

Introduction

HELLE BJERG, CLAUDIA LENZ, AND ERIK THORSTENSEN

In 2010, the German invasion starting five years of occupation in Denmark and Norway is being commemorated in a special way. 70 years after the events, only a few of the eye witnesses are still alive and the traumatic past is about to be transformed from “communicative” to “cultural” memory (Assmann 2004). 65 years after the end of World War II, a fourth generation is learning about the events in school, through media and, less and less, through the stories told in families. The different generations communicating about the war have experienced different ways of telling – or silencing – stories about the war, as they have witnessed different commemorative cultures and political uses of this past. But even 65 years after the breakdown of German National Socialism and the liberation of the former occupied countries, this war is by no means fading away from public debate and media. “The war” is still capable of engaging people and mobilizing strong feelings.

The ambition of this volume is to diagnose and position the history and commemoration cultures of the Scandinavian countries within broader tendencies and recent developments of the history culture of WWII in an international perspective. In order to do so, it is necessary to devote particular attention to the Holocaust-related commemoration and history culture. The articles in this volume dealing with the different national cases will show that the most significant changes in the national representations and interpretations of WWII during the last decades are in one way or another linked to the integration of the Holocaust into new national narratives and to new patterns of interpretation.

In this field, a confusing variety of concepts has emerged, which partly seem to have synonymous, partly overlapping meanings, and

which are not always used in coherent ways. Therefore, we would first of all like to clarify our use of some core concepts in this introduction – which does not, however, in every instance necessarily correspond with the ones chosen by the authors in this volume. The variety in uses of concepts mirrors, in effect, different backgrounds with regard to academic disciplines and “schools”.

To start with, the perhaps most confusing distinction in the field is the one between “collective memory”, “memory culture” and “history culture”. Some scholars doubt that such a thing as *collective memory* exists, arguing that memory is a phenomenon linked to the individual ways of turning experiences into mental and emotional representations. Others interpret memory as a social and communicative process of attaching meaning to the past, mediated by cultural activities. Here the terms *social memory* and *cultural memory* indicate the activity of creating or constructing memories, whereas the term *collective memory* points to the fact that memories serve to construct group identities and cultural traditions (see Erll/Nünning 2008).

Memory culture is often used to describe the complete field of cultural representations and practices dealing with a specific past. Still, it seems more appropriate to reserve this term to all phenomena which are related to commemoration and coming to terms with the past, whereas *history culture* signifies the whole spectrum of ways the past is addressed and used in a society.

In this volume, the diagnosis of history culture is addressed within the perspective of history didactics. This means inquiring how these developments with regard to the interpretations and uses of the history of WWII and the Holocaust raise new challenges and possibilities for history teaching. The main focus here lies on the question whether the opening up of monolithic national master narratives to incorporate grey zones, ambivalences and a more reflective attitude corresponds to new approaches to historical learning and teaching. These might include replacing authoritative fact canons with the reflection about the ways the past has been interpreted and used at different times and in different contexts, including one’s own contemporary situation. This perspective of history didactics, understood as a meta-perspective on learning and teaching history, is addressed throughout this volume, but especially in the second and third chapter.

In order to specify the kind of questions to be raised and discussed within a mainly Scandinavian comparative framework throughout this volume, we shall start this introduction by providing a small glimpse of the history culture in Denmark and Norway respectively, represented by two recent films. We will then go on to summarize the primary ques-

tions of the volume and outline some of the general tendencies within the history culture of WWII and the Holocaust reflected within individual contributions. Finally, we will give a brief presentation linking each contribution to the shared perspectives.

In 2008 and 2009, it seemed that the Scandinavian resistance hero had made his comeback. Two films, a Danish and a Norwegian production, were released, both of them dealing with the resistance against the German occupation of the respective country. But, even if both films played on well-known topics from national history cultures, they dealt with them in quite different ways and, consequently, provoked very different reactions in the Danish and Norwegian public. One could say that each film represents an antipodal landmark in the memory landscapes that have emerged during the more than six decades since the end of WWII.

On the one hand, there is the Danish film *Flammen og Citronen* (*Flame & Citron*), released in 2008 and featuring two members of the Danish resistance movement who are shown as being responsible for the “liquidation” of people considered to be collaborators and to represent a danger for the activities of the resistance movement. Still, the narrative of the movie is not as clear-cut as the last sentence might indicate. The two heroes are portrayed as being under heavy nervous and physical strain, not only due to their brutal task, but also because they are drawn into intrigues within the resistance movement. They even suspect that they are being manipulated into killing innocents, thereby entering the grey area of virtually committing murder. The film leaves the question open whether personal animosities and power struggles within the resistance movement might have been the motives behind some of these “liquidations”. The heroes have turned into anti-heroes; their depressed and at times desperate state of mind undermines the narrative of a resistance movement fighting a just war against a foreign occupier – in the name of *the people*.

On the other hand, the Norwegian film *Max Manus*, released in 2009, carries the name and tells the story of a resistance hero – even one of the best known, belonging to a legendary group: the “Oslo gang”. While *Flame & Citron* undermines patterns of black and white, confronting the narratives of heroes and villains with shades of grey (at times very dark grey ...), the actions and motives of the heroes of *Max Manus* are still beyond any doubt and suspicion. The members of the “Oslo gang” are depicted as those who take action in a situation when being occupied by an overwhelming military power caused lethargy among most Norwegians. In addition, the heroes of *Max Manus* gain their legitimacy through the exiled leaders of the country. In one scene,

Max Manus meets the Norwegian king Haakon VII (being himself a mythical figure representing “the-nation-in-resistance”) in his British exile. When the king encourages him, Max Manus and his actions are symbolically ennobled. When Max Manus is worn out and depressed at the end of the film, it is not because he has lost faith or because he is confronted with moral doubts. Max Manus’ depression is easily explained because he is the only survivor of the Oslo gang – it is the price he paid for his heroic fight. It is his personal sacrifice. This makes him, of course, even more a hero.

The success of both films and the reactions they provoked leave no doubt as to which of the two narratives is the more appealing. *Flame and Citron* won much critical acclaim as a nuanced representation of war history and drew a large audience in Denmark (about 700 000) as well as abroad. But it came nowhere close to the success of *Max Manus* – first of all in Norway. More than a million Norwegians saw the film in the cinemas and it was proclaimed the most successful Norwegian film of all times (taking over from *Nine lives*, a resistance drama from 1957).

Moreover, both films caused quite different reactions among critics and historians. *Flame & Citron* provoked a dispute among historians over alleged lapses in the presentation of historical facts and, accordingly, the degree of fictionalization. No debate of this kind arose after the release of *Max Manus*. It was praised for its “realism” and “authenticity”. The voices of critics accusing the film to present an outdated black-and-white image of war and resistance drowned in the choir of euphoria, including resistance veterans, politicians and even the present Norwegian king Harald VII.

In Norwegian cinemas, one could observe how the film became a matrix for intergenerational transmission of historical knowledge and memories, when grandparents took their grandchildren to a film that supposedly showed the “real past” and linked to their own war experiences. Appealing to the younger generation’s sense for dynamic and action and at the same time authorizing grandparents as contemporary witnesses, the film obviously succeeded in building bridges between generations. Still, it did not include recent developments in Norwegian history culture, namely the inclusion of grey zones and less flattering topics than that of a purely heroic resistance. In other words, the movie *Max Manus* could be regarded as being anachronistic both in relation to contemporary history culture (since it omits several of the perspectives that have been publicly debated in the last years), and when it comes to the “state of the art” of historical research, which also embraces a broader spectrum of perspectives than displayed in the movie. How, then, can the major success of such a representation of the war be explained? Within

the broader picture of history culture, *Max Manus* seems to represent a kind of permission to stick to the positive aspects of occupation history, those aspects easy to identify and to cope with. In stark contrast to *Flame & Citron*, it doesn't challenge the notions of the right and the wrong side and the unambiguous good cause. Still, there are traces of recent developments in history culture visible in *Max Manus*: some years ago, it would have been impossible to see the hero in despair and depression, while his country is celebrating liberation. A diachronic comparison of different movies displaying war heroes since 1945 would yield interesting results in this respect. And here, again, the perspective of history didactics is touched upon: How can an understanding of the dynamics of the success of *Max Manus* contribute to an understanding of the mechanisms of individual and collective uses of the past in general?

The two films and the reactions they provoked are specifically connected to the Norwegian and Danish situation, which means to the specific war history and the commemorative and history cultures that evolved after 1945. Two other Nordic countries, Sweden and Finland, went through very different war experiences – which we will come back to later in this introduction – and both countries went through their own processes of coming to terms with this past – including commemoration, historization and other cultural forms of representing and using the past. A common topic dealt with in the contributions of this book is the difficulty of coping with problematic aspects of this past, which means: fully integrating them into the narratives and images circulating in history cultures.

Still, what applies to all national cases dealt with in this book is the double function of cultural representations of war history: the duplicity of mirroring *and* affecting public history cultures related to WWII. This means, in Michel Foucault's terms, that the elements of history culture are inscribed into cultural systems of meaning which regulate the possible uses of the past ("what can be said and thought" about a certain period of the past) and at the same time *constitutes* these systems, related to the possibility of *change*. In this way, the example of *Flame & Citron* and *Max Manus* touch upon a variety of topics which this book is going to highlight:

- The transformation of experiences of WWII into commemorative practices, individual and collective memories and public history cultures.
- The role of the representations of war as a source for individual and group identities.
- The conflict over "true" and "legitimate" representations of the past.

- The tension between national and universal narratives as well as between identity-focused and reflexive frameworks informing the representations and uses of the past.
- The “pedagogical” impacts of the normative and formative functions of all kinds of representations and uses of the past – and the challenges for didactics of history related to this.

This book represents the attempt to connect the developments on a societal and scientific level and to present them within a Scandinavian comparative framework:

- Which challenges and possibilities of the didactics of history are prompted by the changed European and Scandinavian historical culture and the changed use of history, with a view to the mediation of WWII and the Holocaust?
- How can the concept of historical consciousness be elaborated theoretically and empirically with regard to a mediation of history aiming to develop a self-consciousness of history and a use of history which supports the democratic political culture?
- How can theoretical insights about the consciousness of history, the use of history and the culture of history be transformed into concrete methods of teaching?
- How can an improvement of the level of historical reflection about WWII and the Holocaust be adequately described and evaluated?

The intention of this book is to combine scholarly work and empirical examples in the fields of historical consciousness, history culture and didactics in order to show in which ways they inform and inspire each other. The concept of historical consciousness represents the theoretical linkage between the studies of history cultures and didactics of history. Since history teaching in the Scandinavian countries is focused on the strengthening of critical thinking and the consolidation of democratic values, the concept of historical consciousness has traditionally occupied a strong position. Still, there has been little reflection on the consequences of the changing history culture with regard to the history of WWII for learning and teaching history. This anthology is a contribution to a debate about how the insights into the narrative formation of historical consciousness and the uses of the past which have materialized in the study of history cultures, can be integrated into didactics of history and thereby become sources of (self-)reflective historical learning processes. Much of the work done at memorial sites and in other institutionalized spaces of historical learning in the Scandinavian countries can be regarded as “good practice”, enhancing competences in historical thinking

and in participating in the negotiations of the past in society. Thus, the aim of the anthology is to facilitate an interdisciplinary dialogue between different fields of research, to integrate a Scandinavian perspective into ongoing European debates, and finally to bridge the gap between scientific debates and teaching practices in the field of history cultures with reference to WWII and the Holocaust.

History culture is conceptualized as a field of cultural practices which serve individuals and social groups/communities to make sense of the past, and which has a crucial function for the establishment and regulation of a social order (including power relations). Due to these features, history culture can serve as a brilliant starting point for historical thinking and for didactics of history. Thus, in this volume a variety of examples of “history culture in action” from different national contexts in Scandinavia are presented, and confronted with the “meta-discourse” established by the theoretical and didactical contributions. The idea behind the choice of contents and its structure is to introduce the concept of the “reflexive turn” with regard to the history of WWII and the Holocaust. The concept of a reflexive turn points to the increasing attention on the question of *how* this period was remembered and turned into a “usable past” after 1945. This process is related to a tendency of demythologization, deheroization and a decreasing influence of the patriotic master narratives which formerly dominated the postwar era. Today, local, national and global narratives and interpretative patterns alike contribute to what Levy and Sznajder call the “de- and renationalization” of history cultures with regard to the Holocaust (2005). This means, that not only a “supra-national” knowledge about history, but also “supranational” patterns of interpretation have emerged. This development has the paradoxical effect of re-enforcing national historical narratives, by *modernizing* and *adapting* them to contemporary needs for identity building and the search for political legitimacy. An example of this is the tendency of nation states to confess their guilt regarding the persecution of the Jewish population during WWII. This recognition of national guilt has become a condition for political legitimacy in the context of foreign policy, as described by Cecilie Stockholm Banke in this volume. Considerable research has been done on these phenomena in many European countries, but so far a comparative perspective on the Scandinavian countries is missing.

Shifts in the history culture in Scandinavia

In recent years a conceptual shift has occurred both in the Nordic countries and in other European countries regarding the approach to the history of WWII. This shift applies both to research, to the public culture of memory, and to the common historical consciousness about WWII. In the early postwar years, the national “master narratives” about war and occupation had an elementary meaning for material and moral reconstruction of the war-affected countries and for the establishment of a postwar political order. In the later postwar years, these master narratives have been confronted with perspectives focusing on opposing, ambivalent and painful aspects of the history of war. In Norway and Denmark, Eriksen (1995) and Bryld/Warring (1998) published critical analyses of the mythologizing tendencies in the national “consensus narratives” (Fure 1997) about collective opposition during the war. These studies prompted a new tendency towards “demythologizing” the history of war, focusing on earlier forgotten or suppressed aspects.

Ten years later it can safely be said that a paradigm shift is taking place, both within historical research as well as within public accounts and presentations of the history of WWII. As far as the reasons for a “reflexive shift” in the treatment of WWII are concerned, one has to consider not only demographic but also political factors. The war generation is no longer the generation shaping the agenda – neither economically and politically nor in the cultural and academic debate. This means that the vision of a society molded by war experience has been replaced by visions linked to postwar experiences. During the 1980s and 1990s the so-called “generation of 1968” became an important player in cultural and political life, enabling representatives of this generation to exert a considerable influence on interpretations of history. At the same time, new “agents of political memory” came to the fore. In Norway, the society of “War children” was founded in 1985 and constitutes an example of a social group belonging to the “generation of children”; this group made its voice heard in the struggle for memory and its political consequences when its members had reached middle age.

In Sweden, the national narrative of a neutral Sweden during WWII was challenged when Boëthius (1991) subjected Sweden’s relationship to Nazi Germany to critical investigation. This prompted the debate about “Jewish gold”, the rejection of Jewish refugees, etc. As a result, the Council of Science granted 20 million Swedish kroner in order to conduct research on the topic “Sweden’s Relations with Nazism, Nazi Germany and the Holocaust: A Research Programme” and the Forum for Living History was founded, becoming an important player within the

formation of history culture in Sweden and abroad, as will be shown in some of the contributions by Gullberg, Gerner and Banke.

As the celebration of the liberation in 1995 has shown, the “national consensus syndrome” (Grønnes 1990) was still predominant both in Denmark and Sweden at that time. And yet the historical culture of the Scandinavian countries presented in this volume underwent significant changes during the 1990s, due to shifts within the national political culture of the postwar years as well as under the influence of an increased globalization. Globalization occurs not just on an economic, but also on a cultural level, not least due to new patterns of migration. With a view to the cultures of history and memory, this means that the focus on national unity loses some of its identifying and legitimizing significance.

One decisive factor in this new interpretation process came from outside: the realization that the persecution of the Jews and the Holocaust is a historical theme which concerns all European nations – regardless of whether they were confronted with the policy of extermination as an occupied or (apparently) neutral nation. The cases involving damages which took place during the 1990s in Switzerland, Sweden and Norway were enormously important politically, scientifically and culturally in terms of a new interpretation and a paradigm shift in the national presentation and interpretation of history. It is no exaggeration to claim that the paradigms of history writing were shaken in this period. The categories “us” (patriots) and “them” (inner or outer enemies) could no longer be sustained, or acquired a bad off-taste. Where, for example, were the Jews to be situated on this mental map: as a minority or as refugees? Also in this regard, the Finnish War history seems to be the most complex of the Nordic countries. Fighting at times together with Nazi Germany against the Soviet Union, the self image of Finland was for a long time formed by the idea of having been first and foremost a victim of WWII and of not being involved in the Holocaust. These notions have quite recently been challenged by a younger generation of historians asking questions of responsibility and guilt which have been avoided for decades. It is symptomatic for this trend that Michael Burleigh’s last book on WWII is called *Moral Combat*, and addresses the moral choices made by key protagonists (Burleigh 2010).

In all these countries, the lasting concern with the Holocaust has also left its mark on historical research and on the culture of memory. Today it is no longer possible to present the history of the war without addressing the issue of the Holocaust. The formative aspects of history teaching are no longer related to, and solely informed by, patriotic identification with the resistance heroes, but rather linked to values more closely asso-

ciated with global problems of today and related to the promotion of human rights, democracy, and peace.

Such a perspective can be seen as a new area of commitment in the presentation and teaching of history; the *effects* or *interpretation* of history (linked to the German concepts “Wirkungsgeschichte”, “Deutungsgeschichte”) are regarded as important within the formation of historical consciousness, and as such issues to be addressed within history didactics.

The different chapters of the anthology will address these new tendencies within memory and history culture and didactics of history.

I Cases of national history cultures

In the first chapter, *Cases of national history cultures*, the contributions present actual investigations of how national cultures of memory of WWII within Scandinavia seem to move within new directions. The tendencies shown throughout the national cases seem both to be opening up to more pluralist views upon national history, and keeping a stronghold within national identity building.

This part opens with the contribution *Representations of Victims and Guilty in Public History. The Case of the Finnish Civil War in 1918* by Sirkka Ahonen. Ahonen stresses how it is vital to understand WWII in the light of the Russian Revolution in 1917 and the Finnish Civil War which divided the Finnish society into Whites and Reds. This division has cast shadows into the culture of memory of Finland until today, and Ahonen uses the perspectives of victimization and guilt in a discussion of how a society can reconcile itself with different interpretations of the past.

In *The Holocaust as History Culture in Finland*, Tom Gullberg explores the national debates of Finnish historians concerning the history of the Finnish WWII and the Finnish Cold War. This national debate is related to a larger European discourse about the role of the Holocaust in creating a common European standard for morality and, subsumed under this, the place of Holocaust education in relation to the national history culture. Under the theme of Holocaust education the connection to the Swedish governmental institution Living History is explored, an institution also examined closely in the contributions by Gerner and Banke.

The European concentration camp system creates the setting for Jon Reitan’s article *The Nazi Camps in the Norwegian Historical Culture*. Reitan explores a change in Norwegian memory culture where the Nazi camps have moved from the margins of the national historical culture in-

to occupying a central position in the public consciousness. Reitan argues that this should be seen as an attempt to stabilize and systematize memories and messages from WWII. This analysis corresponds with Karlsson's exploration of different forms in which history is used. Reitan's analysis shows a dialectics between rendering the past fixed in a location with a paradigm of fascination for the concrete and the creation of strong transnational and placeless narratives and meta-narratives interpreting the Holocaust. This tendency of a "glocalization" of the Holocaust is also addressed by Banke and Bjerg in this book.

The changes in interpretations and uses of historical places in Norwegian history culture are also the theme in Tor-Einar Fagerland and Trond Risto Nilsen's chapter *The Norwegian Fascist Monument at Stiklestad 1944-45*. By focusing upon *Stiklestad*, often regarded as the founding place of Norway as a Christian nation, the authors investigate how different layers of (national) history have constructed a symbolic place that most Norwegians take pride in even today. Still, the use of *Stiklestad* as a rallying point for the Norwegian Nazi Party and Vidkun Quisling is a bone of contention within the contemporary uses of the site. As such, the authors suggest a redesigning of *Stiklestad* as a site of commemoration aimed at exposing the different archeological layers of the uses of the past connected to the site.

Kristian Gerner also analyzes contemporary debates on interpretations of the past in *The Holocaust and Memory Culture: The Case of Sweden*. Gerner focuses on the Swedish governmental body, "Living History", which studies and disseminates knowledge about genocides and violations of human rights. The article investigates the different receptions of the Holocaust within Sweden, connected to the position of neutrality, the position of Sweden as the savior related to the White Buses, but also recent modifications of the Swedish self-understanding in relation to new perspectives on the Swedish involvement in the Holocaust. Gerner also addresses the recent initiatives to broaden the original scope of the "Living History" from focussing on the Holocaust to studying and addressing Swedish attitudes towards other genocides or mass killings, as in Cambodia or in the Stalinist Soviet Union and how these have spurred vehement reactions and protests of the Swedish political left regarding both the validity and the possibility of comparing Nazi and Communist crimes.

In her article *Small and Moral Nations. Europe and the Emerging Politics of Memory* Cecilie Felicia Stokholm Banke establishes a link to the topic of universalization of the Holocaust as found in Reitan's contribution. Banke analyzes how the re-actualization of the Holocaust through the Stockholm International Forums created both national poli-

cies and the wider field of genocide studies. As touched upon earlier in this introduction, the national narratives of WWII in the Scandinavian countries have turned towards embracing a new universal morality. Hereby a new policy regime has been framed where human rights could find their way into international politics. Banke relates these tendencies to the development of a denationalized European memory culture in which Holocaust is related to through remembrance. This establishes a break in the former national memory cultures focusing on confrontation, interpretation, and justice. Banke discusses how putting morality on the agenda of international politics may open up new possibilities for smaller states to become bigger moral players.

Looking at the different national case studies, one can easily see common traits in the dynamics of public history culture and politics of history. There seem to be similar mechanisms at work with regard to the formation and negotiations of narratives and interpretative patterns as well as with regard to the negotiations and disputes about legitimate and illegitimate uses of the past. Apparently, the need and capability to handle and cope with unflattering and burdening aspects of the past was not there before the 1980s in any of these countries, and the process of really integrating the “darker sides” of the past into national history and related self-images seems to be an ongoing one. As is the dispute about the consequences of these changing images of the past for contemporary values, political decisions and power relations. The contributions in chapter II within this volume provide theoretical frameworks for understanding these mechanisms of history culture and politics of history. The contributions in chapter III will introduce perspectives on how to teach and learn about history cultures and some theoretical arguments for the impact this kind of understanding has for active citizenship.

II Historical consciousness in history didactics

The contributions within this chapter take historical consciousness as their starting point for theoretical elaborations of how to conceptualize uses of history and historical thinking. The debates raised in this chapter serve to give a theoretical framework for the study of national cultures of memory and history as presented in Chapter I as well as for the didactical reflections and concepts to be presented in Chapter III.

The first two contributions, *Processing Time – On the Manifestations and Activations of Historical Consciousness* by Klas-Göran Karlsson and *German History Didactics: From Historical Consciousness to Historical Competencies – and Beyond?* by Andreas Körber, give an

outline of different theoretical developments building on the ground-work of the concept of historical consciousness – the focus on history culture, on one hand, and that on didactics of history, on the other. Together, both articles provide a conceptual tool kit for the description, reconstruction and analysis of the ways in which individuals and social groups make sense of the past, the ways in which the past is linked to contemporary issues and future prospects, as well as the narratives, artifacts and practices that are bearers of historical meaning.

Karlsson's contribution starts with reflections on the conditions for the past to manifest itself in the present and how this manifestation is mediated. His key argument for transcending the limits of the concept of historical consciousness is related to this topic of mediation: there is no way to understand the processes of making sense of the past and the uses of the past without looking at culture, more accurately: *history culture*. When it comes to the ways of using the past displayed in history culture, Karlsson differentiates between:

- The scholarly-scientific use of history
- The existential use of history
- The moral use of history
- The ideological use of history
- The politico-pedagogical use of history

In his contribution Körber argues for using the concept of historical consciousness as a pathfinder with regard to history culture and the processes of attaching meaning to the past – which presupposes that everyone has the capacity to “process time” in different ways and for differing purposes. He develops a concept of historical thinking, consisting of a number of operations, which enables an individual to perform what is described by Karlsson as “processing time”. Körber draws on the development of the concept carried out within the German network FUER Geschichtsbewusstsein (Schreiber et al. 2008) and suggests a shift of focus from *historical knowledge* to *historical competence*. Using the concept of “(self-)reflective historical consciousness”, Körber describes two basic narrative operations of historical thought: *reconstruction* of historical events and courses of action and *deconstruction* of existing narratives and interpretations. This new thinking has not yet been integrated into the Scandinavian debate about the didactics of history, but is reflected in some of the contributions with a didactical perspective in Chapter III.

The article by Bodo von Borries, *Coping with Burdening History*, takes its starting point in the question of “coping with history”. He applies the assumptions developed by Körber when describing different

forms of overcoming hate and animosities between nations produced by difficult and traumatic histories. After describing forms of collective attitudes towards a traumatic past which maintain and prolong hatred he outlines various initiatives of constructing historical narratives that aim at bridging former dividing lines.

III The mediation of history in practice

This chapter moves the theoretical debates of the development of historical consciousness into analyses of empirical examples of the mediation of history within a didactical perspective. The chapter offers examples of how WWII and the Holocaust are presented within different types of media, and of how history culture is both reflected and addressed within specific cases of history education. The articles in this chapter reflect the broader changes in the history culture of WWII and the Holocaust outlined in chapter I, briefly summed up as universalization, victimization, moralization, de- and renationalization. In that sense, this chapter elaborates on how these tendencies are crystallized within very different settings. Furthermore, the different contributions are to some extent informed by the theoretical development of the concept of historical consciousness outlined in various ways in chapter II. As such, the overall theme of chapter III is the question of how to develop a (self-)reflective historical consciousness. This question is dealt with more or less explicitly in the analyses and evaluations of the various examples of mediation of history in practice.

The first contribution by Ola Svein Stugu: *Exhibiting the War. Approaches to World War II in Museums and Exhibitions* provides a general framework of “reading” war exhibitions with regard to national and supra-national narratives and interpretations. As such, the article presents a framework for the perception of how the tendencies in the history culture of WWII and the Holocaust present themselves within the museum exhibition as a specific form of representation, as well as in very diverse national contexts.

In *World War II at 24 Frames a Second – Scandinavian Examples*, Ulf Zander carries out analyses of films relating to WWII and the Holocaust in Sweden, Norway and Denmark, and his analysis shows the close linkage between media representations as moving images and history culture. The analysis focuses on the understanding of these movies within different national history cultures in Scandinavia, and shows how the movies can be seen as products *and* producers of history culture in the sense that they reflect the interpretations of a given period in the

light of the time of production. In a didactical perspective the elaboration by Zander on the relation between history culture and films paves the way for the development of didactical approaches using films in contextualizing, historicizing and deconstructing war narratives.

With the article by Erik Thorstensen: *Historical Propaganda and New Popular Cultural Medial Expressions* we move into the framework of history teaching and historical learning within the context of a specific exhibition. The article presents and evaluates a teaching concept developed and used in relation to an exhibition on Leni Riefenstahl, presented in 2008 at the Holocaust-centre in Oslo. The teaching concept presented is developed on the basis of the concept of reflective historical consciousness, and Thorstensen points to the difficulties encountered when attempting to develop several of the historical competences introduced by Körber. Especially clear is the danger of producing moral(izing) statements lacking historization and critical judgments by only taking the past as a “stepping stone” for declamations about the present.

The article by Helle Bjerg: *The Culture of Memory in the “Grandchildren Generation” in Denmark* follows up on the outline of recent developments within history and memory culture in an empirical analysis of how these tendencies are reflected and developed within the historical consciousness of the “third” generation in Denmark. Furthermore, the analysis points to the didactical perspectives and challenges posed by a generation where the manifestation of the ongoing relevance of WWII and the Holocaust within the memory culture goes hand in hand with a strong tendency of de-historization and universalization threatening to empty the use of history of the complexities of a specific historical context. Here the article is in line with the contribution by Jon Reitan pointing to the impact of “globalized memory” detached from place and time and the contribution by Thorstensen pointing to a de-historicized use of history where a universal moral message becomes the – only – content of history. This opens up a question of how to didactically confront the paradox of what might be termed as “forgetful remembering”.

This question is followed up in the contribution by Claudia Lenz: *Strengthening Narrative Competence by Diversification of (Hi)stories*, Lenz presents a case of teaching history teachers within the context of Norway’s Resistance Museum (Norges Hjemmefrontmuseum) where a specific learning tool was implemented aiming at developing narrative competence by challenging the participants to re- and de-construct historical narratives of WWII. As such, the case serves as an empirical example of how to operationalize the didactical focus on the development of (self-)reflective historical thinking as theoretically elaborated by

Körber in this volume. Lenz links up with the various contributions within this volume (in particular with those of Reitan, Stugu and Bjerg), pointing to how different layers of history culture intermingle when historical consciousness is put to work within the task of reconstructing and deconstructing existing historical narratives. Finally the case also exemplifies how the historical learning processes are closely related to the capacity of actively participating in the ways the past is used in society, not least related to matter of “burdening history” as discussed by Borries.

Several of the articles in this chapter explicitly deal with didactical approaches and learning methods where the materializations of history culture are put into didactical practice in order to activate a full-fledged historical thinking. The idea of (self-)reflective historical thinking building on the model of a whole range of historical competences raises serious challenges in regard to the evaluation of learning processes and the assessment of individual learning progress. The final contribution by Bodo von Borries: *How to Examine the (Self-)Reflective Effects of History Teaching* takes up this challenge by suggesting various forms of testing which genuinely aim at grasping and diagnosing learning processes leading to (self-)reflective historical thinking. Against the backdrop of a critique of the widespread tendency of testing factual historical knowledge, Borries presents some promising examples designed to test the competence of historical method by carrying out historical reflection rather than just answering factually oriented questions.

The common aim of all contributions in this volume is to build bridges between the empirical finding that history and memory cultures related to WWII have become “reflexive” in the sense of a critical evaluation of narratives of national heroism and suffering on the one hand, and approaches in history didactics taking this reflexivity as a starting point for fostering historical competences and critical judgment, on the other. Theories of historical thinking and historical consciousness – understood as “processing time” – serve as transmitters between the case studies of national history cultures and the didactical case studies. The reflection of the processes transforming the past into history and linking it to the present and future informing the teaching approaches presented here, takes its cue from the insight that human beings’ understanding and interpretation of the past are crucially important for individuals’ and social groups’ conception of reality, construction of identity, and formation of human values. As the German sociologist Peter Reichelt (1995) provocatively puts it, history culture is always accompanied by a “ruler-legitimizing” dimension. If linked to a perspective which is more concerned with an egalitarian and participatory culture, this point may

be rephrased as follows: an understanding of the *uses* of history and a competence in participating in the debates and struggles about memories (i.e. the significance of history and the consequences this entails for our own time) should be considered a condition for active co-citizenship. These problems present themselves in new forms today, since the decisive value-based frame of reference for identity formation and sound judgment is no longer limited to one national dimension. Our sense and understanding of history are today formed in a reality increasingly molded by international connections, transnational structures (the EU) and processes of migration. Seen in this light, the apparent phenomenon that local and other group specific (e.g. religious) identities experience a renaissance can be seen as an expression of a distrust of ambiguity and a need for orientation. Rather than rejecting such tendencies, the theoretical and practical-didactic work should be oriented towards a way of history-mediation which enables individuals and social groups to participate as active citizens in a complex world.

References

- Assmann, Aleida (2004): "Four Formats of Memory: From Individual to Collective Constructions of the Past". In: Christian Emden/David Midgley (eds.), *Cultural Memory and Historical Consciousness in the German-Speaking World since 1500*, Peter Lang, Bern.
- Boëthius, Maria-Pia (1991): *Heder och samvete: Sverige och andra världskriget*, Norstedt, Stockholm.
- Bryld, Claus/Warring, Annete (1998): *Besættelsestiden som kollektiv erindring. Historie- og traditionsforvaltning af krig og besættelse 1945-97*, Roskilde Universitetsforlag.
- Burleigh, Michael (2010): *Moral Combat: A History of World War II*, HarperPress, London.
- Eriksen, Anne (1995): *Det var noe annet under krigen*, Pax, Oslo.
- Erll, Astrid/Nünning, Ansgar (eds.) (2008): *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.
- Fure, Odd-Bjørn (1997): *Kampen mot glemselen: kunnskapsvakuum i mediasamfunnet*, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
- Grimnes, Ole Christian (1990): "Historieskrivingen om okkupasjonen". In: *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift* 2/1990, pp. 108-121.
- Levy, Daniel/Sznajder, Natan (2005): *The Holocaust and Memory in a Global Age*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

