In my paper I will discuss reciprocal representations of Russian and Central European migrants (as well as tourists and other temporary visitors) in Berlin of the present day as they are depicted in fictional texts by contemporary writers from the Czech Republic, Russia, Slovenia, and the Ukraine. I will argue that the relationship between former Soviet/Russian citizens living in German diaspora and those from different Central European states are frequently described as difficult and fraught, ambivalent at best. The main aim of the paper is to analyze modes and structures of this uneasy relationship, to uncover the major conflicts and to discuss their possible reasons from a decidedly post-colonial perspective.

After the fall of the Wall, Berlin became—or claims to have become—a melting-pot, an urban center that attracts people from all over the world because of its liberal and tolerant atmosphere. Since the 1990s, the reunited German capital became a common space for thousands of migrants, laborers, political refugees, students, so-called "Kontingentflüchtlinge" and "Spätaussiedler"[1] from ex-Yugoslavia, Poland, Russia, Ukraine, and many other states. Hence, in Berlin individuals (migrants, visitors etc.) from one particular country encounter not only Germans, the German language, culture, and history but also people from many other countries, their individual languages, cultures, and traditions. In accordance with the concept of "transdifference" propounded by Breinig and Lösch (2002, 11–36), I argue that (literary, social, political or other) interrelations and interactions in modern, multicultural and frequently multilingual societies have to be described as a complex and multi-referential system involving a wide range of individuals with different national, ethnic etc. backgrounds, and cannot be reduced to a simple binary opposition between the migrant and the host country.

In Germany, writers from Central Europe and the former Soviet Union exhibit a large variety of commonalities and thus constitute a distinct and recognizable group (Uffelmann 2009, 606; for the American context Furman 2011). This group shares a long history of close cultural and political ties, most importantly a similar—albeit not identical—experience of life under communist and totalitarian regimes in the second half of the 20th century. They have witnessed the dramatic and often violent events leading to the breakdown and, in some cases, the dissolution of entire states, the chaotic and turbulent times that followed, and finally they left their countries to live abroad. Living in Germany and elsewhere in diaspora, in the same countries, the same cities and sometimes even the same apartments, often sharing the same publishers, readers etc., they occupy both the same physical space and the same "literary field" (Bourdieu 1992). Finally, issues such as estrangement and adaptation in diaspora, language change, language loss etc. are equally treated by writers from the Czech Republic (Jaroslav Rudiš), the former Soviet Union (Wladimir Kaminer, Olga Martynova, Aleksei Shipenko, Nellja Veremej), but also from ex-Yugoslavia (Bora Ćosić, Dubravka Ugrešić) and other countries.[2]

Under these specific conditions an asymmetric relation can be identified between the representation of Russian and Central European migrants in the texts by writers from the Soviet Union and in those by writers from Central European states. While novels, short stories and poems about present-day Berlin written by the latter frequently feature Russian (migrant)

---

1   Soviet Jews, ethnic Germans from the Soviet Union.

2   Features they share with many non-(Central) European migrant writers. Without the common past these similarities alone would not suffice to make them a distinct group.

characters, texts by the former are populated by individuals, mostly migrants from all continents but are almost free of Central Europeans. If these are present at all, they often make for the most negative characters. My central argument is that the texts in question depict a rather aggressive "occupation," or, following post-colonial thought, a "colonization" of Berlin by Soviet/Russian migrants. In reference to Henri Lefebvre's assumptions on the production of social space, the production of a "Russian Berlin space" is achieved by the combination of three aspects—the spatial practice, the representation of space, and spaces of representation—which he considers to be constitutive to this process (Lefebvre 1974). It is also understood to be a process that presupposes the simultaneous expulsion of other Central Europeans and that is only possible under this condition. The banishment of these particular, similar "Others" coincides with the literary self-representation of Russians as victims of communist regimes. Therefore, they claim to be the sole interpreters of the totalitarian past behind the Iron Curtain and deny other Central Europeans any equal knowledge and authority.

Although Berlin's importance to Russian culture cannot be compared to that of Petersburg, Paris or Rome, like those cities it is a *locus* of Russian literature that contains stories and experiences, primarily associated with exile, war and forced labor. Since the 1990s a new chapter of the Russian "Berlin Text" has been continuously written by migrants from the former Soviet Union and today's Russia. While a comprehensive study of the Russian "Berlin Text" comparable to that of New York (Klots 2011) has yet to be written, in what follows I will demonstrate a central strategy eminent in narratives about Berlin by Russian migrants. The aim of this strategy is to depict Berlin as a space dominated and even colonized by Russian migrants. It strives to enhance the visibility of this social group and to ensure them a secure position both in the German contemporary consciousness and in the future German collective memory.

Wladimir Kaminer's collection of short stories *Russendisko* (Russian Disco) became the cornerstone of Russian translingual literature in Germany. In this first book a strange discrepancy became evident that can be observed in many of Kaminer's texts: whereas Berlin is in fact presented as a utopian melting pot inhabited by people from all continents, from Asian and African countries, the Middle East, Turkey and so on, there is no one there from Poland,[3] the Czech and the Slovak Republics, and very few characters from the former Yugoslavia (Kaminer was writing his stories at a time when thousands of refugees from ex-Yugoslav states were living in Germany). Moreover, if present at all, the Central or Southeastern European identity of these migrants is itself a subject of doubt: while in "Das Mädchen und die Hexen" (The Girl and the Witches)[4] a woman who claims to be from ex-Yugoslavia is strangely unaware of the war in her homeland (Kaminer 2000, 71), which makes her life story implausible, in "Geschäftstarnungen" (Business Camouflage) Bulgarians pretend to be Turks (Kaminer 2000, 97–98). Because of their masquerades these characters appear to be (at least potentially) dishonest and untrustworthy. Unlike them, the protagonist, a Russian Jew, never denies his identity and never tries to disguise it in any way or impersonate someone else; this honest and straightforward demeanor elevates him morally above all others. Adrian Wanner's argument that Kaminer's protagonist is a modern-day *picaro*

---

3 This is particularly significant because Polish migrants constitute the second largest group of migrants in Berlin.

4 English translations according to the 2002 American edition.

(Wanner 2009, 60) can be extended to all Eastern European characters. The major difference between them and the protagonist is that next to his moral qualities, he is more intelligent, educated, skillful, in short: a far better *picaro* than the others. Taken together, his moral qualities and intellectual abilities make him an authority other people, migrants or not, turn to when looking for help and support.

The relationship between different groups of migrants is explicitly characterized as one of solidarity. In the story "Suleyman und Salieri" (Suleyman and Salieri) the effects of public debates on xenophobia are discussed:

> Die Ausländerfeindlichkeit war vorübergehend ein großes Thema, und plötzlich entsteht ein Gefühl der Zusammengehörigkeit bei vielen, die nicht zusammengehören und früher vielleicht gar nichts voneinander wissen wollten – Araber, Juden, Chinesen, Türken –, weil sie genau diese "Ausländer" sind. […] So gibt eine Mediendebatte ganz nebenbei vielen Menschen die Chance, sich neu zu sehen, nicht als Türke oder Russe oder Äthiopier, sondern als Teil der großen Ausländergemeinschaft in Deutschland, und das ist irgendwie toll. (Kaminer 2000, 73)

The irony and the skeptical attitude towards the German debate itself and its consequences for the "foreigners" are eminent. Nonetheless, the core episode of this story about a Turkish taxi driver who remains friendly and helpful although his car is damaged by a drunk Russian, betrays in fact a special sense of solidarity between the Turkish and the Russian "foreigners." It becomes even more obvious when contrasted with the relationship among Russians and Central Europeans, which is depicted as extremely difficult. The story "Nie wieder Weimar" (No More Trips to Weimar) is the only one where several Central European characters meet; tellingly, it takes place outside of Berlin. It is only the consumption of large quantities of vodka that prevents physical violence within a group of artists from Poland, Russia, the Czech Republic and Ukraine who are traveling together to a conference:

> Auf Einladung der *Literarischen Gesellschaft Thüringen* fuhr ich zum ersten mal in meinem Leben nach Weimar, um dort an einem Festival namens "Osteuropa im Wandel der Revolution und Konterrevolution" teilzunehmen. Zusammen mit zwei Dutzend anderen osteuropäischen Künstlern, Polen, Russen, Tschechen und Ukrainern. Unterwegs stellte sich bereits heraus, wie unterschiedlich unser Wandel war. Dementsprechend bildete unsere Gruppe eine ziemlich giftige Mischung. Nur der warme ukrainische Wodka sorgte für ein Minimum an Toleranz. (Kaminer 2000, 106, sic)

Not only is this the opposite of solidarity and mutual understanding, it is also suggested that they have next to nothing in common, that the differences among them are fundamental and probably even greater than between a Russian-Jewish actor and, for example, a Turkish taxi driver.

The overall presence of Turkish, Vietnamese and other migrants notwithstanding, Kaminer's Berlin seems to be, as Sandor Gilman has pointedly observed, Russianized:

> Kaminer's most successful creation of a utopian Berlin multicultural world in which all of the ethnicities and nationalities blur into a Russian-colored world. This is the hybridity in which the solvent is vodka. (Gilman 2006, 217)

Berlin is indeed (re-)conquered and colonized by Russian migrants. Several stories demonstrate their progressive movement through the city space from the margins to the center. In "Die erste eigene Wohnung" (A First Apartment of My Own) the protagonist moves from the poor suburb of Marzahn to the center, Prenzlauer Berg, a district soon to become the most fashionable in Berlin (Kaminer 2000, 27–29), and his attempts at professional life

frequently lead him to the posh district of Mitte. "Alltag eines Kunstwerks" (The Everyday Life of a Work of Art) and "Berliner Porträts" (Berlin Portraits) describe how Russian migrant artists inscribe themselves into the city, leaving their traces everywhere and virtually overwriting the city's surface with their art. In the first story a strange sculpture by a Russian artist "travels" throughout Berlin (and even other German cities), constantly changing its location until numerous places in the city become associated with it. Similarly, in the second story, a German painter is so impressed by the face of a Russian migrant that he paints it in countless fashionable bars and restaurants. These places become, in Lefebvre's terminology, Russian *espaces de représentation* (Lefebvre 1974, 39–43), spaces that make the Russian presence in Berlin visible. In the story "Bahnhof Lichtenberg" (Lichtenberg Station) a poor Russian migrant starts his business selling beer and coca-cola in Lichtenberg train station, at the city's periphery. Thanks to his commercial talent and perseverance he soon owns a chain of Russian food stores with the telling name "Kazachok"[5] (Kaminer 2000, 131). This successful expansion does not, however, satisfy the businessman, who plans to leave for America to quench his "imperialistic ambitions" (imperiale Ambitionen).

While these expansions from the margins to the center are only implicitly reminiscent of the Soviet Army's progress from the outskirts to the Reichstag at the very heart of the city during the last days of World War II, a new and no less aggressive conquest of Berlin is made fully explicit in "Stadtführer Berlin" (Berlin Guidebook). Rich Russian tourists are invited to conquer Berlin and fly their own flags over the Reichstag:

> Seit einiger Zeit gilt Berlin in den russischen Reisebüros als eine Art Geheimtipp für Reiche. Man könne sich dort mörderisch amüsieren, heißt es. In einem russischen Stadtführer von Berlin werben die Reiseveranstalter mit dem Slogan "Hissen Sie Ihre ganz persönliche Flagge auf dem neuen Deutschen Reichstag – Berlin erleben und erobern!" (Kaminer 2000, 158)

At the same time this story is the most obvious example of Wladimir Kaminer's critical dialogue with Vladimir Nabokov, namely a new version of the latter's short story "Putevoditel' po Berlinu" (Guide to Berlin, 1925)[6]. In terms of post-colonial theory it can be understood as a "re-writing," a literary strategy which was identified as central to post-colonial literature by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin in their seminal study (1989). Very much like Nabokov, Kaminer is concerned with the creation of (public) memory. Nabokov's story is a meta-literary reflection on the meaning and the memory-related functions of literature, his guide is an observer of other people's future memories ("я подгледел чье-то будущее воспоминание," "I have observed someone's future memory" Nabokov 1990, 340) of which he believes to be a part. Precisely this last assumption is denied by Kaminer: neither Nabokov nor other prominent members of the first wave of emigration (Khodasevich, Shklovskii etc.) ever became part of the individual or collective German memory. They disappeared from Berlin without a trace, leaving no *lieux de memoire* whatsoever,[7] either because they were unwilling or failed to become visible to the German

---

5 Diminutive of "Cossack." The reference to the fierce fighters emphasizes the aggressive and military undertone of this story.

6 The following discussion focuses on Kaminer's appropriation of individual subjects and topics in Nabokov's story but leaves the – multiple and obvious – aesthetic and poetological differences between these two texts aside. The same applies to all further examples of literary appropriations.

7 For example, not a single article in all three volumes of *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte* (German Realms of Memory), especially those about Berlin, ever mentions Russian émigrés or their presence in Berlin in the

public. Hence, the only collective German memory of Russians in Berlin encountered by migrants from the former Soviet Union in the early 1990s was that of the Soviet Army (Kaminer 2001, 115)—a memory about the cruelties committed by Soviet soldiers around 1945. Therefore, it is Kaminer's objective to describe a new Russian presence in Berlin, of Russians of a different kind, and to anchor them permanently in the contemporary German consciousness. To do so, he constantly enhances their visibility, a strategy that is supposed to guarantee them a safe place in future German memories. Thus, in Kaminer's re-writing of Nabokov, whose guide depicted places and objects that held value for him personally but were of no significance or interest to the general public (pipes, streetcars, a beer hall), tourists from Russia are led to places of public interest, such as the Brandenburg Gate, the remains of the Berlin Wall etc., not (only) to make them *see*, but for them to be *seen*, in order to make them as visible as possible. This re-writing of a canonical author of both the Russian and the American literatures adheres to earlier re-writings of the classical texts of Western European literatures by African, Caribbean, Indian and other writers. As in these texts, it is Kaminer's primary intention to make previously subaltern characters, in this case Russian migrants, visible and heard.

In his novel *Nebe pod Berlínem* (The Sky under Berlin, 2002), the Czech writer Jaroslav Rudiš denies Russian migrants their claims to singularity, to the special authority on Central European history—the history of communist totalitarianism. Here, Berlin appears as a multicultural melting pot, it is an international meeting place of losers. Both the German characters and the migrants from post-Soviet Russia and Central Europe are individuals who have aspired to creative professions and have either failed, or for different reasons have been forced, to give them up. Notably, the first place in Berlin that the Czech protagonist and his German friend visit is the *Klub der polnischen Versager* (Club of Polish Losers) (Rudiš 2002, 13–19). As the title itself suggests, the novel's major pretext is Wim Wenders' film *Der Himmel über Berlin*. In his adaptation of the film, Rudiš offers his two characters a second chance at a career as professional musicians. Like Wenders' angel Damiel, who gains a second chance at a life as a human being and descends from the skies to live on earth, the two musicians descend from the city surface into the underground and start a successful punk/rock band, *U-Bahn* (Metro), which plays mostly in metro stations or other underground spaces.

The aforementioned club is a multicultural microcosm where different people, mostly (Czech, Polish and Russian) migrants, peacefully interact, talk, drink, and dance together.[8] The only character disturbing the picture is Igor, a Russian Jew from Moscow. In very aggressive tones, he talks about nothing else but Bautzen II, the infamous prison in the GDR

1920s. German fictional texts about Berlin written in the 1920s, most prominently Alfred Döblin's *Berlin Alexanderplatz*, a groundbreaking modernist novel of over a thousand pages, which was written at a time when 300,000 Russian émigrés lived in Berlin (Schlögel 1998, 78), features no Russian characters at all. Similarly, in Christopher Isherwood's novel *Goodbye to Berlin, which* was written in the years 1928–1933, only the name of a drinking establishment visited by the protagonists ("Troika") and another incidental mention of a Russian tea-house hint at the massive Russian presence only a few years earlier (Isherwood 1960, passim). The protagonist's landlady is one of the "Wilmersdorf widows" (Wilmersdorfer Witwen), who were renowned for letting rooms to Russian émigrés (Schlögel 1998, 168). In Isherwood's novel she says she has had a dozen lodgers since World War I, but not one of them was Russian (Isherwood 1960, 15–20).

8   This episode is also a reference to Wenders' film, where people of different nationalities who speak different languages assemble in clubs, at the circus and on a movie set.

that was also called "Stasi-Knast" (the Stasi jail), where dissidents and political prisoners were detained. At first, Igor's introduction into the novel seems to suggest that he is, or will be ascribed, an important and positive function in the narrative, that he is the only one to uphold the memory of the totalitarian past and to remind the others, who come to the club in search of fun and parties, of the political repression and the crimes committed by communist regimes. Based on the experience of his own family, one half of which was killed by Hitler and the other by Stalin, he claims to be an authority on the history of totalitarianism in general, and his interest and his sympathy are seemingly extended to the victims of totalitarian oppression not only in his own country, but in others too. His educational objective, his wish to enlighten others about these histories, is directed primarily at people from post-reunification western Germany, people whom he believes to have no first-hand experience and little knowledge of Eastern European history in general or of communist crimes in particular:

> "Jen si to kuup sŕači. Nebo už to viš, co je to Baautzeen? Zařval na mě z kouta podsaditý čtyřičátník s krátkými kudrnatými vlasy a docela malýma očima. […] Viš, co je to Baautzeen, ty pitomčee? Vo tom ses ve škole neučil! A vo tom si tam přeečteš! Nebo to snad už viš jako?" Všichni to věděli, jen já ještě ne. Byl to Igor. A Igor je magor. […] Igor je citlivý. Igor je ruský Žid. Je z Moskvy, kde zkoušel psát do novin. Igor nemá rád Němce, kteří pobili půlku jeho předků. Nemá rád ani Rusy, kteří za Stalina vystříleli druhou polovinu. Igor ale nesnáší hlavně západní Němce. Digitální náfuky, co všechno vědí, co si umějí představit život za dráty, asi jako my si umíme představit život na Marsu, frajírky, co tu všechno dirigují, i jeho jako emigranta, žijícího ze sociálních podpor. […] "Hej! Viš, co je to Baautzeen!! Voodkud seeš, frajere?!? Z Mnichova!?! Co si vo sobě mýsliš, ty Bavore?" řval na mě […]. (Rudiš 2002, 14)

However, as Igor's real positions are revealed, Rudiš strips him of his authority on the interpretation and explication of history. When Igor finds out that the protagonist is from the Czech Republic and thus does not need to be lectured on Central European history, he demonstrates a completely different understanding of history, an interpretation diametrically opposed to the one suggested by the previous lines:

> "Gut. Gut, maladěc. Tak to viš, co je to Baautzeen. Viš, co je to ten hnusnej komunismus. Na rozdíl vod těch všech zděs!" zařval. Pustil mě a poplácal zpocenou rukou po zátylku. "Davaj vodky popjom. Moj suseeed řikal vždycky, že Československo dvakrát spasil. Jednou od germánských fašistu, to v 45, a jednou od amerikánskych kontrarevolucionařu, to v 68. Poprvy si přivez hodinky, podruhy džínsy a pokaždy krásny vzpomííínky na holky, který pod nim lehaly samy, protože suseeed byl krásny chlap, rusky Marlon Brando, a tak je mooožno, že má u vás hromadu dětí, protože suseeed když střelil, tak trefil. Pořád řikal, že Slovani musi držet při sobě, že je to naša jediná šaaance v tomhle miru a naša sutba, že jinak se neubráníme germánsky a amerikánsky hydře. Tenkrát jsem se mu tleeemil, ale dneska si mýslim, že on měl pravdu. Krásny vzpomííínky… jedny ty hodinky mi dal. Ale už nemakačenko," řekl mi a stáhl se do křesla v rohu jako pavouk do úkrytu. (Rudiš 2002, 18, sic)

Igor's account of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 follows, unreflected and unfiltered, official Soviet propaganda. His approval of the invasion and the crude idea of a "Slavic solidarity", which does not take the Czech (Czechoslovak) position into account, uncovers and exposes his reactionary and Soviet-nationalistic understanding of Central European history. Since not even outside Russia does Igor ever come to a different, new understanding of history, he is doomed to disappear from the narrative. Rudiš does not replace him with another *authority*, nor does he offer a different, more generalized concept of history, but rather he lets the subaltern voices speak. In the later chapters of the novel, the history of

East Germany and East and West Berlin is hence related by Germans themselves.[9]

Recent studies that applied post-colonial theory to Russian migrant narratives have most frequently referred to Homi K. Bhabha's assumptions on "hybridity" and "third space" in order to analyze the construction of Russian migrants' identity and to describe the spaces which migrant writers imagine in their texts (Furman 2011). The discussion of the poetic means and devices by which these were achieved also relied on Bhabha's notions (Hausbacher 2009). Both implicitly and explicitly, these studies, as well as those on earlier German immigrant literature (Fachinger 2001), discussed emancipation strategies inherent to migrant narratives in most general terms: a migrant's struggle for acceptance in a new society. This paper applies elements of post-colonial thought in order to bring to the fore the downside of these emancipation strategies, the exclusion and degradation of migrants from other Central Europeans countries that stems from a particular strategy of the description of space.

Years after the breakup of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, writers like Wladimir Kaminer or Nellja Veremej resume Soviet colonization practices, transferring them to the diaspora, to Berlin. No new modes of describing the city and no new ways to appreciate it emerge from his narratives. Well aware of the oppressive nature of the Soviet regime, nonetheless writers like Kaminer and Veremej perpetuate old Soviet patterns, especially in regard to the appropriation of city space. The descriptions of Russian expansion in Berlin, often containing aggressive undertones, amount to a (renewed) "occupation" of the city. Potential Central or Southeastern European contestants to Berlins space who claim (or could claim) their own rightful place there and offer a different perspective on the city are ridiculed, denigrated, or simply erased from the text.[10]

The colonization of the physical space is accompanied by what Madina Tlostanova calls *mind-colonization* (Tlostanova 2012, 132), by the claim of the colonizers to an uncontested and exclusive authority in the interpretation and explication of history, in this case of Russian/Soviet, Central European, and even German history. In this respect, too, Kaminer (and Veremej) follow the Soviet example of the colonization of Central Europe (Moore 2001) and yet again, this time in the Berlin diaspora, Central Europeans fall victim to Russian neocolonial desires.[11] Kaminer and other writers offer no new concepts, ideas or interpretations of the past; they devise no new language in order to describe it. Furthermore, Central European historical experiences are again subsumed under Russian authority and primacy. Interpreted from a decidedly Russian point of view, Central European individual voices and positions are not allowed to be heard. The hierarchy of nations prevalent in the Soviet Union and within the Communist Block—a hierarchy that assumed the superior position of the Russian nation and the Soviet state (Tlostanova 2012, 132)—is transferred with little modification to Berlin. Here, the relationships between the representatives of individual nations are structured accordingly—the Russian migrant always being better and

---

9 The subaltern position of the simple people in the GDR, whose individual histories had no place in the official state discourse, is highlighted by the fact that the novel depicts individuals who actually work beneath the surface, in the city's real, physical underground, mostly as metro train drivers. The objective of post-colonial literature, that of making subaltern voices heard (from the perspective of Europe's imagined periphery), is transformed here quite literally into a perspective from below.

10 The writer's efforts to create a new and more friendly Russian image that would replace or cover up the prevailing negative one are thus constantly counteracted by this aspiration to dominate the space.

11 For the terms "neocolonial" and "anti-colonial" see, e.g., Kołodzieczyk and Şandru 2012, 113-114.

cleverer than all the others. Moreover, Russia and the Russians are frequently depicted to have always been victims of a foreign (mostly German) aggression, a peaceful nation with a largely clean conscience, free of guilt or responsibility for any of the tragic events of the 20th century.

Hence it comes as no surprise that Central European writers like Jaroslav Rudiš (Czech Republic), Aleš Šteger (Slovenia), Serhij Zhadan (Ukraine), but also ex-Yugoslav writers like Dubravka Ugrešić and Bora Ćosić, as different as they are in many respects, demonstrate an acute awareness of the colonial desires of today's Russian migrants. Regardless of the question as to whether they are actually familiar with Kaminer's texts or whether concrete intertextual relationships of any kind can be established between their texts, their criticism of Russian migrants is obvious. Each displays an increased critical awareness of the Russian presence in Berlin and they are cognizant of the Russian domination of the space and the positions of authority they themselves aspire to. Although these writers do not omit Russians from their Berlin narratives, they do dispute and deny the authority of Russian migrants and their claim to exclusiveness.

In analogy to Vladimir Toporov's description of Petersburg as the scene of a permanent fight,[12] contemporary Berlin can be thought of in terms of a contested space. Instead of a multicultural melting pot it has become a stage on which writers from the former Soviet Union and Eastern European countries fight over interpretative authority and dominance, a stage on which the recent Russian "occupation" and "colonization" of Berlin, in short post-Soviet neocolonial aspirations clash with the anti-colonial ones of Eastern Europeans. Over six decades after the end of World War II, 25 years after the end of the Cold War and 20 years after the allied forces ultimately left the city, the fight over Berlin is not yet over.

Bibliography

Ashcroft, Bill; Griffiths, Garreth; Tiffin, Helen. 1989. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1992. *Les règles de l'art. Genèse et structure du champ littéraire.* Paris: Éditions du Soleil (English translation: *Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, Stanford, CA.: Polity Press, 1996)

Breinig, Helmbrecht; Lösch, Klaus (Eds.) 2002. *Multiculturalism in Contemporary Societies: Perspectives on Difference and Transdifference*. Erlangen: Universitäts- Bibliothek.

Fachinger, Petra. 2001. *Rewriting Germany from the Margins: "Other" German Literature of the 1980s and 1990s*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

François, Étienne; Schulze, Hagen. 2001. *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte*. München: Beck.

Furman, Yelena. 2011. "Hybrid Selves, Hybrid Texts: Embracing the Hyphen in Russian-American Fiction." *Slavic and East European Journal* 55.1: 19–37.

Gilman, Sandor L. 2006. *Multiculturalism and the Jews*. New York: Routledge.

Hausbacher, Eva. 2009. *Poetik der Migration. Transnationale Schreibweisen in der zeitgenössischen russischen Literatur.* Tübingen: Stauffenberg.

Isherwood, Christopher. 1960 (1939). *Goodbye to Berlin*. London: Hogarth Press.

---

12 Between nature and culture, chaos and cosmos, good and evil (Toporov 1995, 289, 299–301).

Kaminer, Wladimir. 2000. *Russendisko*. München: Goldmann. (English translation: *Russian Disco*, London: Ebury Press, 2002).

Kaminer, Wladimir. 2001. *Schönhauser Allee*. München: Goldmann.

Klots, Jasha. 2011. "The Ultimate City: New York in Russian Immigrant Narratives." *Slavic and East European Journal* 55.1: 38–57.

Kołodzieczyk, Dorota, Șandru, Cristina. 2012. "Introduction: On Colonialism, Communism and East-Central Europe – Some Reflections." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 48.2: 113–116.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1974. *La production de l'espace*. Paris: Anthropos. (English translation: *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.)

Moore, David Ch. 2001. "Is the Post- in Postcolonial the Post- in Post-Soviet? Toward a Global Postcolonial Critique." *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 116.1: 111–128.

Nabokov, Vladimir. 1990. "Putevoditel' po Berlinu." In: Nabokov, Vladimir. *Sobranie sochinenii v chetyrekh tomakh*, T.1: 336–340. Moskva: Pravda.

Nora, Pierre. 1984–1992. *Les Lieux de mémoire*. Paris: Gallimard. (English translation: *Realms of Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996–1998.)

Rudiš, Jaroslav. 2002. *Nebe pod Berlínem*. Praha: Labyrint.

Tlostanova, Madina 2012. Postsocialist≠Postcolonial? On post-Soviet Imaginary and Global Coloniality. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 48.2: 130–142.

Toporov, Vladimir. 1995. "Peterburg i 'Peterburgskii tekst russkoi literatury'." In: EDITOR? *Mif. Ritual. Simvol. Obraz. Issledovaniia v oblaste mifopoeticheskogo*, 259–367. Moskva: Kul'tura.

Uffelmann, Dirk. 2009. "Paradoxe der jüngsten nichtslavischen Literatur slavischer Migranten." In: *Ost-West-Problematik in den europäischen Kulturen und Literaturen. Ausgewählte Aspekte. Problematika Východ – Západ v evropských kulturách a literaturách. Vybrané aspekty*. Eds. Ulbrechtová, Helena a. Siegfried Ulbrecht (Prace Slovanského ústavu. Nová řada 25), 601–630. Dresden: Neisse.

Veremej, Nellja. 2013. *Berlin liegt im Osten*. Salzburg, Wien: Jung und Jung.

Wanner, Adrian. 2011. *Out of Russia: Fictions of a New Translingual Diaspora*. Northwestern University Press: Evanston, IL.