Introduction

Educational Media, Textbooks, and Postcolonial Relocations of Memory Politics in Europe

Eckhardt Fuchs and Marcus Otto

Eckhardt Fuchs is the deputy director of the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research and a professor of the history of education and comparative education at the Technical University of Braunschweig, Germany.

Marcus Otto is a research fellow at the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research in Braunschweig, Germany.

Cultures of remembrance or memory cultures have constituted an interdisciplinary field of research since the 1990s. While this field has achieved a high level of internal differentiation, it generally views its remit as one that encompasses “all imaginable forms of conscious remembrance of historical events, personalities, and processes.”¹ In contrast to this comprehensive and therefore rather vague definition of “culture of remembrance” or “memory culture”, we use the term “politics of memory” here and in what follows in a more specific sense, in order to emphasize “the moment at which the past is made functional use of in the service of present-day purposes, to the end of shaping an identity founded in history.”² Viewing the issue in terms of discourse analysis, we may progress directly from this definition to identify and investigate politics of memory as a discourse of strategic resignifications of the past as formulated in history and implemented in light of contemporary identity politics. While the nation-state remains a central point of reference for the politics of memory,³ the field is by no means limited to official forms of the engagement of states with their past. In other words, it does not relate exclusively to the official character of a state’s policy on history. Instead, it also encompasses the strategic politics of memory and identity pursued by other stakeholders in a society, a politics that frequently, but not always, engages explicitly with state-generated and state-sanctioned memory politics. Thus, the politics of memory is currently unfolding as a discourse of ongoing, highly charged debate surrounding collective self-descriptions in modern, “culturally” multilayered, and heterogeneous societies, where self-descriptions draw on historical developments and events that are subject to conflict.

Such collective controversies surrounding the politics of memory are currently, in a number of European nation-states and in Europe as a whole, becoming particularly visible via these states' increasing awareness that they are de facto postcolonial societies of immigration. It is therefore not surprising that postcolonial politics of memory have advanced to take on the status, which they have held for some time now, of a new discursive topos in various national memory cultures and within an emerging European memory culture.⁴ This is particularly the case for European nation-states with a colonial past. For a long time, colonialism barely registered in the politics of memory that were influenced by discourses of the nation-state, which found their exemplary expression in Pierre Nora's "sites of memory" (*lieux de mémoire*).⁵ Now, by contrast, not least as a result of academic history's reception of the discipline of postcolonial studies,⁶ Europe's colonial and imperial past has evolved into a new focus for the continuously expanding field of research on memory culture and the politics of memory.⁷

While adopting a postcolonial view of Europe, we proceed from the now well-known observation within this field that colonialism, and the gradual development of societies' attempts to deal with this chapter of Europe's past, have a long-term impact on the societies of erstwhile colonial powers and on formerly colonized societies. The legacy of colonialism therefore challenges the way in which both European nation-states with colonial legacies and Europe per se perceive themselves in the present.⁸ For some time, this impact has been felt in the shape of heightened interest in the way in which societies and their public discourse deal with the colonial past in light of the emergent reality of postcolonial societies of immigration in a number of European countries. This increased interest highlights the social relevance of these questions. It is apparent that the colonial past represents both an overarching European experience, at least in part, and a challenge to self-descriptions framed within contexts that are intimately linked to the nation-state. Furthermore, each society's engagement with its colonial legacy is the site of diverse emergent arenas of societal conflict, related in particular to the assertion of national identity and to competing, conflicting memories arising not least from postcolonial immigration and from the return, or reentry, of the imperial differentiation between the metropolis and the colonies into the metropolises themselves.⁹

This special issue of the *Journal of Educational Media, Memory, and Society* is the first academic publication to locate recent research on the politics of memory in the context of school education or, more specifically, in that of history textbooks and other forms of educational media used in schools. Such a focus is important because many current discourses and debates concerning the politics of memory refer specifically to representations of the colonial past in textbooks (and other educational media). Schools as

institutions, and the educational media they make use of, carry out a central function in debates conducted within societies and the academic arena. Schools and educational media have an authoritative role in the transmission of knowledge that is deemed socially relevant; they are likewise creators of meaning, that is, they appropriate and transmit history in the context of the present and future, progressing from the contemporary here and now. Schools in general, and the educational media they use in particular, mediate politics of memory in at least two ways. One consists in the fact that textbooks contain an expression of the self-image of the nation-state, characterized by the representation of national history, which students are required to acquire. The other consists of textbooks' performative communication, as media of institutionalized teaching, of an individual and collective "interpellation"¹⁰ in the name of an overarching collective identity, which is often primarily that of the nation. These circumstances point directly back to societal self-descriptions and to the question of how the overarching subject of representation, be it the specific nation in question or Europe as a civilization, is to be defined in relation to the rest of the world and to the other, and thus, accordingly, in light of the colonial past. All this means that educational media go beyond merely acting as mediators of memory culture; they are subjects of concrete politics of memory reflecting and mapping the current constitution and status of postcolonial memory politics. This applies particularly to textbooks because they are directly subject to political control in two ways. First, their content is aligned to state-prescribed curricula. Second, in many countries they are required to undergo processes of state approval. Therefore, when questions related to national memory enter the political arena, they impact directly or indirectly on the depiction of such memory in textbooks. The articles in this issue by Marcus Otto, Susanne Grindel, and Lars Müller in particular demonstrate this influence.

Any approach to the politics of memory via educational media used in schools must take into account official or state-sanctioned national policies on history and not lose sight of further, conflicting perspectives on politics of memory within a society. In this context, France appears as an ideal starting point on account of the intensity of public debate there about state-sanctioned politics of memory, exemplified in its so-called memory laws.¹¹ France represents a paradigmatic arena of societal conflicts, waged in a number of different configurations, which we could summarize as postcolonial conflicts of interpretation and identification in societies of immigration; they are conflicts that center on which and whose history is remembered, transmitted, and passed on to future generations via a range of media of national self-description, and on how this takes place. These conflicts manifest themselves particularly strongly in schools, educational media, and textbooks, whose traditional remit in France is the twofold task of furthering republican inclusion and providing a representation of

the nation.¹² The issue of what is incorporated into a politics of memory institutionalized in this way and how this takes place refers to the question of who, historically and in the present day, is deemed part or not part of the nation and in which conditions. This notwithstanding, one must inquire into the degree to which these decidedly controversial postcolonial politics of memory are not merely an expression of the much-cited French national exception (*exception française*). They have rather moved beyond this to become, in France and in other European countries with a colonial past, a highly active, inflammable topos within memory politics in individual nations, with the potential to acquire overarching significance in Europe; to represent, in other words, a collective “European site of memory.”¹³ In this context, school as an institution, and the educational media and textbooks it employs, appears to localize and concentrate the current reality of a society empirically found to be culturally heterogeneous, thus reflecting particularly vividly the postcolonial resignifications and relocations to which European politics of memory are subject.

Proceeding from such postcolonial views about present-day Europe and the potential challenge posed by a postcolonial condition¹⁴ as it finds particular expression in textbooks and educational media, the articles in this special issue turn their attention to a range of aspects, discourses, and conflicts surrounding postcolonial politics of memory, which they illustrate by way of selected issues and examples. The common thread of the articles in this issue concerns the extent to which (history) textbooks and other educational media are currently the site of postcolonial resignifications and relocations of European politics of memory, which would make it apposite to claim that Europe finds itself in a genuinely postcolonial condition.

Marcus Otto’s approach to this question enquires whether decolonization since the 1960s in France (the nation that has seen what are probably the most impassioned, polarized debates on the colonial past in politics, education, and the public arena) has been made the subject of discourse as a fundamental challenge to societal self-descriptions and to an emerging postcolonial politics of memory in the knowledge transmitted in textbooks. Taking these debates as his starting point, Otto analyzes the extent to which decolonization and its representations impacted and continue to impact textbooks’ content. Beginning chronologically with the reforms to curricula and history textbooks carried out in the 1960s, Otto examines the changing content of textbooks in the context of various societal discourses from the perspective of systems theory, which proceeds from the diverse couplings of societal function systems, including politics, mass media, academia, the public arena, and the education system, all of which are highly relevant to textbooks. In the 1960s, the dominance of national and political history within textbooks, under the influence of the so-called *Annales* school, ceded to a critical history of

civilizations, within which textbooks figured decolonization as an expression of a global crisis shaking Western civilization in the wake of the two world wars. Since then, social modernization in France has provided the backdrop to a gradual reinterpretation of decolonization, which has been heavily influenced by the social sciences, and (especially in the 1970s and 1980s) which foregrounded the political creation of the Third World as a concomitant aspect of decolonization. The structural North-South divide arising from this shift, modernization in France, and the semantic category of (under)development thus came to form the cornerstones of a discourse of decolonization that had assumed profound ambivalence and that began from the outset of the 1980s to manifest itself in new curricula and textbooks; these, from the time they first appeared, attracted accusations of dismantling the national narrative into categories drawn from the social sciences or even from Marxism. This was followed by fundamental curriculum reform, initialized at the close of the 1980s, which ushered in a return to prominence of the “national story” referred to in French as the *roman national*. Furthermore, representations of decolonization increasingly became explicit bones of contention within society, with debate on the memory of the Algerian War representing these conflicts’ most significant origin. Following this was a focus on the consequences of decolonization in the former metropolitan space, such as postcolonial immigration and the perception of a crisis in republican integration. Otto closes his article by using the vigorous debate in French society about the nation’s colonial past and its representation in the knowledge transmitted by textbooks to argue that the politico-epistemological challenges of decolonization are ubiquitous in present-day France in the sense of a postcolonial condition.

A number of the themes raised in Otto’s study, which demonstrates the degree to which history textbooks have become not only media, but also objects of postcolonial politics of memory in France, are continued in the article by Susanne Grindel on history textbooks in the United Kingdom, which analyzes current debate around the role of the British Empire as a colonial power in the light of planned revisions to the British National Curriculum in history. The article revolves around the core question of the influence of these debates in educational policy and memory-related politics on textbooks’ content. Grindel argues that schoolbooks, as epistemic authorities, reflect not simply emerging narratives, but in fact the full complexity of controversies surrounding politics of memory, as they are indeed themselves components in these controversies. This notion is evident from the fact that the objective of the planned revision to the curriculum, in terms of educational policy, consists of according greater significance not only to history as a subject—which currently is only compulsory up to, and not including, Key Stage 4 (for pupils aged ten and eleven)—but also to a national historical narrative that would relate the

history of the Empire as a success story. This political objective, whose supporters include the committee of historians appointed by the British government to draw up the new curriculum, exists with the aim of generating a positively connotated national identity. Although these plans to strengthen the role and quality of history teaching have found support among teachers, both they and critical historians take a skeptical attitude toward the apparently proposed return to a closed canon of national history. They voice their criticism of the move in light of a heterogeneous British society with inherent conflict potential, a society reflected in classrooms populated by multicultural student bodies to whom a single narrative and a sole, standardized path to the formation of national identity would fail to do justice. In addition to these factors, British society is beginning increasingly to engage with the “dark side” of its history, such as crimes committed in the former colonies and the slave trade, establishing it in the narrative of national history through instruments including museums and exhibitions and thus calling the nation’s “postimperial amnesia” into question. These debates around educational policy and politics of memory have brought their influence to bear in textbooks. Grindel’s diachronic comparison of two textbooks published in 1981 and 2006 respectively analyzes the changes in the representation of British colonial history in textbooks. The textbooks of the 1980s were characterized by a separation of national from imperial history, which provided a guarantee of an unbroken narrative of success in spite of decolonization. In textbooks currently in use, by contrast, the history of the Empire takes a central position, creating a connection between national history, decolonization, and postcolonial migration and thus causing nostalgic “imperial amnesia” to give way to an “imperial revival”; in this way, these recent textbooks represent Britain’s colonial heritage as an integral part of its national history, and reflect, in various forms, transformations in British postcolonial memory.

Echoes of state engagement with the politics of memory relating to colonialization and decolonization that has taken and is taking place in the former major colonial nations, such as France or the UK, have found their way to other countries, including Germany, whose period as a colonial power was relatively short. In this context, Lars Müller explores the beginnings of a postcolonial politics of memory in Germany via the example of the political debate surrounding the remembrance of what was known as the Herero uprising. Müller’s starting point is the motion tabled in the German *Bundestag* in 2012 proposing the adoption of a resolution acknowledging the crimes committed by the German colonial power in Southwest Africa as genocide and pledging reparation; in this context, he outlines the highly charged debate on German colonial policy that has taken place over the last two decades, focusing on the closely intertwined fields of academic research, policy, and education. The academic

discipline of history has only been engaging with Germany's colonial past since the 1990s, with Namibian independence in 1990 providing the principal background to a particular focus on the German-Herero War. The question of whether the crimes committed amounted to genocide ignited a broad debate within the academic community and among the wider public, a discussion that has as yet failed to produce a consensus. The German *Bundestag* first debated the issue of Germany's colonial past and the war waged on the Herero in 1989. While all parties were in agreement on Germany's "particular historical and political responsibility" toward Namibia, only the Social Democratic Party called the war an instance of genocide. Over twenty years were to pass, due not least to demands raised by the Namibian government and the Herero people themselves, until German politics revisited the issue thoroughly, debating and rejecting the motion mentioned above in 2012. Müller's analysis of curricula and textbooks from the 1990s to the present leads him to the conclusion that although the issue was given little or no attention in school curricula, the term "genocide" was used in places in this context during this period and has continued to extend its reach since then; some textbooks in use today, however, still do not use the term. The key finding of the analysis is that knowledge circulates among those engaged with the issue in the political, academic, and educational fields; in other words, textbooks do not simply absorb and re-represent knowledge, a role that would place them at the conclusion of a societal process of negotiation of what is to be transmitted as knowledge; instead, in this case, textbooks were early arenas of the issues surrounding the German-Herero War and its classification as genocide and thus acted as a resource for policy makers.

The articles by Luigi Cajani and Keith Crawford, albeit without explicitly making direct reference to public debate on the politics of memory, provide demonstrations of the fact that textbooks show the traces of continuity and shifts in representations of colonialism. Both pieces create connections between the content of textbooks and contemporary academic discourse, thus extending their scope to encompass other stakeholders in society. By adopting this approach, Cajani demonstrates that, as in France and the UK, public debate is a characteristic of the politics of memory in Italy. His overview of representations of Italian colonialism and decolonialization in Italian textbooks begins with the Fascist era, showing by the example of two textbooks from 1938 and 1940 respectively that during this period, Fascist Italy justified its brutal colonial policies and claimed greatness by citing the self-declared civilizing mission it traced back to ancient Rome. The first textbooks produced in republican Italy after 1945, while they contained criticism of the second war against Ethiopia, presented a positive overall view of Italian colonial policy, invoking above all a demographically based apologia. The article notes, however, that the spectrum of representations in Italian textbooks was a broad one, as text-

books were not subject to state controls despite fascism's excision from schools. It was not until the 1960s that the curriculum instituted in 1918 was replaced and new textbooks produced. In other words, it took some time for the image of the "good Italian" to sustain its first cracks; this happened from the end of the 1950s onward and took the form of increased awareness within society, raised by the beginnings of academic research into the issue and the broadcasting by public and private television channels of war crimes committed by Italy during its colonial wars, particularly the use of chemical weapons—crimes not acknowledged by the Italian government until 1996. It is therefore hardly surprising that information on these war crimes filtered only very slowly into Italian textbooks during the 1970s and 1980s; their treatment remained noncomprehensive and the use of poison gas was mostly ignored or mentioned in the briefest of terms only. To this day, there are very few textbooks in use in Italy that discuss this issue in its entirety. Nevertheless, as Cajani explains, the myth of the "good Italian" is slowly beginning to crumble—not only in the public arena, but also in the most recent textbooks. There is still, however, a long way for Italy to go toward leaving behind its Eurocentric approach to these matters and giving issues such as, to cite an example, the everyday lives of the peoples it colonized the attention in history teaching that befits their significance.

Research on colonialism has come to unanimously recognize that European nations were not the world's only colonial powers; Japan is one example. Additionally, recent years have seen a surge in interest in "internal" colonialism, that is, the subjection of groups of indigenous people within a country to colonializing practices, as happened to the Native Americans and the Saami in Sweden. Keith Crawford engages with this issue in his study of the depiction of Australia's indigenous population, the Aborigines, in Australian social studies textbooks and the monthly periodical *The School Magazine* between 1930 and 1960. Crawford's article demonstrates that in the hegemonic discourses of the textbooks used in primary schools, representing the country's national master narrative, one of two things happened: either the culture and society of Aboriginal people were "forgotten" completely or they were presented as a "marginalized" group. This narrative justified the taking of Aboriginal land by the colonists, arguing in accordance with Enlightenment philosophers' ideas of progress, reason, and industry. The Aborigines were compared to primitive European peoples whose lifestyle stood in contradiction to developed European civilization, its standards, its advanced technological development, and, above all, the progress of its nation-building process. This "discourse of paternalism" is one of the main underlying narratives in the textbooks. Added to this is the fact that the numerous conflicts between settlers and the indigenous population in the course of the colonialization process remained undiscussed in these textbooks, having been

quite simply “forgotten”. The dominant narrative of harmonious development in the name of the nation’s progress was founded on the omission of the “other” from this narrative. This meant that the indigenous population was excluded from Australia’s nation-building process. It was only with the advent of a counterhegemonic movement in the 1970s that a gradual change in the representation of the Aborigines in textbooks began to take place. Today, the exclusion and stereotyping of indigenous Australians has largely disappeared from textbooks, with Aboriginal history and culture treated as an integral part of the history and society of Australia. An apology issued by the Australian government in 2008 to the Aborigines for the treatment meted out to them did not mark an end to controversial discussion around the interpretation of Australian colonialism, as the debates surrounding the terms “invasion” and “settlement” emphatically prove.

We supplement our discussion of postcolonial politics of memory in a primarily western European context with Gabriel Pirický’s article, which addresses recently emerging aspects of what one might call a postimperial politics of memory in various nation-states in southern central Europe by investigating representations of the Ottoman Empire in secondary school history textbooks published between 1990 and 2010 in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia. Taking a comparative approach, the article sheds light on the extent of the impact that the rewriting of history textbooks in these nations in the post-1989 era had on corresponding representations of the Ottoman Empire. The representations dealt with in this article focus on the highly conflictual ways in which each of the four countries interact with the Ottoman Empire, concentrating primarily on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In this context, Pirický convincingly expresses the view that the largely stereotyped depictions of the Ottoman Empire as a Muslim and Turkish “other” in the textbooks serve above all to reinforce the present-day self-image of each of the four states as nations rooted in a Christian Europe. The significance of these findings lies principally in the fact that the history thus represented, located primarily in imperial conflicts between the Habsburg and Ottoman empires, has the potential to open up a multiplicity of transnational perspectives on postimperial memory. In sum, Pirický’s analysis of these representations shows how the textbooks in each country prioritize (albeit to differing degrees) the political imperative, which demands the de facto hegemony of a narrative founded on the identity of the nation-state, over a multidimensional historiography that holds the promise of multiple approaches to these issues.

This special issue concludes with an essay about the representation of colonialism on German television, complementing our analysis of textbooks with the consideration of another mass medium with substantial educational relevance. Taking as examples the German television series called *The Global German Empire* (*Das Weltreich der Deutschen*) and the melo-

drama *Africa, mon amour*, Wolfgang Struck explores how filmmakers such as the German popular historian Guido Knopp exercise a “representational superiority” and control over the material that accords no space to alternative representations. Although more recent research has demonstrated that explorers such as the German “conqueror” Carl Peters were met not with primitive “savages” but rather with highly developed social structures characterized by trade and diplomatic relations, the television series and its reenactments of the events rely on Peters’s reports as their principal source, effectively aestheticizing and eroticizing the day-to-day reality of colonialism. Struck argues that popular education of this kind is tenuous due to its neglect of the findings that have emerged from the discipline of postcolonial studies and its contribution to the romanticization of colonialism. Filmmakers know in advance the story they want to tell, meaning they are largely uninterested in what they actually find on location. Furthermore, the sights shown in the program are neither natural nor cultural, but rather artificial; their sole purpose is to be consumed. The article thus reaches the conclusion that in these programs, the filmmakers construct the colonial world in accordance with their desire to tell the story they intend to tell; the result is the perpetuation of stereotypes, prejudices, and fantasies surrounding the past—indeed, the visualizations of colonialism currently disseminated via the mass media amount to the unbroken continuation of the logic of colonial representation. This is once again an emphatic indication of the fact that postcolonial politics of memory concern not only the objects and content of memory, but also, and indeed primarily, the forms and viewpoints of the representations depicted in the media, which, as their name suggests, mediates memory. The evident truth of this thesis is particularly apparent in regard to the relationship between postcolonial politics of memory and educational media.

Viewed as a whole, this special issue seeks to shed light on the extent to which societies’ coming-to-terms with their colonial heritage is not exclusively a national task, but rather represents a transnational, a European, indeed a global challenge. The discussions surrounding politics of memory in Europe continue in large part to take place within the context of each nation’s specific history. Nevertheless, the experience of postcolonial migration from the former colonies is currently ushering in an awareness of colonialism as an overarching European legacy within global history. A European perspective of this kind, expanded to encompass the transnational and global historical context, promises to present a fundamental challenge to textbooks and educational media as well as to other media of representation. As the articles in our special issue demonstrate, textbooks are not only carriers and media(tors) of knowledge arrived at in processes of negotiation within societies, but also subject to transformation into subjects/objects of the debates and controversies surrounding these issues. This susceptibility makes them core components

of the processes by which politics of memory arrive at the positions that media of representation eventually transmit.

Within this context, Eckhardt Fuchs und Marcus Otto have conducted the research project on “Decolonisation and Memory Politics: School Textbooks in the Context of Social Conflicts in France (1962–2010)” at the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research in Braunschweig, Germany, since August 2010.¹⁵ This special issue of *JEMMS* emerged from a workshop that took place in April 2012 as part of this project. Both the project and the special issue place emphasis on the discursive status acquired by textbooks in discourses of postcolonial politics of memory. In other words, their chief interest is the manner in which textbooks are both the medium and the subject/object of these memory politics. Beyond this principal focus, the project aims to open up new avenues of research, a remit giving rise to a complex set of questions. A **first**, hitherto neglected aspect of this field is the historical perspective of long-term historical structures or “long duration” (*la longue durée*), which retraces continuities and transformations in specific representations emerging from colonialism as well as contextualizing them within particular discourses of politics, academia, or educational policy. **Second**, recent research into (post)colonialism has given rise to interest in the extent to which perceptions and strategies of representation exist that are valid across regions (for instance, Europe or east Asia) and to the possibility of comparing them. The newest research, which has looked into the specifics of the (post)colonial in a number of regions of the world, has called attention to the fact that (post)colonial history cannot be restricted to being a history of European influence. These findings both open up new vistas on regional forms of colonialism and postcolonialism¹⁶ and turn the spotlight on the issue of how colonialism and societies’ exploration of their colonial past have acted, and continue to act, to induce change in the former European centers of metropolitan power and elsewhere. Following from this, we may ask questions as to whether, and to which extent, textbooks are integrating these new approaches and, for instance, exploring relationships between various (post)colonial cultures. A global comparison of textbooks with reference to their representations of colonialism could make a substantial contribution to this discussion; a pertinent example is the highly charged debate on Japanese colonialism, of which textbooks are a significant arena. A **third** issue in this context relates to the potential for comparison between the content of textbooks and that of other media relevant to education that serve as arenas for the discussion and representation of colonialism. These include museums, documentaries, and feature films. A comparison of this kind would highlight the plurality of the influences that come to bear on the knowledge acquired by students. **Fourth**, and finally, the question of what these students actually know about colonialism, and thus the question of the degree of

their participation in memory cultures, can only be answered by means of combining analysis of textbooks with empirical studies on teaching practices. We might continue by listing further points. However, we consider those we have mentioned to be sufficient evidence of the extent of this field of research—and of how much still remains to be done. Analysis of textbooks and educational media, conducted as part of and complementary to (post)colonial research, promises to deliver new insights for both academic fields. This special issue of JEMMS is intended to make an initial contribution to bringing these insights to light.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the following people for their valuable contribution toward this special issue: Katherine Ebisch-Burton (who translated the introduction and the articles by Marcus Otto and Susanne Grindel); Shivaun Heath (who translated the chapter by Lars Müller); and Nicola Watson (who proofread the articles by Luigi Cajani and Wolfgang Struck).

Notes

1. Cf. Christoph Cornelißen, *Erinnerungskulturen, Version 2.0*, Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte, accessed 17 December 2012, https://docupedia.de/zg/Erinnerungskulturen_Version_2.0_Christoph_Corneli.C3.9Fen?oldid=84892.
2. Ibid.
3. A paradigm of this can be found in Pierre Nora, *Les lieux de mémoire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1984–1992).
4. Cf., among others, Pascal Blanchard, Nicolas Bancel, and Sandrine Lemaire, eds., *La fracture coloniale: La société française au prisme de l'héritage colonial* (Paris: La Découverte, 2005); Pascal Blanchard, Nicolas Bancel, and Sandrine Lemaire, eds., *Culture postcoloniale 1961–2006: Traces et mémoires coloniales en France* (Paris: La Découverte, 2006); Olivier Dard and Daniel Lefeuvre, eds., *L'Europe face à son passé colonial* (Paris: Riveneuve Editions, 2008); Helma Lutz and Kathrin Gawaretzki, eds., *Kolonialismus und Erinnerungskultur: Die Kolonialvergangenheit im kollektiven Gedächtnis der deutschen und niederländischen Einwanderungsgesellschaft* (Münster: Waxmann, 2005); Malgorzata Pakier and Bo Strath, eds., *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance* (New York: Berghahn, 2010); and Helena Goncalves da Silva, ed., *Conflict, Memory Transfers, and the Reshaping of Europe* (Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010). See also, on cultures and politics of memory in Europe generally, among others, Katherine Hodgkin and Susannah Radstone, eds., *Contested Pasts: The Politics of Memory* (London: Routledge, 2003); Sophie Wahnich, ed., *Politics of Collective Memory: Cultural Patterns of Commemorative Practices in Post-war Europe* (Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2008); Karin Tilmans, Frank van Vree, and Jay M. Winter, eds., *Performing the Past: Memory, History, and*

- Identity in Modern Europe* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010); Siobhan Kattago, *Memory and Representation in Contemporary Europe: The Persistence of the Past* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012); and Irial Glynn and Olaf Kleist, eds., *History, Memory, and Migration: Perceptions of the Past and the Politics of Incorporation* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012).
5. Cf. Indra Sengupta, "Introduction: Locating *lieux de mémoire*: A (Post)colonial Perspective," in *Memory, History, and Colonialism: Engaging with Pierre Nora in Colonial and Postcolonial Contexts*, ed. Indra Sengupta, Bulletin Supplement 1 (London: German Historical Institute, 2009), 1–8.
 6. Cf., among others, Sebastian Conrad and Shalini Randeria, eds., *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus: Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften* (Frankfurt: Campus, 2002).
 7. Cf. Jörn Leonhard, *Koloniale Vergangenheiten—(post-)imperiale Gegenwart* (Berlin: Berliner Wiss.-Verlag, 2010); and Pakier and Strath, *A European Memory?*
 8. Cf. Susanne Grindel, "Deutscher Sonderweg oder europäischer Erinnerungsort? Die Darstellung des modernen Kolonialismus in neueren deutschen Schulbüchern," *Internationale Schulbuchforschung* 30, no. 3 (2008): 695–716.
 9. Cf. Marcus Otto, "Das Subjekt der Nation in der *condition postcoloniale*: Krisen der Repräsentation und der Widerstreit postkolonialer Erinnerungspolitik in Frankreich," *Lendemains: Etudes comparées sur la France* 36, no. 144 (2011): 76.
 10. Cf. Louis Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," in Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays* (London: New Left Books, 1977), 121–176. On Althusser's theory of interpellation and more recent reception of his work, particularly in discussion on poststructuralist theory, see also Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997); and Isolde Charim, *Der Althusser-Effekt: Entwurf zu einer Theorie der Ideologie* (Vienna: Passagen-Verlag, 2002).
 11. Cf., among others, Catherine Coquery-Vidrovitch, *Les enjeux politiques de l'histoire coloniale* (Paris: Agone, 2009); Claude Liauzu and Gilles Manceron, eds., *La colonisation, la loi et l'histoire* (Paris: Editions Syllepse, 2006); Pascal Blanchard and Isabelle Veyrat-Masson, eds., *Les guerres de mémoires: La France et son histoire: Enjeux politiques, controverses historiques, stratégies médiatiques* (Paris: La Découverte, 2008); and Johann Michel, *Gouverner les mémoires: Les politiques mémorielles en France* (Paris: PUF, 2010).
 12. On this issue, cf., among others, Corinne Bonafoux, Laurence de Cock, and Benoît Falaize, *Mémoires et histoire à l'école de la République: Quels enjeux?* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2007); and Laurence de Cock and Emmanuelle Picard, eds., *La fabrique scolaire de l'histoire: Illusions et désillusions du roman national* (Marseille, France: Agone, 2009).
 13. Cf. Grindel, "Deutscher Sonderweg."
 14. Cf. Otto, "Das Subjekt der Nation."
 15. The project is funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG no. FU 250/14). We would like to thank the German Research Foundation for their financial and other support for the project and the workshop.
 16. Cf. Olaf Kaltmeier, Ulrike Lindner, and Binu Mailaparambil, "Reflecting on Concepts of Coloniality/Postcoloniality in Latin America, South Asian and African Historiography," *Comparativ: Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsgeschichte* 1, no. 21 (2001): 14–31.