SCREEN MEMORY OR MULTIDIRECTIONAL MEMORY? THE HOLOCAUST AND THE BRAZILIAN MILITARY DICTATORSHIP IN *THE GERMAN BROTHER*

Sabrina Costa Braga

Leibniz Center for Literary and Cultural Research

Abstract

This article examines how Holocaust memory enters into productive interplay with other historical and cultural memories, focusing specifically on its relationship to representations of the Brazilian military dictatorship (1964-1985) in Chico Buarque's novel *The German Brother* (2014). I argue that the novel mobilizes Holocaust memory not merely as a distant historical reference but as a framework through which Brazil's unresolved dictatorial past can be narrated and confronted. To illuminate this dynamic, the article brings together Sigmund Freud's concept of screen memory and Michael Rothberg's theory of multidirectional memory. While screen memory is often understood as a mechanism that obscures access to repressed experiences, I propose that it can also function as an enabling structure that opens pathways to engage difficult or silenced histories through mediated or displaced representations. This does not imply a harmonious relationship between memories; rather, it acknowledges ongoing political disputes and tensions in the field of remembrance. Drawing on multidirectional memory, I explore how such displacement may not only produce competition for space among traumatic pasts but may also generate new, overlapping interpretive possibilities. The article unfolds across three interconnected sections. First, I define screen memory and analyze its relevance for understanding the often indirect and fragmentary nature of Holocaust representations. Second, I consider the theoretical convergences between screen memory and multidirectional memory, showing how both concepts challenge linear or hierarchical models of historical remembrance. Finally, I demonstrate how the novel deploys Holocaust memory as a metaphorical and narrative tool for grappling with the dictatorship's legacy of state violence, institutionalized torture, and persistent national memory disputes within Brazil's contested historical landscape.

Introduction

The interconnections between memories and manifestations of different historical traumatic pasts remain a frequent theme in post-World War II studies. Comparisons between the Holocaust and other historical traumas are common, even when such comparisons prove objectively and historically imprecise. In this article, however, my objective focuses specifically on examining the deployment of screen memory and multidirectional memory concepts to analyze the relations between Holocaust memory and memory of the Brazilian military dictatorship (1964-1985), as represented in Chico Buarque's novel *The German Brother* (2014). For this purpose, I will undertake a conceptual reflection on how to analyze these intertwined memories, considering both the pervasive presence of Holocaust memory in the Western world and the memory conflicts surrounding it.

The end of the Brazilian military dictatorship (1964-1985) represents a case of negotiated political transition, where military elites controlled and orchestrated their own departure while securing amnesty, thereby maintaining significant influence over subsequent political developments. The work of the National Truth Commission only began in 2012, yet it established no legal punishment for crimes committed during the Brazilian military dictatorship. The historical oblivion of the political past in Brazil is not natural but produced by deliberate policies and practices through the erasure of traces. The events of the military dictatorship period remain recent, yet still unclear. Official information about the military regime contains significant gaps: many victims and disappeared politicians still await clarification and remembrance of their stories.

Thus, in Brazil's case, it is not so much in physical sites of memory but specifically in literature about the military dictatorship that Holocaust memory plays an important role. It is particularly after periods of silencing and denial that these distant histories of violence interconnect and reemerge in this specific context. The history of both the Shoah and antisemitism features prominently in literature dealing with the dictatorship (Costa Braga, 2024), typically serving as a metaphor for working through the recent (and still open) wounds created by institutionalized torture and murder of specific groups.

The article is divided into three main sections, excluding the introduction and conclusion. First, I examine Freud's concept of screen memory and analyze its applications concerning Holocaust memory within global memory studies and media representations. Second, I explore the relationship between the concept of screen memory and multidirectional memory. Finally, I present a case study of *The German Brother* to discuss how Holocaust memory functions in this novel's treatment of the Brazilian dictatorship.

The Holocaust as a Screen Memory

In 1899, Freud developed the concept of the screen memory (*Deckerinnerung*). A screen memory appears as a fragmentary recollection that persists from the early years of childhood. At the time, Freud already recognized that the impressions and experiences from our first years could hold great importance for our psychic functioning as adults. However, when confronted with recollections from this period of life, the content of these memories may be considered enigmatic, to say the least. Since people are simply unable to remember everything, we tend to assume that what is retained in memory must have a clear link to the significance of the experience. What first struck Freud, then, was not the phenomenon of forgetting, but rather the act of remembering something apparently indifferent (Freud, 1981, p. 303).

Thus, Freud took an interest in the content of the earliest memories of childhood. In dealing with adults, one might expect that the experiences chosen as worth remembering would have aroused powerful emotions or had significant consequences soon afterward. According to Freud's findings, this is usually the case with children as well, except for a fraction of memories that defy these expectations: recollections of childhood focused on everyday life, incapable of producing much emotional impact, yet remembered with unusual clarity and in great detail at the same time that important events were not retained in memory. This can be explained in terms of a relevant scene being only incompletely retained in memory, while the parts that have been forgotten (or rather omitted) contained what really made the experience worthy (Freud, 1981, p.305).

The question of why what is relevant is suppressed while what is irrelevant is remembered remains. Freud's answer to this was that it results from a compromise between two opposing forces involved in the creation of a memory: the first seeks to preserve an experience because of the importance of the scene, while the second resists and attempts to prevent its recollection. The outcome, according to Freud, is that "what is recorded as a mnemic image is not the relevant experience itself […]; what is recorded is another psychical element closely associated with the objectionable one" (Freud, 1981, p. 307). In other words, the mnemic image is produced through association. That is, a case of repression accompanied by a displacement or substitution that turns from a conflict into a compromise.

The use of the concept of screen memory in relation to the place that Holocaust memory occupies in transnational contexts was recently revitalized by debates surrounding the so-called *Historikerstreit 2.0*. In these discussions, the dominant Holocaust memory regime – especially in Germany, but not exclusively – was called into question in light of the connections between colonialism and the Holocaust, racism and antisemitism, and the ongoing cri-

sis in Israel and Palestine. The argument that fascination with the Holocaust may function as a screen memory, concealing other traumatic events, is not a new one, however. In this sense, the Holocaust would often be used as a screen memory, being remembered in order to repress or displace other local events and histories, usually those having their history still under political dispute.

Although not employing the Freudian concept, David Stannard, for example, in somewhat unwary wording, argues that a "handful" of Jewish scholars and writers have devoted their professional lives to defending the idea that the Holocaust was a unique and unprecedented event. For him, the thesis of uniqueness is not only an erroneous and exclusivist notion, but also "willingly provides a screen behind which opportunistic governments today attempt to conceal their own past and ongoing genocidal actions" (Stannard, 2001, p. 250).

Andreas Huyssen (2003, p. 11) argues that, since the 1980s, the contemporary focus on memory reflects a shift from "present futures" to "present pasts." In Europe and the United States, this shift was driven primarily by debates about the Holocaust, including the role of the first *Historikerstreit* in 1986. The predominance of Holocaust memory was not at all isolated; rather, the Holocaust as a universal trope for historical trauma and genocide was reinforced by genocidal politics around the globe in the post-Second World War period. Huyssen (2003, pp. 13-14) notes that the emergence of the Holocaust as a universal trope enabled its memory to be invoked in connection with events that are historically, geographically, and politically distant. Therefore, while the Holocaust functions as a metaphor for other traumatic histories, it could also serve as a screen memory, blocking insight into specific local histories.

 Drawing on cases from post-dictatorial societies in Latin America, Huyssen (2003, 15-16) reminds us that, while discourses of memory may appear to be global through the lens of the Holocaust, the political sites of memory are not global but remain tied to the histories of specific nations and states, as in the cases of Chile or Argentina.

> Although the Holocaust as a universal trope of traumatic history has migrated into other, nonrelated contexts, one must always ask whether and how the trope enhances or hinders local memory practices and struggles, or whether and how it may help and hinder at the same time. National memory debates are always shot through with the effects of the global media and their focus on themes such as genocide and ethnic cleansing, migration and minority rights, victimization and accountability (Huyssen, 2003, p. 16).

This raises the question of how to reflect on comparisons and global tropes of historical trauma while, at the same time, addressing the urgent demands of different societies for the recognition of their own national memory. For Huyssen (2003, p. 19), explaining why the years following the 1980s, in particular,

are marked by an obsession with memory and a panic over forgetting requires examining the influence of new media and the spectacularization of the Holocaust in an era in which traumatic memory and entertainment memory occupy the same public space. But beyond the place the Holocaust occupies in the entertainment industry at large, official Holocaust memory could also function as a "comfortable horrible memory." This is the concern Edward Linenthal raises in his study on the creation of the US Holocaust Memorial Museum. According to him, Holocaust memory in the US might allow "Americans to reassure themselves that they are engaging profound events, all the while ignoring more indigestible events that threaten Americans' sense of themselves more than the Holocaust" (Linenthal, 1995, p. 267).

Enzo Traverso (2005) also raised the concern about the political uses of the memory of the Holocaust by comparing the commemorations of the 50th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz – then in a newly unified Germany – with those of the 60th anniversary. According to him, after fifty years, the prevailing fear was one of oblivion, of a renewed silence surrounding the crimes. But this fear of forgetting would no longer persist; instead, the concern would have shifted to a supposed "excess of memory." He argues that the risk is not the erasure of the Shoah but rather the misuse of its memory: a misuse of the past that neutralizes memory's critical potential. Or, as he puts it, an apologetic use of Shoah memory, one that serves to justify everything that politically, economically, and culturally defines the so-called West. In this framework, remembering the Holocaust would function to affirm the (Western, liberal) world as the best of all possible worlds. In a sense, relentlessly invoking absolute evil would serve to reinforce the conviction that one system embodies absolute good, which would require overlooking the ambiguities within this system.

One key aspect of defining Holocaust memory as a screen memory is that, although it may sometimes appear "comfortable" by diverting attention from other traumatic histories and their accompanying responsibilities, the content of this memory is not merely trivial, like the childish memories Freud described may look on a superficial level. There is an interchange between two disturbing memories. While the concern that emphasizing the Holocaust's singularity might overshadow other historical tragedies is understandable – and while political conflicts over memory do exist – the Holocaust's memory remains (not rarely directly) linked to the histories of various societies. Moreover, even if we consider that it serves as a diversion, addressing this particular choice of focus may still shed light on other silenced histories of victimization.

Screen Memory or Multidirectional Memory

At the same time that Freud (1981, p. 320) describes screen memories as well-remembered yet indifferent in content, he emphasizes that their significance

does not lie in the content itself, but rather in "the relation existing between that content and some other, that has been suppressed". Building on this premise, Michael Rothberg (2009, pp. 12-16) proposes a rethinking of screen memory. The fascination with Holocaust representations does not merely compete with the memory of other traumatic events, but also generates displaced referents linked to other traumas seemingly unapproachable directly. In that case, it may become possible to draw attention to the connections between different traumas. Thus, even if the content of the memory of the Holocaust is not a banal one per se, sometimes it may be more valuable to make noticeable the relation between this content and a suppressed one.

This potential lies at the heart of Rothberg's interpretation of the Freudian concept. In his framework, the notion of screen memory becomes integrated into his broader model of multidirectional memory. By developing this concept, Rothberg challenges the assumption that Holocaust memory necessarily overshadows or displaces memories of slavery and colonialism. This makes it possible to establish relationships between memories of apparently income-patible legacies – that is, it allows us to consider how different narratives of victimization interact in the public sphere without framing them as competing for space.

Rothberg conceptualizes contemporary multicultural societies as spaces where memory does not obey a logic of scarcity. On the contrary, collective consciousness emerges through the formation of group identities that arise from interactions between different pasts. In this sense, what Rothberg (2009, pp. 4-6) calls multidirectional memory represents an intercultural dynamic that does not draw a direct line between remembrance of the past and identity formation in the present. Instead, it operates through connections with others' pasts that are often perceived as foreign and distant.

Methodologically, this approach enables analysis of how different historical memories interact, revealing the processes through which multiple traumatic pasts converge in a heterogeneous, ever-evolving post-Holocaust present. Consequently, the Holocaust's pervasive cultural presence can function less as an obscuring force and more as a discursive platform for articulating diverse traumas. This dynamic operates reciprocally: just as the Holocaust created conditions for other traumatic narratives to emerge, so too has its public memory been shaped (and reshaped) through engagement with seemingly unrelated postwar events.

The examples Freud provides to illustrate the function of screen memories depict recollections of mundane impressions that would hold little or no emotional significance even for a child. Through psychoanalysis, it may become apparent that such a memory served as a screen, standing in for a more distressing or painful memory that was not forgotten but displaced. In this way,

screen memories act as substitutes for other, genuinely significant impressions whose direct recollection is obstructed by resistance (Freud, 1914, p. 58). Building on Freud, Rothberg (2009, p. 12) conceptualizes screen memory itself as an associative process that inevitably operates through negotiation and substitution, making it, in his terms, structurally multidirectional. Within this multidirectional framework, the displacement inherent in screen memory can function both to open pathways of communication with the past and to foreclose them.

The temporal relationship between a memory and its screen memory counterpart is inherently complex. Freud (1914, p. 58) categorizes screen memories as either "anticipatory," "retrospective," or "simultaneous" – indicating that the repressed event may have occurred before, after, or concurrently with the consciously remembered one. For Rothberg (2009, pp. 13-14), this temporal complexity serves to reinforce how screen memories both conceal and expose suppressed content, thereby confirming his argument about their inherently multidirectional nature. This perspective enables us to consider Holocaust memory not just in terms of memory conflicts, but as part of a "remapping of memory in memories" that redistributes recollections between conscious and unconscious domains.

Rothberg (2009, pp. 14-16) examines the distinctions between multidirectional memory and screen memory through the lens of collective versus individual memory. While the concept of multidirectional memory was purposely developed to address collective phenomena, could we analyze a collective memory as a form of screen memory? To explore this possibility, we must recall that even Halbwachs' foundational work acknowledged the inseparability of individual and collective memory. Conversely, Avishai Margalit would later coin the term "shared memories," a form of collective memory where all remembering exists simultaneously as both individual and collective as an aggregation of different perspectives. For Rothberg, multidirectional memory is collective memory and aligns with notions of shared memory in its requirement for communicative exchange between diverse perspectives. Yet it simultaneously diverges from these concepts by emphasizing what he describes as the "inevitable displacements and contingencies that mark all remembrance."

Thus, the concepts of screen memory and multidirectional memory are not mutually exclusive when we recognize that a screen functions not merely as a barrier to remembrance, but equally as a surface for projecting other memories. Both possibilities are inherent to multidirectional memory's model, since the articulation of memories remains fundamentally unpredictable – shaped by intersecting social, political, and psychic forces. But how does this multidirectionality materialize across different forms and formats? How will it manifest within *lieux de mémoire*? How might it be negotiated through remembrance

policies? What role does it play in fictional representations? These kinds of questions about multidirectional manifestations cannot yield uniform answers, precisely because memory's articulations remain fundamentally heterogeneous.

The German Brother

Chico Buarque's *The German Brother* (2014) occupies a liminal space bet-ween reality and fiction, blurring the boundaries between autobiographical truth and literary invention. The novel employs autofiction – a narrative mode that diverges from traditional autobiography by prioritizing imaginative freedom over strict chronological or factual accuracy – to explore the tension between lived experience and artistic creation. This deliberate ambiguity invites readers to interrogate the interplay between history and storytelling, particularly those familiar with the public lives of the author Chico Buarque and his father, the renowned historian Sérgio Buarque de Holanda. In 1930, during a stay in Berlin, Buarque de Holanda fathered a son, Sergio Ernst, with Anne Ernst, a German woman. The child was later adopted by another family under the name Horst Günther, only to rediscover his origins as an adult and reclaim his birth name before he died in 1981. The brothers Sergio and Chico never met.

The autobiographical underpinnings of *The German Brother* are reinforced through the inclusion of archival documents, some of which were uncovered during Chico Buarque's real-life search for his lost brother in 2013, aided by historian João Klug (Neher, 2014). Yet even as these documents anchor the narrative in verifiable events, they also underscore the elusiveness of historical truth. Confronted with irreparable gaps in the record, Buarque turns to fiction as a means of negotiating the unknowable. From the outset, the novel signals its resistance to strict factual fidelity: names are altered (Sérgio Buarque de Holanda becomes "Sérgio de Hollander"), the family's residence is in a different city, and entirely invented characters (such as Ciccio's Brazilian brother Mimmo) are introduced. Moreover, the novel's autobiographical dimensions are complicated by the dissonance between Chico Buarque's public persona and that of his fictional alter-ego, Ciccio. While Buarque himself is celebrated as an artist (more known as a musician than a writer) who resisted Brazil's Military Dictatorship and was forced into exile for his activism, Ciccio remains strikingly passive in the face of authoritarianism and even seems to be in denial during the advance of violence.

The narrative begins when Ciccio discovers an old letter in German among his father's books. Though his comprehension of the language is limited, the letter revives a childhood rumor about his father having a son in Berlin. With the help of a drunk friend of a friend after a visit to a local German immigrant

bar, Ciccio obtains a rough translation, which confirms that his father had indeed fathered a child during his time in Germany.

This discovery propels Ciccio into an obsessive quest to uncover the truth about his lost brother, a journey that unfolds alongside his fraught relationship with his Brazilian brother, Mimmo, with whom he competes for the affections of women and their father's approval. The German brother becomes, for the somewhat resentful young Ciccio, an imaginary projection of his own traumas and desires. Finding him would be to solve something that his father could not. In his search for his lost brother, Ciccio constantly fables about possible lives for his brother. These ramblings, however, are much greater than the concreteness of the clues he follows, which causes him to constantly dream of tragic fates for his unknown brother (Buarque, 2014, p.108).

While examining his father's papers, Ciccio stumbles upon correspondence related to his brother's adoption, including requests for documentation proving the child's lineage, that is, proving that the child was not Jewish and therefore that he could be given up for adoption. He gets to know that Nazi-era restrictions prevented Sérgio from maintaining contact with his son, leaving the boy's fate shrouded in mystery. From these fragments, he creates a narrative in which his brother, imagined as Jewish, was murdered during the Holocaust, in a gas chamber. Though there is no evidence to support this conclusion, Ciccio clings to it with a fervor that borders on delusion, as if the magnitude of the Holocaust could lend meaning to his own familial ambiguities. Tellingly, this fixation coincides with his willful indifference to the political repression unfolding around him. When a friend compares Brazil's dictatorship to Nazi Germany, though, Ciccio dismisses the analogy as hyperbolic (Buarque, 2014, p.133).

This is how the relationship between the two, at first very distant events, is established in the book: Ciccio refuses to deal with the frightening present events and ends up turning to the trauma already recognized historically. About the Holocaust he has a lot of information, he can read it, as he reads so many stories and so much history in his father's endless books. Being able to know so much, he can imagine that in some way his particular story meets that history of recognized absolute evil. Meanwhile, in Brazil, in his city, another type of violence is unfolding in the shadows and he prefers not to look at these signs, represented, among other things, by the cockroaches that occupy the bookshelves at home. The cockroaches run free over the books and nobody takes action.

The narrator of *The German Brother* clearly has no Jewish ancestry, but this does not stop him from insisting on fantasizing about a Jewish past for his unknown German brother. If their shared father was not Jewish, the mother of the German brother could be, he imagines. At the same time that he goes on

with this projection, his other well-known Brazilian brother disappears during the dictatorship. By the end, he even considers the possibility of his brothers being the same person, bringing together both historical traumas.

In the last chapter, we discover that the story is narrated by Ciccio in 2013, many years after Sergio's death and Mimmo's disappearance, when he goes to Berlin in search of his German brother. This is not a novel that aims to elucidate a mystery, but rather the narrator's search for his own identity, which he projects (even if as an opposite) onto his brothers and their father. When these answers are not found, they need to be created, as years after Mimmo's disappearance, Ciccio invents stories about Mimmo's location to ease his sick mother's suffering (Buarque, 2013, pp.192-194).

In an interview, Chico Buarque, at the time of the book's release, states that two stories happened simultaneously: that of the book, on the level of imagination, and that of the search for his brother in real life. This is a story that could not end, since the initial question "who was this brother?" remains open (Chico, 2015). What is known about this mysterious brother is that he lived in a reality completely different from that of Chico Buarque and that, even with the help of documents and historians, any attempt to seize his existence can only be a fictionalization.

Conclusion

The German Brother, drawing from real documents and photos of one of Brazil's most famous artists, leaves readers with mounting suspicions rather than answers: the narrator's attempts at clarification only generate more doubts. The novel traces a man's obsession with a little-known brother from whom he expects much, yet the final chapter reveals Ciccio's own limited knowledge (or memory) of his Brazilian brother. Ciccio speculates that Mimmo was mistakenly arrested through association with an Argentinian activist woman, as he was so engrossed in fabricating stories about his German brother that he entirely overlooks his Brazilian brother's actual political activities. Ultimately, the German brother was neither Jewish nor a Holocaust victim, disproving Ciccio's most compelling hypothesis. The family's tragedy resonates not with the vast collective memory of the Holocaust, but through its own private suffering – a trauma Ciccio might prefer remained unknown.

In this context, the concept of screen memory is useful to reflect on the Holocaust's role in the narrative. While Ciccio isn't entirely oblivious to his surroundings, the story primarily focuses on his search for his German brother. Merely by being German and distant, this brother becomes the screen for Ciccio's various projections. The military dictatorship forms the backdrop of the protagonist's life during this period, yet it remains largely unaddressed –

except when its consequences intrude upon the search for the lost brother. Drawing on Rothberg's reading of Freud's screen memory concept, I argue that the novel presents Holocaust memory as present yet – if not the character himself, then for the reader – fundamentally displaced: particularly in the crucial revelation that the German brother was not Jewish. While this memory functions as a cover, it nevertheless (like a screen) reveals much about how both Ciccio and some real-life Brazilian counterparts process dictatorship history.

While testimony as a historical source predates the Shoah, Annette Wieviorka (2006) and Shoshana Felman (2001) identify the post-1970s "era of the witness" marked by testimonies transcending archival confines to enter public discourse through written, recorded, and filmed formats. Buarque's fictionalization exemplifies this relentless quest for answers when confronting historical trauma. The working-through process often appropriates existing frameworks, making Holocaust memory an available pathway – despite its temporal and experiential distance from events like Brazil's dictatorship – due to its established narrative conventions for addressing trauma.

Thus, Holocaust literature functions as a trope or archetype for trauma narratives. Distinctively, its power stems not from conventional narrative arcs but from memory's fragmentation – what Aarons (2014) terms a "genre of rupture," extending Berel Lang's (2000) observation about Holocaust literature's "blurring of traditional genres." This generic instability reflects language's failure to conventionally represent trauma, producing texts that straddle reality and imagination. Historical verisimilitude emerges precisely through linguistic absence and discontinuity, forging a literature of destruction whose narrative strategies, via multidirectional memory, reverberate across other traumatic histories.

If we acknowledge the trope of traumatic literature as an attempt to work through the past, the concept of multidirectional memory becomes particularly suitable for analyzing the literary experimentations in *The German Brother*. As Hayden White (1986, p. 5) observes, understanding involves an attempt to render the *unheimlich* familiar – that is, to situate something within the realm of the known through associative frameworks. In the novel, the unknown manifests not only through the elusive whereabouts and mysterious history of the German brother but also in the novelty of the escalating violence that disrupts the protagonist's family life. This unknown further resides in the impossible mourning of those who disappeared during Latin America's dictatorships.[1] Within this narrative context, Holocaust memory emerges as a platform for articulating these distinct yet interconnected traumas.

When we consider the Holocaust as a paradigm for how memory circulates across different locations and historical periods, we can begin to address how competing narratives of victimization interact in public discourse. The central challenge involves ensuring that the concept of multidirectional memory avoids

depoliticizing effects – whether by glossing over actual conflicts between memories in favor of an ideal harmony, or by automatically filtering all traumatic memories through the Holocaust framework while overlooking the specific political contexts of different memorialization processes. As Assmann and Conrad (2010, pp. 9-11) demonstrate, the globalization of Holocaust memory is often perceived globally as a form of Euro-American cultural imperialism in memory studies.

Lastly, the role of the multidirectionality of memory in the book can also be indicated by its reception in the German press. In a review published in *Die Zeit* about the book that was translated as *Mein deutscher Bruder*, Jens Jessen (2016) classified Chico Buarque's work as *Weltliteratur* (World Literature). The term *Weltliteratur* was coined by Goethe to refer to an overcoming of national literature in the name of a literature with a cosmopolitan character of the emerging global modernity. Despite the complexities surrounding the definition of the term in a rapidly expanding world, the concept suggests that literature is more than just a representation or reflection of particular realities. *Weltliteratur* can be understood as both a concept and the literature itself capable of creating worlds and shaping realities. Thus, if Chico Buarque's book represents a very particular national reality, it is also capable of reaching a much wider audience precisely because of its dialogue with memories that go beyond the national scenario and unite the Brazilian military dictatorship with the set of catastrophes in Contemporary History.

Notes

[1] See Dulitzky, Ariel E. (2019). The Latin-American Flavor of Enforced Disappearances, *Chicago Journal of International Law:* Vol. 19: No. 2, Article 3. Ulster University Transitional Justice Institute. *Disappearance and state responses in Latin America* [Research project]. Ulster University. Retrieved from https://www.ulster.ac.uk/transitional-justice-institute/our-research/disappearance-and-state-responses-in-latin-america

References

Aarons, V. (2014). A genre of rupture: The literary language of the Holocaust. In J. Adams (Ed.), *The Bloomsbury companion to Holocaust literature.* Bloomsbury.

Assmann, A., & Conrad, S. (2010). Introduction. In A. Assmann & S. Conrad (Eds.), *Memory in a global age: Discourses, practices and trajectories* (pp. 9-11). Palgrave Macmillan.

Brasil. Comissão Nacional da Verdade. (2014, December 10). *Relatório da Comissão Nacional da Verdade.* http://cnv.memoriasreveladas.gov.br/

Chico, um artista brasileiro [Film]. (2015). Miguel Faria Jr. (Director). Globo Filmes.

Costa Braga, S. (2024). Multidirectional memory: The Holocaust and the Brazilian military dictatorship in K. Relato de uma busca and O irmão alemão. *Revista de Teoria da História*, 27(1), 189-205.

Felman, S. (2001). Theaters of justice: Arendt in Jerusalem, the Eichmann trial, and the redefinition of legal meaning in the wake of the Holocaust. *Critical Inquiry*, 27(2), 201-238.

Freud, S. (1914). *Psychopathology of everyday life* (trans. by A. A. Brill). T. Fisher Unwin. (Original work published 1901)

Freud, S. (1981). *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 3). (J. Strachey, Ed.). Hogarth Press.

Huyssen, A. (2003). *Present pasts: Urban palimpsests and the politics of memory*. Stanford University Press.

Jessen, J. (2016, May 4). Pochen des aufgewühlten Herzens [Review of the book Mein deutscher Bruder, by C. Buarque]. *Die Zeit,* 20.

Lang, B. (2000). *Holocaust representation: Art within the limits of history and ethics*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Linenthal, E. (1995). *Preserving Memory: The Struggle to Create America's Holocaust Museum*. Viking.

Neher, C. (2014, November 21). *Historiador revela detalhes sobre "irmão alemão" de Chico Buarque*. DW. http://www.dw.de/historiador-revela-detalhes-sobre-irm%C3%A3o-alem%C3%A3o-de-chico-buarque/a-18079537

Rothberg, M. (2009). *Multidirectional memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the age of decolonization*. Stanford University Press.

Stannard, D. (2001). Uniqueness as denial: The politics of genocide scholarship. In A. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *Is the Holocaust unique?*. Westview Press.

Traverso, E. (2005). *Le passé, modes d'emploi: Histoire, mémoire, politique*. La Fabrique.

White, H. (1986). *Tropics of discourse: Essays in cultural criticism. Johns* Hopkins University Press.

Wieviorka, A. (2006). *The era of the witness* (trans. by J. Stark). Cornell University Press. (Original work published 1998)

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no ethical issues or conflicts of interest in this research.

Ethical Standards
The author affirms this research did not involve human subjects.

Disclaimer / Publisher's Note
The statements, opinions and data contained in published works are solely those of the individual author and contributor and do not reflect the views of YSU Publishing House and/or the editor(s). YSU Publishing House and/or the editor(s) assume no responsibility for any injury to persons or damage to property resulting from the use of ideas, methods, instructions or products described in the publications.