

5.6.4 Conclusion

It was the aim of this case study to examine how the category of sub- and periurban space in Luxembourg and in the border region is specifically constituted by its inhabitants. The subjective assessments that emerge in the spatial classifications of place of residence correspond at first glance to the 'objective' features with which these locations are characterized in the professional discourse. At second glance, however, these categorizations are relatively scattered, very segmented and greatly dependent on the local context. As far as statements are made about residential satisfaction, these are all positive, consistent with the research on choice of residential location and motivations (see Beckmann *et al.* 2006). Close ties are confirmed with respect to the social context. But these are not necessarily explainable in the spatial context. So the question whether there is something like a space-related identity or identification on the basis of this evaluation has to remain unanswered. We should here point out the special importance of infrastructures: it is only thanks to the high degree of motorization and the good spatial development that the dispersed life in the sub- and periurban space has become feasible and attractive.

This picture seems to confirm the afore-mentioned tendency towards dissolution of sharp contours of 'urban' and 'rural' spaces also for the area examined here. This yields at least two points for further discussion: first, one would need to clarify what the concomitant hybridization of spatial contexts actually signifies. Secondly, we have to ask ourselves how meaningful are spatial categorizations at all, in particular when we are dealing with such complex questions as 'identity': "Geographical spaces are now overlapped by many and varied social and cultural ideas, requiring a reconceptualisation of space as a socially produced set of manifolds [...], better recognised as territories of becoming able to produce new potentials rather than as fixed territories of identity" (Clore 2011: 568).

5.7 REMEMBERING THE SECOND WORLD WAR IN LUXEMBOURG AND THE BORDER REGIONS OF ITS THREE NEIGHBOURS

Eva Maria Klos and Benno Sönke Schulz

In 2006, the cultural studies scholar Aleida Assmann stated with regard to the Second World War and the Germans: "We live in the shadow of a past that in manifold ways continues to make itself felt in the present and haunt later generations with emotional dissonance and moral dilemmas"¹¹⁴ (Assmann 2006: 159). The Nazi period is still present in German and European everyday life – be it

¹¹⁴ | Personal translation of: "Wir leben im Schatten einer Vergangenheit, die in vielfältiger Form in die Gegenwart weiter hineinwirkt und die Nachgeborenen mit emotionaler Dissonanz und moralischem Dilemma heimsucht."

in the form of memorial days, representations in schoolbooks or in the popularity of 'histotainment' in TV programmes and on the internet. The media, school lessons, as well as family conversations play important parts in the ways in which people form specific historical knowledge (see Welzer *et al.* 2002: 9, referencing Wineburg 2001: 181), but they position themselves very differently in regard to memories as conveyed by the media or the family.

This diversity of stances is particularly accentuated in border regions: different countries exist side by side in terms of specific memory cultures, while at the same time being in direct relation to and exchange with one another; in border regions, the individual is consequently more intimately confronted with the view of the 'other' and the view on the 'others' in day-to-day life. Our case study takes this lived experience as its point of departure in order to examine the following two questions¹¹⁵: What are the identitary attributions that people from Luxembourg and the surrounding border regions of France, Belgium and Germany respectively come and came into contact with through verbalized accounts of the Second World War? And what is the stance adopted towards these accounts?¹¹⁶ The case study aims to shed light on identity constructions in the border regions articulated in this (tension) field.

Empirically, this study is based on newspaper articles from the years 1950 to 2013¹¹⁷ that deal with the invasion of neutral Luxembourg by Nazi forces on 10 May 1940. Articles of the *Luxemburger Wort*, the Luxembourg regional edition of the French paper *Le Républicain Lorrain* and the Belgian paper *La Meuse* as well as the German paper *Trierischer Volksfreund* constitute the sources¹¹⁸ used to initially reconstruct the coverage of 10 May 1940 since 1950. Secondly, identitary attributions as related by print media are considered from a historical perspective,

115 | We would like to thank Professor Norbert Franz for his extensive conceptional preparation of the study and critical comments.

116 | Drawing on Reckinger 2013: 12.

117 | We can make no claim to comprehensiveness regarding the selection of the articles, but we have tried to ensure a balanced differentiation in terms of region and period. The newspapers were checked for reports on 10 May 1940 around the time of the anniversaries (until 1960 annually, after that in five-year periods). One should note the Catholic and conservative leaning of the newspapers chosen for Luxembourg (*Luxemburger Wort*) as well as the temporal limitation for *Le Républicain Lorrain*, which only began publishing a regional edition for Luxembourg in 1961. That newspaper articles have a relevance for the everyday life of the residents in the border regions is confirmed by the representative survey conducted for this volume, according to which 92 % of the respondents in Luxembourg state that they read a daily newspaper once in a while (University of Luxembourg, IDENT2 2012/2013 – quantitative survey).

118 | Our thanks go to Danielle Werner (*Bibliothèque nationale de Luxembourg*) for making it possible for us to obtain comprehensive access to this material.

as the newspaper articles are here treated as a reflection of publicly relevant topics and are seen as conveying collectively shared values and moods and, hence as implying subjectifications. 10 May 1940 was chosen as a specific date, as it presented coverage of a direct violation of a border – a point in time when the survey areas' situation was charged with tension, due to which communally held values are observed as having emerged particularly strongly.

This methodological approach is complemented on a third level by the evaluation of the representative survey (University of Luxembourg, IDENT₂ 2012/2013 – quantitative survey) that focuses on current memory practices. One should, however, note here that the preset response options presented by the survey have the consequence of preliminary structuring the process of remembering, as it only enquires about partial and specific aspects. With the help of the survey, we aim to establish which people regard the Second World War as playing an important role in the construction of their memories and which of the queried contents they remember. Subsequently, we will discuss possible individual stances taken towards the established attributions (subjectifications) which are empirically noticeable in the respondents' behaviour as related to the questions posed.

5.7.1 The Invasion on 10 May 1940 and the Occupation as Represented in the Print Media from 1950 until Today

“There was no cloud in the sky on 10 May 1940. For us it was a day for dying, for Hitler, however, the chosen hour for victory”¹¹⁹ (*Luxemburger Wort* 1950: 1). These are the words chosen in 1950 by the *Luxemburger Wort* to commemorate the day of the invasion when German military pushed across the border of the neutral Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, an invasion that constituted a clear breach of international law. The article failed to mention the neighbouring states of Belgium and France as well as the Netherlands, which were further targets of this military operation (*Fall Gelb* – ‘Case Yellow’). Nevertheless, this quote can be regarded as typical of the journalistic tone adopted in regard to coverage about the Second World War published in the papers of the surveyed border regions outside Germany during the 1950s, because it contrasts the emotional state of the local population with that of the Nazi regime. “My homeland was violated by a ruthless intruder”¹²⁰, wrote a Luxembourg author in the Belgian paper *La Meuse* (1952: 2). Here, the contrast between the big and brutal German aggressor and the small and peace-loving Grand Duchy emerges as a continuously recurring theme. Not only the prose of the corresponding articles about 10 May 1940, but also their outer appearance and their placement within the newspaper divulge cohesive similarities in the 1950s. They mostly take the form of relatively short articles, often adopting a very

119 | Personal translation of: “Kein Wölkchen trübte den Himmel am 10. Mai 1940. Für uns war es ein Tag zum Sterben, für Hitler aber die auserwählte Stunde zum Siegen.”

120 | Personal translation of: “Ma patrie a été violentée par un intrus sans scrupule.”

emotional style, and placed on the newspapers' front or second page. A further feature of the articles' content organization in this period is the emphasis on the unbending will of Luxembourg's population during German occupation and their commitment to a free and independent state of Luxembourg. Frequently, 10 May is also used as an opportunity to comment on the geopolitical situation in the Cold War period. The *Luxemburger Wort* in particular draws a parallel between the 10 May and the perceived threat of the Soviet Union on several different occasions. The impact of the 1950s newspaper articles can thus be seen as a chiefly emotional one, an effect that will surely have reinforced the transmission and fixation in the memory of the readers.¹²¹

By the early 1960s, the formerly rather short pieces published on the occasion of anniversaries were increasingly replaced by longer documentaries. Series of articles such as "History of the War 1939-1945 – Today 20 years ago"¹²² (*La Meuse* 1960a: 4) or "When the Allies opened the gates"¹²³ (*Le Républicain* 1965: 18) now no longer commemorate single events, but rather present an analytical treatment of war events. In addition, through continuous coverage, the newspapers *La Meuse* and *Le Républicain* aimed to publish their articles in a format that allowed the reader to collect them, so that in the end they could be used as a book (see *La Meuse* 1960b: 5). The daily routine of reading is here expanded by the opportunity to archive material. The articles in the *Luxemburger Wort* also increased in length, while common journalistic practice used the date of invasion as serving for the entire period of occupation. The 1960s, however, saw a decline in this detailed and partly documentary-analytical form of remembering; with the exception of major anniversaries, we see an increasing reduction of the obligatory text in favour of a photographic documentation of functions such as wreath-laying ceremonies.

The events of the Second World War are also increasingly interwoven with each other in the papers examined. This is explicitly evident in the connection of two dates, namely, 10 May 1940 and 8 May 1945. The articles concerned covering victory celebrations or reunions of associations suggest that the events of 10 May have begun to lessen in importance in the light of Germany's defeat in 1945. Moreover, by the 1970s, with the commemoration of the Schuman plan announced on 9 May 1950, the unifying European perspective had gained greater relevance. Leading up to the 1980s, we can note a distinct decrease in the quantity of articles about the *Fall Gelb*. In the 1990s, by contrast, there is again an increase that can be explained by the so-called 'history boom' (see Macdonald 2013: 3f.; Assmann 2008: 61ff.), particularly on the 50th anniversary, on 10 May 1990.

121 | The predominance of the emotional transmission over a cognitive one is emphasized by Harald Welzer *et al.* (2002: 200f.) who studied family memories.

122 | Personal translation of: "Histoire de la Guerre 1939-1945 – Il y a aujourd'hui 20 ans."

123 | Personal translation of: "Quand les Alliés ouvrirent les portes."

The analysis of the articles relating to 10 May 1940 shows two major tendencies that apply to the entire survey area: firstly, by the 1960s, the invasion is no longer commemorated every year. Around this time, it is only at important anniversaries that papers run articles on the topic. Their spatial position within the paper also changes and disappears almost completely from the front pages by the 1970s. Secondly, the articles published on the occasion of anniversaries are more differentiated and analytical and show a larger contextualization of the topic of the *Fall Gelb*. From the 1960s onwards, newspaper readers in the border region are thus provided with historical and factual knowledge in journalistic packaging, while the emotional link has all but disappeared. Nevertheless, the trend of a decreasing number of articles about 10 May 1940 does not go unnoticed by Luxembourg's population: recently, readers have voiced their concern that history may be in danger of being forgotten.¹²⁴

5.7.2 ‘Border Violators’ and ‘Violated’: The Representation of Perpetrators and Victims in the Print Media

A comparison of the newspaper articles reveals certain recurring topoi. In the first three decades after the Second World War, the *Trierischer Volksfreund* simply ignores the subject of the invasion of Luxembourg and Germany's other western neighbours and instead frequently emphasizes the suffering of the German population during the bombing of Trier in the winter of 1944. The border violation is – at best – mentioned in passing in general articles about the Second World War and German readers are addressed using an imagery of victimhood that centrestages Germany's own suffering.

During the first two decades of the post-war period, the analysis of the newspapers of the western part of the examined border regions displays a distinct contrast between images of perpetrator and victim. This is reflected particularly in the description of the behaviour of German soldiers: “The people of Luxembourg looked on with apprehension as the first unaccustomed grey motor cyclists with the cruel faces and the repulsive helmets clattered past their houses”¹²⁵ (*Luxemburger Wort* 1950: 1).¹²⁶ The border violation is not only condemned as a breach of international law, but described as an invasion of destitute starvelings

124 | This is for instance mentioned in the *Tageblatt* which does not belong to the source corpus but nevertheless represents an important medium in the border region (see *Tageblatt* 2006: 58).

125 | Personal translation of: “Das luxemburgische Volk zitterte und sah mit schüchternen Blicken die ersten ungewohnten grauen Motorradler mit den grausamen Gesichtern unter den abstoßenden Helmen an ihren Häusern vorüberrattern.”

126 | There is perhaps one other group, referred to with the abstract and not further explained term of ‘the traitor’ (*Luxemburger Wort* 1950: 1), which was identified within Luxembourg's population, otherwise marked by a ubiquitous expression of cohesion.

in a prosperous country: a “march of the hungry into paradise, an exodus of the unbeckoned ‘have-nots’ into the realms of wealth and plenty”¹²⁷ (ibid.). Pillage at the cost of the civilian population is therefore, besides the loss of a free and sovereign native country, a further aspect of the topicalized image of victimhood. Finally, however, the accounts of the fatalities among the civilian population of 10 May and the fate of the deportees from the Minette region carry considerably more weight. Only from the 1960s onwards are the latter two aspects addressed more frequently, probably provoked by the interest of the public and the increasing depth and length of the articles. By contrast, the fate of Luxembourg’s Jewish population remains almost unmentioned until the 1980s. In the 1950s and 1960s, a very clear differentiation between victims and perpetrators can be observed: values such as humanity and freedom are advocated to the readers – particularly by emphasizing a contrast to the inhuman and despotic Nazi Germany – while at the same time projecting an image of the country’s own image of victimhood.

In subsequent decades, this more or less clearly structured binary code of victims and perpetrators became more differentiated: as the Second World War grew more distant in time, we can not only observe a more specific identification of different kinds of victim groups (e.g. ‘forced recruits’), concurrently, the perpetrator attributions became more diverse. The generalization and part-demonization of the German military as soldiers that bring only suffering and death began to disintegrate and was contrasted in particular in personal narratives with more positive accounts. One of the individual reports that it was “thanks to the sympathy of some *Wehrmacht* officers”¹²⁸ [...] (*Luxemburger Wort* 1965: 20) that the evacuation could be brought to a good conclusion. Moreover, there was a clear departure from the notion, prevalent in the 1950s and 60s, that the entire population of Luxembourg had experienced the invasion as terrifying. The articles of subsequent years focus in detail on the personal experiences of Luxembourgish nationals and their different attitudes towards the German occupiers. In recent years, the distinction between perpetrator and victim attributions is thus no longer exclusively established in accordance with nationality.

Nevertheless, the memory of the Second World War in all the newspapers remains predominantly national. In their regional editions for Luxembourg, the papers *La Meuse* and *Le Républicain* address connecting, binational topics such as the friendship established between Luxembourg and France, a factor that was reinforced, among other things, by France taking in evacuees from the Minette region. But in comparison with the front-page coverage of the celebrations of 8 May in Paris, these articles prove only marginally significant. As to the German

127 | Personal translation of: “[...] Marsch der Hungrigen ins Schlaraffenland, ein Auszug der ungerufenen ‘Habenichtse’ in die Regionen des Wohlstandes und des Überflusses.”

128 | Personal translation of: “[...] dem Verständnis einzelner Wehrmachtsoffiziere” [zu verdanken].

coverage, it was only after the 1980s that a more compelling mention of the fate of the population on the other side of the Our, Sauer and Mosel can be observed. Before that time, there is little evidence of identification with the role of the perpetrator regarding 10 May 1940, since the articles reported only in a very implicit manner on the *Fall Gelb*. The newspaper articles published outside Germany generally convey a perception of the border that emphasizes the notion of transgression and – particularly in the first years after the war – affirms the border as a (moral) dissociation from Germany.

5.7.3 Remembering the Second World War Today

If one subscribes to the view adopted by some scholars that the differentiation “between victor and vanquished, on the one hand, and perpetrators and victims, on the other, [constitutes] an essential basis for the comparison of nations and their problems in dealing with their past”¹²⁹ (Assmann 2006: 70), then this differentiation proves helpful for the survey area under review here as well: in the examined border regions, the course of the Second World War created the situation of positioning the victims of the invasion as victors. The side of the perpetrator on the other hand, Nazi Germany, was seen as coinciding with the vanquished. Particularly from the 1950s until the 1970s, this reversal of power received a great deal of attention in the newspapers: it is to a large extent within this framework of remembering, influenced by the variable binary code of ‘victim/perpetrator’, that people position themselves towards attributions. In what follows, we will examine which forms of subjectivity manifest themselves in current remembering within the border regions of Luxembourg, France, Belgium and Germany. Here the representative survey serves to shed light on two fundamental questions of current remembering: In the lives of which people currently living in the examined border regions do the memories of the Second World War play a role and what are their sociodemographic features? And what stance do they take with regard to established attributions? The aim here is to reveal identity constructions articulated in the practices of remembering.

Who remembers which contents? The answer to this question gives an indication about which memories the Second World War still plays a role in. Here we can observe a number of common denominators across the political and territorial borders of the survey area: mostly people in the age group of 65 and older display an interest in active memorializing, they most frequently show an interest in memorial events of the neighbouring regions¹³⁰ and are furthermore

129 | Personal translation of: “Zwischen Siegern und Besiegten einerseits und Tätern und Opfern andererseits [...] besteht] eine unentbehrliche Grundlage für den Vergleich von Nationen und ihren Problemen im Umgang mit ihrer Vergangenheit.”

130 | A surprising exception is Rhineland-Palatinate, where the 16 to 24 year-olds show most interest.

the most numerous in stressing the importance of remembering the time of Nazism (see University of Luxembourg, IDENT2 2012/2013 – quantitative survey). These findings clearly show the connection between remembering and personal experience: personal experiences of the war or growing up in a postwar period are shaped by the coming to terms with the aftermath of the war and provide an access to remembering differing from that of following generations, because here it is not only transmission, for instance via print media, that informs the construction of remembering, but primarily personal experience.

Moreover, one can observe a gender-specific manner of remembering, with men more frequently than women showing an interest in active ways of remembering in the form of memorial events of the neighbouring regions. In addition – looking at the survey area in its entirety – it is especially university graduates who confirm that it is necessary to remember the period of Nazism. This might be explained by the fact that this section of the population has acquired a particularly wide interpretational knowledge through continuous access to educational material about history in general and Nazism in particular.

Regarding the content of remembering, we can formulate two theses: they refer primarily to the victim side of the aforementioned binary code, and – considering the survey results of the entire survey area – the border indicated in and by the newspaper articles is ever-present. Within the German border regions, the memories of the aftermath of the war occupy a special place. In the Saarland, family memories of flight¹³¹ are particularly vivid. Also the loss of relatives is most frequently remembered in the Saarland and in Rhineland-Palatinate. A glance at the historical background here shows that memory constructions trace an image of historically proven reality: the population of the German border region was greatly affected by war events, particularly towards the end of the Second World War, because “cities close to the border such as Aachen, Trier and Saarbrücken as well as their environs turned into direct military combat zones”¹³² (Düwell 1997: 97).

Memories of Nazi persecution¹³³ dominate on the other side of the German border: almost a fifth of the respondents from Luxembourg and the border regions of France and Belgium state that family members were interned in a concentration camp (in the Saarland, by contrast, these are 3 % and in Rhineland-Palatinate 6 %). Also experiences of emigration and exile are most frequently remembered in Luxembourg and in the border regions of France and Belgium. What is surprising is that the

131 | Deportations were included in the question: “During the Second World War, members of my family were affected by deportation or flight.” (University of Luxembourg, IDENT2 2012/2013 – quantitative survey).

132 | Personal translation of: [denn] “grenznahe Städte wie Aachen, Trier und Saarbrücken sowie ihr Umland [wurden] direkt zum militärischen Kampfgebiet.”

133 | Respondents were asked about internment in a concentration camp, about emigration and exile.

survey results for Luxembourg reflect no particular memory of the evacuations in the Minette region that were featured in the newspaper articles.

The results show that the partition of the survey area by the border between the German and the neighbouring regions to the west, as indicated in the first step of this case study, remains prevalent. The memory contents do not, however, completely match the contents of the newspaper articles.¹³⁴ We can therefore identify a process of remembering that runs contrary to the print media: the border residents thus do not adopt the newspapers' ready-made explanations and identitary attributions, it is rather subjectivations that comprise a substantial part of the constitution of the subject. Here the border drawn by the survey results separates the differently experienced war years.

So far, we have shown that personal memories frequently contradict the discourses in the print media, particularly with respect to victims' memories. Patterns of desirability are a common feature in the newspaper articles: the victim as a moral victor is a desirable transmission that is both ever-present and implied. The more powerful party in this constellation has *per se* a stronger interest in visualizing the past than the perpetrator whose ideas and actions were discredited. For this reason, one can assume that the practices of remembering draw on the implicit values and patterns of interpretation of the victims' memory, while memories of perpetratorship are not included. But which subjectivations emerge in the respondents' response behaviour?

The interest of the respondents from the Saarland and Rhineland-Palatinate in participating in memorial events of neighbouring regions is only marginally smaller than in the border regions of Belgium, France and Luxembourg. The relevance of the subject 'Nazism' for the present, however, is assessed very differently: in Belgium, 84 % of the respondents believe that it is necessary to remember the time of Nazism, in Luxembourg and France it is 83 % – in Rhineland-Palatinate, by contrast, only 68 % and in the Saarland 65 % of respondents gave an affirmative response to this question. Here, the affirmation follows the border indicated in the newspapers, which stresses the fact that the population in the survey area absorbed the experiences of the war period in diverse ways. Queried directly about the relevance of remembering, they chose very different responses among the range of options presented in the questionnaires.

It was possible to clarify the reasons for these differences by putting the very direct question to the respondents whether they had any memory of perpetratorship in their own family: an equally small number of people in the examined border regions remember that family members were involved in

134 | One should note the problem inherent in the content-related comparison between transmission and survey results; newspaper articles about 10 May 1940 contain hardly any information about Nazi persecution. Here a thematic expansion of the source corpus of the newspapers would suggest itself, as well as evaluating the survey using additional socio-demographic criteria.

executions. The vehemence with which this memory was expressed and thus the form of subjectivation¹³⁵ of the respondents is, however, articulated differently: while 74 to 78 % of the respondents from the border regions of France, Belgium and Luxembourg assertively answered with “no” (no family members were involved in executions) and 15 to 18 % stated “I don’t know”, 29 % in Saarland and 23 % in Rhineland-Palatinate admitted that they had no knowledge with regard to this question. Concerning the memory of perpetratorship in their own family, the respondents of the German border regions are thus more guarded in their statements. This guardedness can be seen as related to a feeling of shame and repression, but can also be tied to ignorance, because the issue does not feature in the relevant family accounts. Yet both explanations point to different ways of processing these memories in border regions: the observation that on the German side, memories of victimhood are clearly expressed while at the same time, memories of perpetratorship tend to be more vague could suggest that here various codes overlap. Thus, many Germans refused to adopt the attribution of perpetrator made in the border-region newspapers of Belgium, France and Luxembourg. On the contrary, in the Federal Republic of Germany after the Second World War, there prevailed “over many years an attitude of repression which can be described as ‘self-victimization’ and which makes the own perpetratorship recede behind the self-perception as a victim of Nazi seduction, Anglo-American air raids and the arbitrariness of the Soviet victors”¹³⁶ (Sabrow 2006: 134). Thus, in the German case, there was a difference between the forms of subjectivation and the way in which “individuals are addressed as subjects by discourses”¹³⁷ (Bührmann/Schneider 2007). In Luxembourg, by contrast, the media addressed subjectifications that – in their attributions of victimhood – were easier to integrate into subjectivations. Hence, on both sides of the indicated border, we see different interpretations of the position of the victims, as on the German side they were influenced more strongly by ambiguities in people’s own (family) biographies. These ambiguities are evident today in the respondents’ response behaviour.

The fact that memories are relevant for an understanding of history is confirmed by a connection in the memory of the respondents: cross tabellations

135 | ‘Form of subjectivation’ here means the “[...] self-interpretation, the self-experience and the self-perception of individuals and thus their self-understanding in the sense of an ‘own identity’” (Bührmann/Schneider 2007). (Personal translation of: “Selbstdeutung, das Selbsterleben und die Selbstwahrnehmung der Individuen und damit ihr Selbstverständnis im Sinne der ‘eigenen Identität’”).

136 | Personal translation of: [herrschte in der Bundesrepublik vielmehr] “[...] über viele Jahre eine Verdrängungshaltung vor, die sich als ‘Selbstviktimsierung’ bezeichnen lässt und die die eigene Täterschaft hinter der Selbstwahrnehmung als Opfer brauner Verführung, angloamerikanischer Bombardierung und sowjetischer Siegerwillkür zurücktreten ließ.”

137 | Personal translation of: “[...] wie Individuen von Diskursen als ‘Subjekte’ adressiert werden.”

have shown that people with memories of victimhood are particularly frequently of the opinion that the Greater Region has a common history. This connection is not evident with people who have memories of perpetratorship in their family.¹³⁸ We can therefore observe a connection between remembering and current positioning in reference to the survey area.

5.7.4 Conclusion

We have shown that practices of remembering in the border regions of Luxembourg, France, Belgium and Germany take on different forms. The presented source corpus allowed us to make a range of further differentiations. This is particularly advantageous in view of the *en bloc* treatment of Luxembourg, France and Belgium conducted here. The approach chosen in this case study represents one of many possibilities of defining identities in border regions in relation to memory.

The evaluation of newspaper articles has shown the distinctiveness of the war experience separating the Rhineland-Palatinate and the Saarland from the survey regions further to the west. In Luxembourg, the border violation of 10 May 1940 is permanently inscribed in the collective memory, while in the French and Belgian border regions, it is addressed in a less intensive but similar way. The survey was also instrumental in making the border visible by how past events are remembered today in various forms of subjectivation; it thus not only divides the memory, transported via the media, of differently experienced war years, but also reacts to the alignment with different "subject models"¹³⁹ (Reckwitz 2008a: 139): while the respondents of all regions covered by the survey can identify with the remembered representation of victimhood, the constitution of the subject remains vague when the delicate issue of remembering perpetratorship in the family is addressed. These observations are particularly evident on the German side of the border; the emotional dissonance mentioned earlier, as well as moral dilemmas of the next generation (see Assmann 2006: 159) feature prominently here.

It was also illustrated how the memory of victimhood is dominant within the binary code 'victim/perpetrator', as the former comes to define a culturally desirable subject model. This means that in the examined articles it is primarily values connected with the victims' side that are emphasized: freedom, independence and humanity are implicitly conveyed as features of the victims (and thus ultimately of the victors). The processing of these attributions, as informed and impacted by, amongst others, constantly changing public interpretations of the past, group memories and forms of subjectivation continuously takes on new forms.

138 | The empirical data base is very small, due to the few recorded memories of perpetrators: only 67 of the 2,279 respondents state that members of their family had been involved in executions and 102 respondents remember that family members had been involved in lootings.

139 | Personal translation of: "Subjektmodelle."

This case study has shown that the border location is actually the special feature of the survey area: in daily life, it is not necessarily solely people's own memory that is relevant, but also the manner in which they view the neighbouring regions and how they are viewed by their neighbours. It was only possible to bring to light the different forms of subjectivation in contrasting the different border regions. The newspaper articles in particular have helped to show to which degree the view of the 'other' and of one's own role can be subject to change – a result that once again points to the instability of identity models in general.

Sources

La Meuse (1952), VELA: "10 Mai. Mir Letzeburger önner ons", edition of 10.5.1952, 2.

La Meuse (1960a), n. p.: "Histoire de la guerre 1939-1945. 10 mai 1940", edition of 10.5.1960, 4.

La Meuse (1960b), n. p.: "Histoire de la guerre 1939-1945", edition of 11.5.1960, 5.

Le Républicain Lorrain (1965), n. p.: "Quand les Alliés ouvrirerent les portes", edition of 2.5.1965, 18.

Luxemburger Wort (1950), n.p.: "Erinnerung", edition of 10.5.1950, 1.

Luxemburger Wort (1965), Jacoby, Al: "Das Generalkommissariat für Evakuierte", edition of 8.5.1965, 20.

Tageblatt (2006), Faber, M.: "Ne pas oublier le 10 mai 1940", edition of 30.5.2006, 58.

5.8 BEYOND LUXEMBOURG. SPACE AND IDENTITY CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF CROSS-BORDER RESIDENTIAL MIGRATION

Christian Wille, Gregor Schnuer, Elisabeth Boesen

This case study examines the relationship between constructions of space and identity in Luxembourg and the surrounding border regions. A particular focus are cross-border residential migrants, that is, people who have moved from Luxembourg into the neighbouring border regions. This group is compared with other groups in Luxembourg and in the border region with respect to their space- and group-related attitudes and practices. In addition, it serves as a reference category in the sense that the attitudes of the interviewees towards the phenomenon of residential migration provide insights about their self-positionings and group-related identity constructions.

The flow of residential migrants from Luxembourg has been continuous for the last decade and has entailed some considerable structural changes for the