EU’s most recent newcomers, such as Bulgaria, Romania, and Croatia; its official and potential candidates, among them Albania and Serbia; and its associates, including Moldova and, most obviously, war-torn Ukraine. Historian Larry Wolff’s prophecy that “in the 1990s Eastern Europe will continue to occupy an ambiguous place between inclusion and exclusion” has extended well into the twenty-first century.\textsuperscript{54}

And so, let us review the most significant recent preconditions for betweenness and then move on to the constraints that it entails. In the wake of 1989, when Wolff mused on the staying power of the Enlightenment’s “mental map” of Eastern Europe, construed as alien to the West yet inalienable from the West’s civilizational self-fashioning, the area’s transition from socialism to the next milestone seemed to justify the turn to “between.” Indeed, the shift engulfed—and, in many ways, continues to engulf—entire soci-
etries, not just their economies. At times, its impact was so overwhelming that it appeared to leave some states suspended between categories indefinitely, with political scientists wondering whether transition could still count as a liminal rite of passage or should be viewed, instead, as a permanent status quo, as its own kind of culture.55

More recent invocations of being “stuck in between,” however, have been geopolitically motivated. As the media headlines in the last few years have made obvious, Eastern Europe’s outlines depend not on mental mapping alone. Russia’s annexation of Crimea in March 2014, along with its subsequent military intervention in mainland Ukraine, placed Eastern Europeans in the dual role of intrepid mediators between Western Europe and Russia and Russia’s fearful victims-to-be. This turn of events marked yet another instrumentalization of history, since “between” looms large not only in the narratives of Eastern Europe’s present. With even greater vigor, it molds views of its past.

Politicians, scholars, and media pundits in Eastern Europe and abroad have routinely described this part of the Continent as being or having been trapped betwixt the East and the West, Hitler and Stalin, Catholicism and Orthodoxy, Occidentalism and Orientalism.56 In addition, “between” has provided the backdrop for discussions of global “eastness,” predicated much more on drawing lines between adjacent entities than on difficult-to-extricate “nesting Orientalisms.”57 “Between,” it bears reminding, only makes sense on a flat, surveyable surface: on a map that, to paraphrase Pickles, precedes the represented territory.58

Hypothetically, the interstitial position could have been a blessing: a much-needed third-way alternative to “dualistic East-West thinking,” an overdue opposition to Russia’s neither-West-nor-East ideology of Eurasia, or a synonym for the area’s rich layering of cultures.59 Yet in practice, it has borne closer resemblance to a curse. Elsewhere, spatial frames of reference—Germany’s once-proverbial Mittellage (central position) comes to mind—eventually become consigned to history as it runs its course. With regard to Eastern Europe, however, the logic of “between” stubbornly endures, cementing the area’s geographical position as all-important and indisputable.

Eastern Europe’s “historical continuity,” to cite an iteration of this cliché, derives “from its ill-fated location between the more organized and powerful neighbors.”60 In short, the rhetoric of “between” has been an instrument in the much larger project of casting geography as the area’s inescapable, and unfortunate, destiny. In contrast to Russia, where since the nineteenth century space-as-destiny has stood (and was consciously chosen) in welcome opposition to Western Europe’s self-definition through time and history, for Eastern Europe this “destiny” has had much more ambiguous implications.61
The list of the latter, spelled out below, proves that tropes “can be potentially reckless,” as our contributor Adam Zachary Newton observes elsewhere.62 The “trope of ‘betweenness’” is no exception.63 It brings about several interrelated, if partially unintended, side effects that shape the direction of our book. These go far beyond what Alexander Maxwell terms “geographic egoism,” best paraphrased as a Kantian extension of one’s subjective physical position to one’s similarly subjective intellectual posture.64 Betweenness has implications not for geopolitics alone.

Epistemologically, to borrow from Leslie Adelson, “between” “often functions literally like a reservation designed to contain, restrain, and impede new knowledge.”65 It hampers, in particular, the wider recognition and reappraisal of the area’s connections to ideas, locales, or movements around the globe—the now proverbial ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, finanscapes, and ideoscapes and their precursors.66 Such links can be positive, based on interest or solidarity, as much as negative, that is, rooted in rejection, as this introduction suggests in closing.

Conceptually, to speak with Maxim Waldstein, “between” leaves Eastern Europe “in the blind spot on the map of contemporary social and cultural theory” as a consumer but not producer of methodological innovations.67 Politically, it entrenches suspicions of Eastern Europe’s territorial volatility (i.e., its “expanding and contracting areas with very fluid boundaries”),68 its wanting sovereignty, its violent tangling and untangling of populations, and its colonial- or postcolonial-like subalterity, encapsulated in the moniker “the buffer zone.”69

Culturally, “between” acts as the great homogenizer. For a lay observer, it feigns a semblance of unity among the area’s constituents and is as easily mistaken for the area’s most obvious defining feature as it is misconstrued as the glue that holds the widely disparate places together. Besides, “between” renders any attempted distinctions among the region’s many aforesaid designations—Eastern, Central, or East Central Europe—null and void.70 The inherent vagueness of these labels’ “geographical domains” gives way, instead, to their mappability.71 Consequently, “between” validates that prevalent Cold War-era label “Eastern Europe” as the proper umbrella term for the countries erroneously perceived as “geographically contiguous” and “structurally homogenous.”72

THE LONG SEARCH FOR ALTERNATIVES

Just as “Europe” has been “more than a geographical expression,” so have the designations describing Eastern Europe borne their fair share of myths and aspirations.73 In the scheme of this volume—premised on the broadest
possible definition of history that includes histories of religion, literature, and the arts—it means a great deal that the rebuttals to the cartographic mandate have been advanced by the literati. The eminent Cold War–era critic of Marxist thought Leszek Kolakowski, known for his Swiftian sensibilities, was among the first in his cohort to expose the overwhelming inutility of surface mapping.74

A satire of his, originally published in 1972, takes his readers on a search for the utopian Kingdom of Lailonia, populated with characters with such decidedly non–Eastern European names as Ajio, Kru, or Mek-Mek.75 Unlike Robert Musil’s better-known Kakania from The Man without Qualities (1930–43), Lailonia maintains no identifiable presence right in Europe’s center. On the contrary, its location is as elusive as could be, much to the dismay of Kolakowski’s narrator. Pinning it down takes so many maps, atlases, and globes that this character and his brother must sell most of their possessions and take special potions to shrink themselves in order to fit into their cramped apartment. And when they finally find the requisite map, it quickly gets lost in the clutter. Eventually, a package arrives confirming Lailonia’s existence, but no postmaster can trace it back to the point of origin. Instead of more maps, the package contains a collection of the satirical tales that form the core of the book, warning the reader against conflating territory with content or substance.

Yet efforts such as Kolakowski’s have more than once crashed against the pronounced inclination to overstate—or else simply leave unquestioned—Eastern Europe’s link to the delimited physical space that it occupies.76 To adopt a postmodern turn of phrase, Eastern Europe has been re-territorialized (i.e., linked back to its original physical space) much more frequently than it has been de-territorialized.77 In this cycle, “between” has served as a vehicle for the region’s geo-coding both by outsiders attempting to wrest control over it and, as Steven Seegel points out, by its resisting natives.78

Undoing Eastern Europe’s territorial anchoring has been difficult even for those intent on making the leap. In his seminal essay “The Tragedy of Central Europe” (1984), often quoted in this volume, Kundera teetered on the verge on failing. On the one hand, he insisted that Central Europe is not a “coincidence of geography,” typically dictated by the “always inauthentic” political borders. It is “not a state,” but “a culture or a fate,” he famously proclaimed, anticipating Timothy Garton Ash’s nostalgic paean to just such a “kingdom of the spirit.”79 On the other hand, for all his attachment to symbolic geographies—the cornerstone of the ensuing years-long debate about the scope and meaning of Central Europe—not even Kundera could entirely shake off the spell of betweenness.80 “What is Central Europe,” he asked on the same page, but an “uncertain zone of small nations between Russia and Germany,” one “vanished from the map of the West”? A fellow dissident
Milosz, by then a Nobel Prize laureate, fell prey to a similar contradiction a few years on.81

The present obviousness of such inconsistencies signals our distance not only from the 1980s, when Kundera and Milosz laid out their thoughts, but also from the more than two decades that followed 1989. That period, in Magdalena Marszałek’s observation, was tantamount to a “spatial revolution,” spurred by the “new [relative] freedom of movement” and “the drawing of new borders” within Europe.82 The accompanying changes inaugurated a wave of Eastern Europe’s political and literary mapping and remapping, informed by the broader interdisciplinary “spatial turn,” whether as an indispensable counterpart of time in Eduardo Mendieta’s “chronotopologies,” as Appadurai’s alternative global topography of various -scapes, or as Hillis Miller’s literary topographies.83

Just as “phantasmagorical geography”84 and so-called geopoetics—a “cultural self-determination of territories,” originally formulated by Kenneth White—appealed to writers,85 symbolic or imagined geography (focused on the perception of places and spaces, interlinked and mutable) and critical geopolitics (characterized by querying the geopolitical knowledge-making) became de rigueur among political scientists engaged with the region.86 Given these decades-old counterweights to geopolitics, why is it that the cartographic mandate has lost none of its allure?

The pressing political crises and their geopolitically tinged media coverage surely account for some of the causes. At present, multiple factors have been conducive to upholding the master narrative of betweenness and contiguity: the East/West disparities with regard to taxation, migration, or asylum and minority rights within the EU; the well-publicized electoral gains of right-wing parties in countries such as Hungary and Poland; and Russia’s threats, real and perceived, to the neighbors just west of it. Other circumstances have been cultural: the voices attuned to various discontiguities have tended to stress, perhaps too emphatically, the intangible worlds of fiction or the arts. What makes this volume so timely is the turning point that we observe with regard to these two vectors, political and creative. Therefore, in closing this introduction outlines the current constellation of forces that could enable a more robust narrative of Eastern Europe’s discontiguous past and present. In this constellation, the intensities of fact and fiction align.

WHY NOW?

On the political front, discontiguities appear more pronounced than ever before. This is not only because Eastern Europe, as mentioned earlier, has
become an eminent global exporter of democratic know-how, whether deservedly or not. Activism of such transition-era politicians as Lech Wałęsa has reached such remote places as Cuba, Iran, Tibet, Tunisia, and Burma. The agents in these transnational (and, at times, transcontinental) exchanges have functioned, in Tsveta Petrova’s description, as “diffusion entreprenurs” rather than recipients of democracy support, often to the chagrin of their Western European colleagues and in contradiction to their own not always democratic current opinions.87

Still more intriguing is the lead that the smallest Eastern European countries are taking in “virtualization of the state.”88 Until recently, physical territory used to be the linchpin for such demographic pillars as residency, frequently described by most states and supranational actors in bounded terms. This is how it appears in Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which entitles individuals to “the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.”89 However, in December 2014, the established territorial foundation of this and similar definitions felt a tremor when Estonia became the world’s first country to introduce e-residency. The “transnational digital identity available to anyone in the world interested in administering a location-independent business online,” as Estonia’s exceedingly digital government describes the innovation, is still limited to fiscal matters.90 But its blatant disregard for physical territory, commentators predict, will not remain thus circumscribed for long.91

In Estonia, Appadurai’s technoscapes and finanscapes overlap to cast doubt on Eastern Europe’s geographically circumscribed destiny.

In a parallel to politics, discontiguity has picked up momentum in literature as well. Taking geopoetics beyond the bounded and self-referential Eastern European topographies are several widely translated and internationally well-received authors, some scrutinized in this volume. Georgi Gospodinov’s novel *The Physics of Sorrow* (first published in Bulgarian in 2011), for example, experiments with radical ruptures of temporal continuity and familial lineage. In the prologue, the “I” introduces a vexing number of his multiple personalities, born, the reader learns, “at the end of August 1913,” “on January 1, 1968,” “on September 6, 1944,” “always,” or not yet: “We am,” he agrammatically concludes. From this potpourri of years, any unambiguous indicators of place are conspicuously absent. For that, layers of history are all the more contemporaneous in the narrator’s memory, which boasts equal access to “the beginning of the Ice Age and the end of the Cold War.”992 Capable of “get[ting] inside other people’s memories,” this narrator proceeds to recount “a story in which eras catch up with one another and intertwine. Some events happen now, others in the distant and immemorial past.”993 The distortion of chronologies, in turn, sweeps up the novel’s spaces:
“The places are also confused, palaces and basements, Cretan kings and local shepherds build the labyrinth of this story about the Minotaur-boy, until you get lost in it. It winds like a maze and unfortunately I will never be able to retrace its steps.”\textsuperscript{94} The maze ends up being not only the text’s mythological reference point but also its exaggerated pun on the “tangling” and “mixing” that usually pervade historical and fictional accounts of Eastern Europe. Mixed and tangled, that is, unmappable, here are not only populations but, primarily, memory, time, and space.

A comparably extraterritorial crescendo rises in the recent work of the Ukrainian writer and public figure Yurii Andrukhovych, one of the earliest and most consistent Eastern European champions of geopoetics. His \textit{Lexicon of Intimate Cities} (2011) announces that “everything starts with maps,” but to take this statement at face value would be rash.\textsuperscript{95} For already its subtitle—\textit{An Arbitrary Aid in Geopoetics and Cosmopolitics}—suggests cartography’s limitations, underscored by the title’s pun on the Ukrainian місто (city, town) and місце (place, and, in this context, also body part). Indeed, Andrukhovych begins the book with an “instructions-like prologue,” which opens to the Cyrillic alphabet instead of a more traditional map. However, any reader who counts on the author to be his or her cicerone on this circumscribed linguistic terrain will walk away sorely disappointed. The \textit{Lexicon}, in the author’s admission, is a guide to disorientation instead. With its list of alphabetically arranged cities, meaningful within the author’s private life, the book, Andrukhovych warns, is the worst possible reference work.

Admittedly, the actual maps’ curious color-coding of countries may have once served him as an inspiration, but this gazetteer is no work of a cartographer. Towns and cities follow each other in a wild mash-up: “Aarau neighbors on Alupka, Balaklava on Barcelona, Haysyn has squeezed in between Heidelberg and Hamburg, Detroit has united with Dnepropetrovsk, Riga with Rome, Ternopil with Toronto, and Chicago with Chernivtsi.” Furthermore, Andrukhovych’s Cyrillic order does not mirror its Latin counterpart. Aware of the mismatch, the author rewites his list of toponyms in Latin characters and comments on the resulting territorial incongruities: “It’s clear: the original Quedlinburg [Квєдлiнбург, in Ukrainian] is not at all where it used to be. Salzburg is also in completely new environs, having swapped Zaporizhia for San Francisco.” Seemingly baffled, in conclusion to his “instructions” Andrukhovych speculates on alternative ways of ordering, one more outlandish than the other: by years of visits; by adjoining rivers (in Ukrainian, another pun on рiк, “year” and рiчка, “river”); or by the countries’ latitudes. Wary of falling prey to cartography, he jokes about organizing cities by earthquakes, seasons, or types of landscape. But ultimately, he advises, such organization does not matter at all: the sequence, in the end, is in the eyes of the beholder.
All this said, it would be cynical to celebrate the narrative of discontiguity as a roster of achievements when failures to engage with non-neighbors loom as large in Eastern Europe’s recent history as they do now. In 2015 and 2016, the political dreams of open borders and the literary dreams of phantasmagorical geographies ran up not only against the security fences erected by such countries as Hungary and Macedonia in response to the incoming waves of refugees. The dreams dissipated, first and foremost, in the chasm of racial, cultural, and religious intolerance—not to mention nationalism—that the crisis had put under the magnifying glass. When the leaders of such countries as Hungary or the Czech Republic balked at accepting refugee quotas and their constituencies demonstrated under the slogan “Have a nice, white day,” it was “Eastern Europe” and “Central Europe”—not merely “Europe”—that were accused of heartlessness vis-à-vis the newcomers and of amnesia to the past migration ordeals of their own sons and daughters.96

To strike a balance, this volume does not shy away from conversations about Eastern Europe’s relationships to space and the accompanying symbioses, positive or negative. On the contrary, it continues the search for new spaces, new relationships, and new methods and forms with which to process them—in the hope that its readers, in the spirit of Andrukhovych’s gesture, will pick up the baton. The idea is not to replicate a map by giving a share of the book to every country or methodological concern, but to offer an array of new perspectives on some of the most striking discontiguities that cut across disciplines.

To this end, the following contributions are arranged into five parts, each corresponding to a specific category of analysis. To disencumber this introduction and offer more focused commentary, a brief editorial preface contextualizes each category within the broader scope of the volume’s tasks, summarizing the contributions’ central concerns and identifying the connections between them. It shall therefore suffice to indicate the units’ thrusts here. Part 1, “Re-placed Religion,” contributes to the writing of the area’s religious history from its Jewish and Muslim margins. Part 2, “Dislodged Dissent,” focuses on dissidence as the most recognizably unmapped rubric of the book. Part 3, “Fictional Cartographies and Temporalities,” examines the global circulation of Eastern Europe on the printed page. Part 4, “ Appropriated Afterlives,” turns to architectural landmarks—entities usually anchored in place and its practices—that have been relocated physically and/or have been reassigned historically. Part 5, “Elective Affinities,” underscores that learning, thinking, and writing about Eastern Europe is a choice that need not be determined by one’s professional affiliations or genealogical roots. Finally, the volume concludes with an outlook onto the future directions of the intellectual trajectory plotted in the book.
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