

INTRODUCTION

Towards a ‘Europeanized’ European History?

CANER TEKIN AND STEFAN BERGER

In 1988, the prominent British historian A.J.P. Taylor wrote about the topic of European history: ‘It must take place in or derive from the area we call Europe. But as I am not sure what exactly that area is meant to be, I am pretty well in a haze about the rest’.¹ The European project has been trying to blow away the haze since the 1970s, beginning to mobilize culture in order to further European integration.² An important part of this cultural reinvention of Europe was history. Until the 1970s the European Economic Community had relied heavily on its economic success and attractiveness, but then came the realization that something else, apart from the economy, was needed to guarantee the success of European idea. Today, this ‘something else’ includes the House of European History, a museum that opened in 2017 right next to the European Parliament in Brussels. In it, a narrative of European integration history meets some of the traditional national narratives; but whether this merger, inside and outside of the museum, is successful or not will contribute to determining whether the citizens of Europe have a less hazy idea about Europe than A.J.P. Taylor had almost thirty years ago.

The aim of this volume is to give an introduction to the representations of European history, in particular the history of European integration after 1945, in both European and national contexts. The European Union’s history politics forms an important part of these representations, which have remained, to this day, extraordinarily contested. We can subdivide the

Notes for this section begin on page 13.

EU's presentation of history into two groups: expressions on history made within the EU's institutions, and the history narrative that the EU strives to systematize. The first group includes celebrations of historical events that the EU deems critical to European memory, such as the European Parliament's resolutions on the Remembrance of the Holocaust, anti-Semitism and Racism (2005), on the Armenian Genocide (1989), and on the Armenian Genocide's centenary (2015). The speeches given by diplomats and politicians representing the European Union's stance on specific historical events can also be considered in this category.

The second group consists of more systematic attempts to create a discourse on history underpinned by a political strategy. The EU initiated its cultural and identity policies in the 1970s in order to strengthen its legitimacy in the face of economic crises.³ The EU's Declaration on European Identity, signed by (West) European foreign ministers in 1973, called for the first time for the foundation and advancement of a common conception of European identity by means of activities that would further European unification and analyse Europe's 'common heritage'. Since then the EU's institutions, in particular the European Commission and European Parliament, strived to contribute to the public awareness of European culture and identity within the framework of a common cultural policy.⁴ The EU's history politics should be considered in this context. The recent projects presenting European memory and history serve the same aims, creating an awareness of identity and legitimizing the EU's institutions.⁵ Thus, for example, the European Commission's former president Romano Prodi initiated the group of intellectuals called 'The Spiritual and Cultural Dimension of Europe', who upheld notions of multiculturalism in the European Union against the powerful arguments about an alleged 'Clash of Civilizations'.⁶

In another example, the European Commission and European Parliament worked together in 2013–14 in a project entitled 'New Narrative for Europe', to overcome the recurring discussions on the EU's political legitimacy following its financial crisis in 2008.⁷ In 2013, the European Commission and European Parliament also started 'Active European Remembrance' as a joint endowment to sponsor projects stressing the memory of the totalitarian past of Europe.⁸ The fourth example is the already mentioned House of European History, the idea for which was introduced by the European Parliament in 2008 with a similar political rationale of creating identity. Hans-Gert Pötering, the then president of the European Parliament, stated that the House of European History 'will bring Europe's history alive for everyone, but especially young people, and will thereby help promote an awareness of European identity'.⁹

What recent publications on the EU's history politics can agree upon is that the objective of legitimizing the EU brings a tendency to write

European history as a cumulative, linear process leading up to a positively accentuated European Union. In this way, the attempts by the EU to shape a European integration narrative become part and parcel of the ongoing process of European integration. As Stråth and Leggewie write separately, the EU-sponsored European integration history evokes an ethical position against wars and in favour of democracy and welfare.¹⁰ Gerard Delanty argues in the same direction that today coping with the contemporary problems of the European Union entails bringing into focus European history as a transnational history.¹¹ A number of scholars, however, have recently voiced their scepticism about such functionalization of the past. Oriane Calligaro, Wolfram Kaiser, Fabrica Larat and Tuuli Lähdesmäki have recently reminded us that the single narrative of European integration is part of a streamlined and streamlining objective of legitimizing European institutions at the grass-roots level.¹² The EU's history projects are described as initiatives of top-down cultural engineering.¹³

In a similar vein, the House of European History (HEH) is criticized as a legitimatory project making the case for European integration. So, for example, Kaiser questioned its teleological perspective, rooted in the idealism of Pöttering and finding expression in the museum's first Conceptual Basis (2008).¹⁴ Huistra, Molema and Wirt have argued that the HEH, through its conceptualization of European history, has an inbuilt automatism that moves history in the direction of democracy and diversity.¹⁵ The narrative presents the two world wars as temporary breaks with an otherwise continuous history of European values that were born in previous centuries and have come into their own with the foundation and development of EU institutions.

Partly as a result of such criticisms, the House of European History changed its narrative scope and reduced the tone of its teleological argument about European integration.¹⁶ Yet, following Wolfram Kaiser, it remains a problem that the museum's exhibition does not cover a longer-term historical perspective on European integration, and focuses attention on the developments emanating after the Second World War.¹⁷ As Veronika Settele adds, it remains deeply problematic that some important aspects of European integration underpinning the value of diversity, including colonial relations of European nation states or immigration into Europe, are sidelined in the HEH's exhibition.¹⁸ Another major critique focuses on the tendency of the museum to present European integration as a success story. To Ben Wellings and Ben Power this is a typical attempt to vindicate the European Union.¹⁹ The official EU representations of the past rely to some extent on positive perceptions of the European past, including its ancient heritage, its Christian culture, its Enlightenment tradition and, not least, the process of European integration after the Second World War.²⁰ At the same, however,

official EU statements on the past also present a darker picture of Europe – a picture dominated by wars, civil wars, violence and genocide. The EU can then be presented as an inheritor of the good traditions of Europe and, at the same time, as an instrument with which to overcome the darker aspects of the past.

Yet this officially preferred version of European history has been difficult to align with national conceptions of Europe that are still characterized by wide contestation over the precise relationship between the national and the European and over the contribution of diverse nation states to a wider European space.²¹ Different nationalized conceptualizations of Europe, which dominate European historical consciousness today, rely on very different narrative framings of key events, including the history of the two world wars in the twentieth century.²² As the following chapters in our volume also demonstrate, the memory landscape of the Second World War has an important impact on the way in which various nation states in Europe position themselves vis-à-vis democratic politics and Europeanization.²³ Recent publications on the memory of those wars therefore call for analyses of rituals, landscapes, symbolic representations and other elements of war memories to understand better the importance of national interests in framing national identity and to arrive at an understanding both of the commonalities and the differences of war remembrances across Europe.²⁴

The Holocaust has become an integral part of that war memory, and today forms the core of a European remembrance culture that assumes commonality but often hides substantial differences. In fact, the assumed European foundational narrative of the Holocaust has a very different place in diverse national collective memory. On the one hand, the European Union has invested heavily in putting the Holocaust at the centre of its historical self-understanding and in influencing national understandings of the Holocaust in diverse European nation states. In their article, Buttner and Delius take the remembrance of the Holocaust as an example of the universalization of a single-memory culture in the Western world.²⁵ Aline Sierp, in her book on the changes in Holocaust commemorations in Germany and Italy, discusses the connection between national politics, European politics and remembrance at length. She shows how the European Union's initiatives are emphasizing the singularity of the Holocaust and how they make the Holocaust the principal event to remember in European history.²⁶ The Council of Europe is producing a range of programmes on Holocaust remembrance, intending to further its understanding as an important anchor of European identity creation.²⁷ On the other hand, this remembrance of the Holocaust is still centrally linked to the particular agendas of national history politics. Even if European nation states are all, to a certain extent, presenting the Holocaust as illiberal 'other' to their self-presentation today, its weight in

national memory politics differs substantially.²⁸ Especially in Eastern Europe, it is ranked far below the memory of the Communist past.²⁹

With regard to British Holocaust memory, Sharon Macdonald concurs with this view as she looks into the Holocaust memorial ceremonies in Britain, which were first organized in 2001. She states: 'Depicting the nation itself as cosmopolitan, as open to different cultures and traditions was, then, a central ambition of the new Holocaust commemoration'.³⁰ Indeed, as Chantal Mouffe and, in her wake, Anna Bull and Hans Lauge Hansen have argued, such forms of cosmopolitan politics and memory have become dominant in European politics and memory cultures. However, cosmopolitan politics and memory, they contend, may well be the problem rather than the solution to European politics and memory cultures, as they depoliticize politics and memory, and make contention over politics and memory a near impossibility. Hence, they call for agonistic forms of politics and memory, which would allow renewed political debate that does not fall back into the antagonistic forms of politics and memory that were often at the heart of earlier military conflicts in Europe.³¹

A uniform cosmopolitan understanding of history and memory as sometimes championed by the European Union is likely to be challenged by national contexts, and recent publications already explore the disagreements expressed by Central and East European countries on two occasions. First, the principal importance given to the Holocaust's representation is intrinsic to Western Europe, whereas in the East it is the memory of the crimes committed in the Communist era that take centre stage.³² True, from the European enlargement in 2004, the Holocaust is not the only event memorialized within the European Union as new members often call for the remembrance of Stalinist and other Communist crimes in the East. As Marek Kucia discusses, the new members of the European Parliament from Central and East European countries have included these crimes in the European Parliament's resolutions.³³ However, the West European understanding of European memory primarily resting on the Holocaust memory is still visible in many official proclamations emanating from the EU, and also in the narration of the House of European History. According to Kaiser, the HEH does cover the memory of Stalinist and Communist crimes but it still takes the Holocaust as the single most important criminal event in human history.³⁴

Ultimately the memorial landscapes of Central and Eastern Europe cannot be expected to be the same as those of Western Europe. In Eastern Europe, as many scholars, such as Berger and Leersen, point out, nationalisms and national representations of history were revitalized in the 1990s, when the Cold War and the Soviet Union's ideological influence came to an end.³⁵ Consequently, and as Fabrice Larat's work also reminds us, the EU's new members from Central and Eastern Europe today have particular

relationships with their national pasts and with the concept of European integration.³⁶ This particularity focuses on a foreign-imposed Communist past that excluded East-Central and Eastern Europe from the post-war 'success story' of the European Union. Therefore, one of the main challenges for European historical consciousness today remains how to bring together the very different post-war memorial landscapes of Western and Eastern Europe, divided for so long by the Cold War.

This is not, of course, to deny the very important differences between the memorial cultures within Eastern, Central and Western Europe. Thus, the revival of nationalism has by no means been restricted to Eastern Europe. Nationalist movements and nationalist memory politics have been growing in many West European nation states, including France, and a range of small nation nationalisms, for example in Scotland and Catalonia, have been threatening the existence of long-established multinational states, such as the United Kingdom and Spain.³⁷ At the same time, nationalist memory politics in East-Central and Eastern Europe show important specificities that should not be lost amidst blanket charges of a nationalist memory politics in those regions of Europe. Thus, for example, the Polish memory landscape as a major site of both the Holocaust and Soviet war crimes is quite different from the memory landscape of Hungary, where the trauma of the Trianon treaty still looms large over national memory.³⁸

The chapters of the present volume attend to these interlinked debates on the pitfalls of the EU's history politics, representations of history in European and national contexts, and memory politics in Central and Eastern Europe. They also reflect on the relevance of specific concepts regarding interconnected histories and memories in Europe. The first is 'transnational memory': how national memory landscapes impact on each other, and how, in a dialogic exchange, memory landscapes often transcend the boundaries of the nation state. Transnational memory has emerged as a relatively recent concept in memory studies, and is particularly employed by constructivist approaches taking national identities as invented.³⁹ There are two mainstream viewpoints connecting transnational memory to either supranational (global/European) or national contexts. A number of scholars have been arguing that, in the case of the Holocaust, memory receives global recognition and takes precedence over national memory.⁴⁰ Civil dialogue, including the presentations and exhibitions discussed through international mass media, museums, and academia, plays a decisive role in the emergence of a globalized Holocaust memory.⁴¹ The second viewpoint maintains that nation states are still the primary agents of memory politics throughout Europe that continue to determine the direction of transnational memories.⁴² Disagreements on the definition and scope of transnational memories do exist in many instances, and many of them stem from national politics. The representation of the

Holocaust is an example. The media have contributed to a global awareness of the Holocaust, but the authenticity and purpose of these contributions cannot always be the same.⁴³ Thus, the media in different nation states have juxtaposed the memory of the Holocaust and the memory of Stalinist crimes to differing degrees, making a problematic aspect of transnational memory in contemporary Europe.⁴⁴ Another example is the memory politics in most post-Yugoslav states, which link the negative remembrance of Yugoslavia, in their separate ways, to the positive remembrance of their national identities.⁴⁵ The contributions to this volume deal with all of these issues, and together provide further commentary on the importance of transnational memory in the representation of Yugoslav history between Balkan nations, the Soviet (Stalinist) history between West and East European countries, and the remembrance of the Holocaust between Europe and Israel.

Conceptualizations of 'self' and 'other' also feature strongly in the present volume. Lionel Gossman, Gregory Sterling and Jörn Rüsen have all separately pointed to the importance of such binaries in historical meaning-making.⁴⁶ National memory, through its constructions of evils, heroes and victims, plays a major role in re-enforcing these binaries, as it strengthens an in-group identity vis-à-vis its 'others'.⁴⁷ What the EU's official history politics primarily takes as its 'other' are the periods in the previous century marked by authoritarianism, totalitarianism and violence, in which many of the EU's member states and candidates for accession were entangled. Yet, arguably the most contested 'other' today is Turkey. Political debates on Turkey's accession to the EU already reveal contestations between political camps over Turkish history in relation to European history.⁴⁸

The book gathers ten chapters, all dealing with either the European Union's attempts to promote a 'shared' narrative of European history or national contestations over such unifying narrative frames. In the opening chapter, Daniel Rosenberg reviews the debates over the House of European History (HEH). Rosenberg first introduces the main approaches taken towards an understanding of European civilization and subsequently critiques those approaches for not being pluralist enough. He then reviews a range of museums dedicated to European history, and compares them with the HEH. After reflecting on its scope and aims, he contends that the coverage of the HEH is in harmony with the general purpose of the primary supranational EU institutions, namely to produce a streamlined pan-European discourse of a uniform European civilization. To Rosenberg, the HEH is not designed to show an accumulation of diverse European histories that might at certain points converge but also diverge; on the contrary, it is designed as an attempt to give a narrative frame to the pan-European idea.

The second chapter reviews the role of European institutions in the historiography of European integration. Oriane Calligaro argues that the

European Commission has attempted to promote a particular take on European history in academia. To achieve this objective, the Commission first supported the project of European integration history at the European University Institute during the 1970s. As this project ‘failed’ in 1980, the Commission initiated the Liaison Committee – a network of scholars working on the subject of European integration – and continued to endorse it until the mid-1990s. According to Calligaro, the Commission was partially successful in these attempts. From the 1980s the Liaison Committee did well in bringing together a network of scholars writing on European integration and streamlining a standard terminology, which fed into popular concepts like ‘identity’, ‘memory’ and ‘integration’. In the end, however, the European Commission did not succeed in creating a singular dominant ‘Europeanized’ form of history writing.

The first two chapters beg the question of why the EU was relatively unsuccessful in forging a dominant European historical narrative, when the nineteenth-century nation states of Europe were so successful in doing so.⁴⁹ Part of the answer lies in the rather half-hearted and almost ashamed attempts by the EU institutions to drive a determined history politics from above. Much of this may well have to do with the recognition that the construction of such narratives streamlines and excludes contention over the very narratives that are at the heart of any democratic politics. As democrats, EU politicians subscribe to the necessity for such contention and pluralist perspectives, which makes it far more difficult to arrive at a European master narrative of history. Furthermore, there is also far greater respect for the autonomy of the historical sciences among European politicians than was the case amongst the politically powerful in nineteenth-century nation states. The latter had a much more functionalist approach to historical writing. And as it always takes two to tango, the professional historians in contemporary Europe are also far less willing to become the prophets of Europe in the way that their nineteenth- and early twentieth-century predecessors were the prophets of their nations.⁵⁰

Because historiographical nationalism is today perceived as having contributed to some of the major disasters of modern history, including civil war, world war and genocide, it has been tainted and is not likely to be revived at European level without contention. This is precisely what we have witnessed in the debates over the European House of History, referred to above. But a European master narrative is struggling to emerge, and not just because of unwilling politicians and historians; in effect, the content of that master narrative is also difficult to construct. Just as some national histories were easier to construct than others, a homogenizing and unifying European history is difficult to write. After all, what disunited Europeans in the past is so much more visible and obvious than what united them. All of

the potentially unifying narratives have their flaws. For example, classical Greece as birthplace of democracy included parts of the Mediterranean that are now firmly outside of Europe, and it excluded large parts of Northern Europe that are now an integral part of the EU. It is also questionable to what extent imperial Rome should serve as a model for the contemporary EU. Christianity contains some history of bloody separation and division that cost the lives of millions, as did its equally bloody struggles against alleged ‘infidels’. Humanism and the Enlightenment contained a dialectic that could and did turn its enlightening intentions into their mirror opposites.⁵¹ The Holocaust and hyper-nationalism producing two world wars marked the high point of the crisis of European civilization against which the European Union is often defined; but can a European master narrative be built on negative foundational myths alone. Even if we answer this question in the affirmative, the wars as well as the Holocaust concerned and touched European nations to very different degrees. And finally, the success story of the EU itself arguably lacks all the heroism and gripping storylines that national histories were made of in the nineteenth century. Thus the difficulties of coming up with a convincing European master narrative have to be added to the hesitancy of its main agents to explain why all those attempts to frame such a narrative have not been entirely convincing or successful.

After discussing in the first two chapters the relatively limited success of the EU to promote a streamlined version of European history, Claudia Schneider asks in the third chapter to what extent EU members actually uphold a supranational representation of European history and culture? She addresses this question through her analysis of national images presented at the European Union National Institutes for Culture (EUNIC), the network of national cultural institutes of the EU member states. One of the network’s aims is to encourage ‘cultural dialogue and exchange’ at the European level. Despite that, the principal objective of each individual EU member of EUNIC is to put forward national self-images. The question as to what extent these are shared (or not) by other EU member states is all too rarely addressed. Thus, member states of EUNIC voluntarily come together to exhibit to each other their national cultural heritages, whilst arguments on common or shared European memory remain rather superficial. The emphasis on being European, as Schneider concludes, is in fact no more than a side effect of EUNIC.

The fourth chapter then turns its attention from cultural initiatives to school curricula and textbooks. Falk Pingel discusses changing conceptions of European integration in national school curricula and textbooks from the 1990s onwards. He reviews teaching materials and additionally makes use of Eurobarometer surveys. Although national textbooks in Europe move within a shared memory space, ‘nation’ remains the core point of reference not only

for curricula experts and textbook authors but also in pupils' concepts of collective identities. The stronger national identities of European schoolchildren may thus well contribute to a growing Euroscepticism, especially when the latter is pushed by important populist forces across many nation states in Europe. For these reasons, Pingel argues that a common history education about Europe and the European Union is becoming more and more central for the European project today. And yet, we seem to be far away from any such developments becoming a reality, despite the good intentions of some politicians, history educators and historians who have been pushing for the development of joint schoolbooks. The Franco-German schoolbook, the first volume of which (on the post-1945 period) was launched in 2006,⁵² has been followed by a Polish-German one, launched in 2016,⁵³ and the model has been received well in many places. However, there is currently little evidence that the Franco-German schoolbook is actually being used widely in either France or Germany. The Polish-German initiative is as yet too new to be able to judge its future success.

If there has been a long-standing tension between national and European narratives, this tension has been particularly marked in the case of Britain, more specifically England. In the fifth chapter, Ben Wellings and Chris Gifford explore the uses of history in contemporary discussions of Euroscepticism in England, which they grouped into 'soft' and 'hard' versions. Together these groups construe England as the birthplace of representative democracy and an empire of free trade. The main difference between the two is that the hard version of Euroscepticism completely rejects the idea of coexistence between European and British histories, whereas the soft one confirms intersections during certain times in history. According to Wellings and Gifford, political camps with hard and soft versions of Euroscepticism conflicted each other harshly during the Brexit debates. The authors analyse the arguments put forward by both camps on a range of historical themes, including 'representative democracy', 'Empire' and the 'Second World War'.

The sixth, seventh and eighth chapters explore the meaning of the Second World War in memory politics of diverse other European nation states. The sixth chapter, written by Jelena Dureinovic, addresses the memory of Yugoslavia in various post-Yugoslavian states. The remembrance of the Second World War was the primary source of legitimacy of the state in socialist Yugoslavia. Socialist leaders constructed a narrative framing the war as the triumph of antifascism. As a form of resistance to the Yugoslav state, independence movements in the 1980s put forward alternative, nationalist narratives celebrating anticommunist movements going back to the Second World War. This legitimization of quasi-fascist movements in the struggle against Communist Yugoslavia and its version of Yugoslavism

was exacerbated during the secessionist wars in 1992. And it remained an important part of history politics in many of the post-Yugoslav states. The Second World War was now interpreted very differently, as it symbolized the defeat of nations by communism. Antifascism was delegitimized as the ideology of Serbian nationalism allegedly oppressing other nationalities in the Balkans. In this narrative framing, nationalist Croatian warlords, often in alliance with German and Italian fascism, could be reinterpreted as national heroes. In the early 1990s, Serbian and Croatian narratives about the Second World War were often constructed against each other, yet, according to Dureinovic, they also showed a number of interesting parallels in their framing of stories of resistance, collaboration and victimhood. Overall, as Ulf Brunnbauer has shown, the important role of history in contributing mentally and culturally to the dissolution of Yugoslavia would have been unthinkable without the move towards more nationalist historiographies and a more nation-centred history politics in the individual federal states making up Yugoslavia throughout the 1980s.⁵⁴

The rewriting of national pasts in pre- and post-Communist Yugoslavia finds intriguing parallels across much of post-Communist Eastern Europe. In the seventh chapter, Claudia Weber discusses contemporary East European memory cultures surrounding the histories of Stalinism. The agents of memory politics in Eastern Europe are acutely aware of the West European preoccupations with Holocaust memory, and are often arguing that the memory of Stalinist and Communist crimes, which had been a taboo topic under Communism in Eastern Europe, deserves a stronger hearing and emphasis in a post-Cold War European memory space. Giving examples from European and national politics prioritizing the memory of the Holocaust, Weber therefore rightly cautions us against making a hierarchy of humanitarian crimes.

European memory today undoubtedly finds one of its strongest anchors in the Holocaust, but to what extent is this memory a shared one? In the eighth chapter, Judith Müller reviews Lizzie Doron's literary work, *On the Brink of Something Beautiful*, and questions the existence of a uniform contemporary European discourse connecting Holocaust memories with Europeanness. Hesi, Doron's fictional character, is a young scholar who meets witnesses of the Holocaust in Poland and France, observing disagreements between the narratives with which he was raised in Israel and the ones he finds in Europe. The memory of the Holocaust, Hesi has to conclude, is not a uniform one: victims' perspectives can vary, and today's media and literature can represent it very differently. The chapter concludes that the Holocaust should certainly play a key role in Europe's commemoration of its past, but a more pluralistic way of representing identity and history in relation to the Holocaust also needs to be found.

If there is no uniformity in relation to European Holocaust memory, there is also no uniformity of European images of and dealings with Turkey, a long-time candidate for EU accession and arguably one of the key 'others' of Europe. The ninth and tenth chapters are reserved for analyses of contemporary memory debates surrounding Turkey. Paul Levin begins his chapter with the evolution of the Turkish image in Europe in the *longue durée*. He shows how Europe's historical identity was partially forged in relation to the Islamic image of the Ottoman Empire. Levin argues that Turkey's religious exclusion from Europe continues today, and he finds much evidence of this in the European Union's membership negotiations with Turkey, which have been ongoing since 2005. He concedes that Turkey's inability to democratize has also played a decisive role in the continuing failure of the negotiations, but he can also demonstrate how European political elites have been characterizing Turkey using its historically 'non-European' traits, especially its Islamic character. These characterizations have, according to Levin, contributed to Turkey's 'othering', and sometimes Turkey-sceptical political camps even explained the democratic problems of the candidate with its religious history. Once again, we encounter in Levin's chapter the importance of historical arguments for excluding one country, Turkey, from belonging to an association of other countries, the EU. History has become a weapon with which to question the compatibility of Turkey with the Europeaness.

In the final chapter, Caner Tekin explores the specific examples from Turkish history that European political camps discussed in the European Parliament during the 2000s, particularly from the beginning of the membership negotiations in 2005 onwards. He argues that these prominent historical images of Turkey find very little reflection in the accession criteria that are based on a range of political and economic conditions that Turkey, like any other accession country, has to meet. Yet especially among European conservatives a distinct historical discourse on Turkey, problematizing in particular its belonging to the Islamic world, in fact augments the accession criteria and has led to the continued exclusion of Turkey from Europe. As these conservatives tend to define Europe (again with reference to history) as 'Christian Europe', an Islamic Turkey, by definition, does not belong. Tekin exemplifies such exclusionary practices with a collection of parliamentary statements on the historical image of Turkey.

Overall the chapters in this volume shed light on the complex and multifaceted relationships between vernacular national memorial landscapes and attempts to arrive at European memorial landscapes. Europe has for a long time been part and parcel of national memories and vice versa, and European memory reappropriates in manifold ways national memories. The mismatches and internal contradictions of the national memory landscapes in

Europe make the emergence of a European landscape so difficult. Ultimately history may well be what divides rather than what unites Europe, which might explain the futility of building Europe on history.

Stefan Berger is professor of history at the Ruhr University Bochum, where he is the director of the Institute of Social Movements and the chairman of the History of the Ruhr Foundation. He was appointed honorary professor at Cardiff University in 2017. He has published numerous books and articles on historiography and comparative labour history, and his most recent book publications include *Industrial Heritage and Regional Identities* (edited with Christian Wicke and Jana Golombek, 2018), *The Transnational Activist: Transformations and Comparisons from the Anglo-World since the Nineteenth Century* (edited with Sean Scalmer, 2018), and *Popularizing National Pasts: 1800 to the Present* (edited with Chris Lorenz, 2017).

Caner Tekin is a member of the Centre for Mediterranean Studies at the Ruhr University Bochum, where he has recently received his doctoral degree. He worked previously at the Georg-Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research in Brunswick, Germany as a postdoctoral fellow. He is also a review editor working for H-Nationalism, the online scholarly forum on nationalism studies. His research interests revolve around the linkages between nationalisms, representations of the past, and migration.

Notes

1. A.J.P. Taylor et al., 'What is European History?' in J. Gardiner (ed.), *What is History Today?* (Houndmills and London: Macmillan Press, 1988), 143.

2. C. Shore, "'In Uno Plures" (?) EU Cultural Policy and the Governance of Europe', *Cultural Analysis* 5 (2006), 12–13.

3. C. Shore, *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration* (London: Psychology Press, 2000).

4. Commission of the European Communities, 'A People's Europe'. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, Com(88) 331 Final, Brussels, 7 July 1988, 11.

5. O. Calligaro, 'Legitimation through Remembrance? The Changing Regimes of Historicity of European Integration', *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23(3) (2005), 330–43; W. Kaiser, 'Clash of Cultures: Two Milieus in the European Union's "A New Narrative for Europe" Project', *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23(3) (2015), 364–77.

6. See K. Biedenkopf, B. Geremek and K. Michalski, *The Spiritual and Cultural Dimension of Europe: Concluding Remarks* (Vienna, Austria: Institute for Human Sciences / Brussels: European Commission, 2004), which were in stark contrast to S. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996).

7. European Commission, 'General Report on the Activities of the European Union 2013' (Luxembourg: Publication Office of the European Union, 2014), 15.

8. European Commission, 'Europe for Citizens Programme 2007–2013, Programme Guide 2013', 49–52, http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/programme/documents/2013/guide_2013_en_final%20.pdf [last accessed 2 February 2017].

9. 'EP Bureau Decides to Set Up a "House of European History"', Press Release, Directorate for the Media, 20081216IPR44855.

10. B. Stråth, 'Methodological and Substantive Remarks on Myth, Memory and History in the Construction of a European Community', *German Law Journal* 6(2) (2005), 264; C. Leggewie, 'Seven Circles of European Memory', *Cultural Memories* 4 (2011), 123–43.

11. G. Delanty, 'Entangled Memories: How to Study Europe's Cultural Heritage', *European Legacy* 22(2) (2017), 129–45.

12. Calligaro, 'Legitimation through Remembrance?' 340–41; W. Kaiser, 'Unreliable Narrators: Witness Accounts and the Institutionalization of European History', *Eurozine*, 24 November 2011; F. Larat, 'Present-ing the Past: Political Narratives on European History and the Justification of EU Integration', *German Law Journal* 6(2) (2005), 27–90; T. Lähdesmäki, 'Narrativity and Intertextuality in the Making of a Shared European Memory', *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 25(1) (2017), 57–72.

13. Kaiser, 'Clash of Cultures', 364–77.

14. W. Kaiser, 'Limits of Cultural Engineering: Actors and Narratives in the European Parliament's House of European History Project', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 3 October 2016, 2.

15. P. Huistra, M. Molema and D. Wirt, 'Political Values in a European Museum', *Journal of Contemporary European Research* 10(1) (2014), 124–36.

16. Kaiser, 'Limits of Cultural Engineering', 2.

17. *ibid.*, 13.

18. V. Settele, 'Including Exclusion in European Memory? Politics of Remembrance at the House of European History', *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23(3) (2015), 405–16.

19. B. Wellings and B. Power, 'Euro-myth: Nationalism, War and the Legitimacy of the European Union', *National Identities* 18 (2015), 157–77.

20. S. Berger, 'History and Forms of Collective Identity in Europe: Why Europe Cannot and Should Not be Built on History', in L. Rorato and A. Saunders (eds), *The Essence and the Margin: National Identities and Collective Memories in Contemporary European Culture* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009), 21–36.

21. S. Woolf, 'Europe and its Historians', *Contemporary European History* 12(3) (2003), 324–25.

22. J.H. Gillis, *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994); S. Berger and C. Lorenz (eds), *The Contested Nation: Ethnicity, Class and Gender in National Identities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008); S. Sumartojo and B. Wellings (eds), *Nation, Memory, and Great War Commemoration: Mobilizing the Past in Europe, Australia, and New Zealand* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2014); A. Sierp, *History, Memory, and Trans-European Identity: Unifying Divisions* (London: Routledge, 2014).

23. See the contributions in R.N. Lebow, W. Kansteiner and C. Fogu (eds), *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).

24. E.T. Woods and R. Tsang, 'Ritual and Performance in the Study of Nations and Nationalism', in R. Tsang and E.T. Woods (eds), *The Cultural Politics of Nationalism and Nation-Building, Ritual and Performance in the Forging of Nations* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), 1–18; T. O'Keeffe, 'Landscape and Memory: Historiography, Theory, Methodology', in N. Moore and Y. Whelan (eds), *Heritage, Memory and the Politics of Identity: New Perspectives on the Cultural Landscape* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 3–18; D. Zuev and F. Virchow, 'Performing National Identity: The Many Logics of Producing National Belongings in Public Rituals

and Events', *Nations and Nationalism* 20(2) (2014), 191–99; S. Sumartojo, 'Commemorative Atmospheres: Memorial Sites, Collective Events and the Experience of National Identity', *Transactions* 41(4) (2016), 541–53; S. Sumartojo 'On Atmosphere and Darkness at Australia's Anzac Day Dawn Service', *Visual Communication* 14(3) (2015), 267–88. See also the Horizon 2020 project 'Unsettling Remembering and Social Cohesion in Transnational Europe', www.unrest.eu [last accessed 9 February 2017], which is seeking to explore the directions in which war memories have been developing over the last decades.

25. S. Buttner and A. Delius, 'World Culture in European Memory Politics? New European Memory Agents between Epistemic Framing and Political Agenda Setting', *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23(3) (2015), 394.

26. A. Sierp, *History, Memory, and Trans-European Identity: Unifying Divisions* (London: Routledge, 2014).

27. E. Kuebler, 'Holocaust Remembrance in the Council of Europe: Deplorable Victims and Evil Ideologies without Perpetrators', *Jewish Political Studies Review* 23(12) (2012).

28. For insights into the political instrumentalization of memory, see M. Pakier and B. Str ath, 'Introduction: A European Memory?' in M. Pakier and B. Str ath (eds), *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 7–11.

29. On the impact of Holocaust memory in Eastern Europe, see M. Kucia, 'The Europeanization of Holocaust Memory and Eastern Europe', *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures* 30(1) (2016), 97–119; E. Droit, 'Le Goulag contre le Shoah', *Vingti me Si cle* 94 (2007), 101–20.

30. S. Macdonald, *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2013), 205.

31. C. Mouffe, 'An Agonistic Approach to the Future of Europe', *New Literary History* 43(4) (2012), 629–40. Also see A. Bull and H.L. Hansen, 'On Agonistic Memory', *Memory Studies* 9(4) (2016), 390–404.

32. Buttner and Delius, 'World Culture in European Memory Politics?', 394.

33. Kucia, 'The Europeanization of Holocaust Memory and Eastern Europe', 106–7.

34. Kaiser, 'Limits of Cultural Engineering', 11–12.

35. S. Berger, 'Narrating the Nation: Historiography and Other Genres', in S. Berger, L. Eriksonas and A. Mycock (eds), *Narrating the Nation: Representations in History, Media and the Arts* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), 3–4; J. Leerssen, *National Thought in Europe: A Cultural History* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007), 242–43.

36. Larat, 'Present-ing the Past', 273–90.

37. On the memory politics of the Front National in France, see C. Flood, 'The Politics of Counter-memory on the French Extreme Right', *Journal of European Studies* 35(2) (2005), 221–36; and G. Goodliffe, 'From Political Fringe to Political Mainstream: The Front National and the French Municipal Elections of 2014', *French Politics, Culture and Society* 35 (2017), 126–47. On the memory politics of Scotland and Catalonia, compare I. Robertson and T. Hall, 'Memory, Identity and the Memorialisation of Conflict in the Scottish Highlands', in N. Moore and Y. Whelan (eds), *Heritage, Memory and the Politics of Identity: New Perspectives on the Cultural Landscape* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 19–36; R. Mann and S. Fenton, *Nation, Class and Resentment: The Politics of National Identity in England, Scotland and Wales* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2017); D.A. Messenger, 'Contemporary Memory Politics in Catalonia: Europeanizing and Mobilizing the History of the Spanish Civil War', in C. Kraenzle and M. Mayr (eds), *The Changing Place of Europe in Global Memory Cultures: Usable Pasts and Futures* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2017), 49–62.

38. On Poland, see P. Madajczyk, 'Experience and Memory: The Second World War in Poland', in J. Echterkamp and S. Martens (eds), *Experience and Memory: The Second World War in Europe* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 70–85; on Hungary, compare K. Gerner,

'Open Wounds? Trianon, the Holocaust and the Hungarian Trauma', in C. Mithander, J. Sundholm and M. Holmgren Troy (eds), *Collective Traumas: Memories of War and Conflict in Twentieth-Century Europe* (Brussels: Peter Lang, 2007), 79–110.

39. S. Berger and B. Niven, 'Introduction', in S. Berger and B. Niven (eds), *Writing the History of Memory* (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014), 16; A. Assmann, 'Transnational Memories', *European Review* 22 (4) (2014), 546–47; A. Sierp and J. Wüstenberg, 'Linking the Local and the Transnational: Rethinking Memory Politics in Europe', *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23(3) (2015), 322.

40. D. Levy and N. Sznajder, *Erinnerung im globalen Zeitalter: der Holocaust* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2001). A similar and newer approach prioritizes the role of Europeanization in the existence of transnational memory. See C. de Cesari and A. Rigney (eds), *Transnational Memory: Circulation, Articulation, Scales* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014); and Sierp and Wüstenberg, 'Linking the Local and the Transnational'.

41. See E. Lehrer, 'Can There Be a Conciliatory Heritage?', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16(4–5) (2014), 269–88. D. Levy and N. Sznajder, 'Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory', *European Journal of Social Theory* 5(1) (2002), 87–106.

42. S. Berger and B. Niven, 'Writing the History of National Memory', in S. Berger and B. Niven (eds), *Writing the History of Memory* (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014), 150. K.K. Patel, 'In Search of a Second Historicization: National Socialism in a Transnational Perspective', in K.H. Jarausch and T. Lindenberger (eds), *Conflicted Memories: Europeanizing Contemporary Histories* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), 99.

43. A. Assmann, 'The Holocaust – A Global Memory? Extensions and Limits of a New Memory Community', in A. Assmann and S. Conrad (eds), *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 113–14.

44. Assmann, 'Transnational Memories', 552.

45. G. Kirn, 'Transnationalism in Reverse: From Yugoslav to Post-Yugoslav Memorial Sites', in C. de Cesari and A. Rigney (eds), *Transnational Memory: Circulation, Articulation, Scales* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 328.

46. L. Gossman, 'History as Decipherment: Romantic Historiography and the Discovery of the Other', *New Literary History* 18(1) (Autumn 1986), 23–57; G.E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992); J. Rüsen, 'Historical Thinking as Intercultural Discourse', in J. Rüsen (ed.), *Western Historical Thinking: An Intercultural Debate* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2002), 1–14.

47. D.S.A. Bell, 'Mythscape: Memory, Mythology, and National Identity', *British Journal of Sociology* 54(1) (2003), 69–70; C. de Cesari and A. Rigney, 'Beyond Methodological Nationalism', in C. de Cesari and A. Rigney (eds), *Transnational Memory: Circulation, Articulation, Scales* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 9. Also see, P. Nora and D.L. Kritzman (eds), *Realms of Memory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).

48. C. Tekin, 'Discussing Turkey in "European Terms"? Conceptualisations of Turkey and the European Union between European Political Camps during the Accession Talks in the 2000s'. Unpublished PhD thesis (Bochum: Ruhr Universität Bochum, 2016).

49. As documented in the eight-volume book series *Writing the Nation*, edited by S. Berger, C. Conrad and G. Marchal (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007–2015).

50. S. Berger and C. Conrad, *The Past as History: National Identity and Historical Consciousness in Modern Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2015).

51. M. Horkheimer and T.W. Adorno, *Dialectics of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002).

52. C. Defrance and U. Pfeil, 'German–French School Textbook: Some Considerations about its Origins and the First Two Volumes'. Conference paper, 2008, <https://www.bpb.de/system/files/pdf/IK3TE4.pdf> [last accessed 11 February 2017].

53. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, 'Foreign Ministers Present Polish–German History Textbook', 23 June 2016. http://www.ms.gov.pl/en/news/foreign_ministers_present_polish_german_history_textbook_jsessionid=60E6BFE46A014C43DD9D48F8C915E045.cmsap5p [last accessed 11 February 2017].

54. U. Brunnbauer (ed.), *(Re)writing History: Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism* (Münster: Lit-Verlag, 2004).

Bibliography

Archival Sources

Commission of the European Communities. 'A People's Europe'. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, Com(88) 331 Final, Brussels, 7 July 1988, 11.

European Commission. 'General Report on the Activities of the European Union 2013'. Luxembourg: Publication Office of the European Union, 2014.

European Commission. 'Europe for Citizens Programme 2007–2013. Programme Guide, 2013'. http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/programme/documents/2013/guide_2013_en_final%20.pdf [last accessed 2 February 2017].

European Parliament. 'Declaration of the European Parliament on the Proclamation of 23 August as European Day of Remembrance for Victims of Stalinism and Nazism', 23 September 2008, Brussels, P6_TA(2008)0439.

European Parliament. 'EP Bureau Decides to Set Up a "House of European History"'. Press Release, 20081216IPR44855. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?language=en&type=IM-PRESS&reference=20081216IPR44855> [last accessed 2 February 2017].

Horizon 2020 Project. 'Unsettling Remembering and Social Cohesion in Transnational Europe'. www.unrest.eu [last accessed 9 February 2017].

House of European History, Brussels. <https://historia-europa.ep.eu/en> [last accessed 7 November 2017].

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland. 'Foreign Ministers Present Polish–German History Textbook', 23 June 2016. http://www.ms.gov.pl/en/news/foreign_ministers_present_polish_german_history_textbook_jsessionid=60E6BFE46A014C43DD9D48F8C915E045.cmsap5p [last accessed 11 February 2017].

United Nations Outreach Programme. 'About the Holocaust and the United Nations Outreach Programme'. <http://www.un.org/en/holocaustremembrance/> [last accessed 11 February 2017].

Secondary Sources

Assmann, A. 'The Holocaust – A Global Memory? Extensions and Limits of a New Memory Community', in A. Assmann and S. Conrad (eds), *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 97–118.

———. 'Transnational Memories'. *European Review* 22(4) (2014), 546–56.

Bell, D.S.A. 'Mythscape: Memory, Mythology, and National Identity'. *British Journal of Sociology* 54(1) (2003), 63–81.

Berger, S. 'Narrating the Nation: Historiography and Other Genres', in S. Berger, L. Eriksonas and A. Mycock (eds), *Narrating the Nation: Representations in History, Media and the Arts* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), 1–16.

———. 'History and Forms of Collective Identity in Europe: Why Europe Cannot and Should Not be Built on History', in L. Rorato and A. Saunders (eds), *The Essence and*

- the Margin: National Identities and Collective Memories in Contemporary European Culture* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009), 21–36.
- Berger, S., and C. Conrad. *The Past as History: National Identity and Historical Consciousness in Modern Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2015.
- Berger, S., C. Conrad and G. Marchal. *Writing the Nation*. 8 volumes. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007–2015.
- Berger, S., and C. Lorenz (eds). *The Contested Nation: Ethnicity, Class and Gender in National Identities*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Berger S., and B. Niven. 'Introduction', in S. Berger and B. Niven (eds), *Writing the History of Memory* (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014), 1–24.
- . 'Writing the History of National Memory', in S. Berger and B. Niven (eds), *Writing the History of Memory* (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014), 135–56.
- Biedenkopf K., B. Geremek and K. Michalski. *The Spiritual and Cultural Dimension of Europe: Concluding Remarks*. Vienna, Austria: Institute for Human. Sciences / Brussels: European Commission, 2004.
- Brunnbauer, U. (ed.). *(Re)writing History: Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism*. Münster: Lit-Verlag, 2004.
- Bull, A., and H.L. Hansen. 'On Agonistic Memory'. *Memory Studies* 9(4) (2016), 390–404.
- Buttner, S., and A. Delius. 'World Culture in European Memory Politics? New European Memory Agents between Epistemic Framing and Political Agenda Setting'. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23(3) (2015), 391–404.
- Calligaro, O. 'Legitimation through Remembrance? The Changing Regimes of Historicity of European Integration'. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23(3) (2005), 330–43.
- Cesari, C. de, and A. Rigney (eds). *Transnational Memory: Circulation, Articulation, Scales*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.
- . 'Beyond Methodological Nationalism', in C. de Cesari and A. Rigney (eds), *Transnational Memory: Circulation, Articulation, Scales* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 1–25.
- Defrance, C., and U. Pfeil. 'German–French School Textbook: Some Considerations about its Origins and the First Two Volumes'. Conference paper, 2008, <https://www.bpb.de/system/files/pdf/IK3TE4.pdf> [last accessed 11 February 2017].
- Delanty, G. 'Entangled Memories: How to Study Europe's Cultural Heritage'. *European Legacy* 22(2) (2017), 129–45.
- Droit, E. 'Le Goulag contre le Shoah'. *Vingtième Siècle* 94 (2007), 101–20.
- Flood, C. 'The Politics of Counter-memory on the French Extreme Right'. *Journal of European Studies* 35(2) (2005), 221–36.
- Gerner, K. 'Open Wounds? Trianon, the Holocaust and the Hungarian Trauma', in C. Mithander, J. Sundholm and M. Holmgren Troy (eds), *Collective Traumas: Memories of War and Conflict in Twentieth-Century Europe* (Brussels: Peter Lang, 2007), 79–110.
- Gillis, J.H. *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Goodliffe, G. 'From Political Fringe to Political Mainstream: The Front National and the French Municipal Elections of 2014'. *French Politics, Culture and Society* 35 (2017), 126–47.
- Gossman, L. 'History as Decipherment: Romantic Historiography and the Discovery of the Other'. *New Literary History* 18(1) (Autumn 1986), 23–57.
- Horkheimer, M., and T.W. Adorno. *Dialects of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002.
- Huistra, P., M. Molema and D. Wirt. 'Political Values in a European Museum'. *Journal of Contemporary European Research* 10(1) (2014), 124–36.

- Huntington, S. *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996.
- Kaiser, W. 'Unreliable Narrators: Witness Accounts and the Institutionalization of European History'. *Eurozine*, 24 November 2011.
- . 'Clash of Cultures: Two Milieus in the European Union's "A New Narrative for Europe" Project'. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23(3) (2015), 364–77.
- . 'Limits of Cultural Engineering: Actors and Narratives in the European Parliament's House of European History Project'. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 3 October 2016, 1–17..
- Kim, G. 'Transnationalism in Reverse: From Yugoslav to Post-Yugoslav Memorial Sites', in C. de Cesari and A. Rigney (eds), *Transnational Memory: Circulation, Articulation, Scales* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 313–38.
- Kucia, M. 'The Europeanization of Holocaust Memory and Eastern Europe'. *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures* 30(1) (2016), 97–119.
- Kuebler, E. 'Holocaust Remembrance in the Council of Europe: Deplorable Victims and Evil Ideologies without Perpetrators'. *Jewish Political Studies Review* 23(12) (2012).
- Lähdesmäki, T. 'Narrativity and Intertextuality in the Making of a Shared European Memory'. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 25(1) (2017), 57–72..
- Larat, F. 'Present-ing the Past: Political Narratives on European History and the Justification of EU Integration'. *German Law Journal* 6(2) (2005), 273–90.
- Lebow, R.N., W. Kansteiner and C. Fogu (eds). *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Leerssen, J. *National Thought in Europe: A Cultural History*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007.
- Leggewie, C. 'Seven Circles of European Memory'. *Cultural Memories* 4 (2011), 123–43.
- Lehrer, E. 'Can There Be a Conciliatory Heritage?' *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16(4–5) (2014), 269–88.
- Levy, D., and N. Sznajder. *Erinnerung im globalen Zeitalter: der Holocaust*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2001.
- . 'Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory'. *European Journal of Social Theory* 5(1) (2002), 87–106.
- Macdonald, S. *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Madajczyk, P. 'Experience and Memory: The Second World War in Poland', in J. Echternkamp and S. Martens (eds), *Experience and Memory: The Second World War in Europe* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 70–85.
- Mann, R., and S. Fenton. *Nation, Class and Resentment: The Politics of National Identity in England, Scotland and Wales*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2017.
- Messenger, D.A. 'Contemporary Memory Politics in Catalonia: Europeanizing and Mobilizing the History of the Spanish Civil War', in C. Kraenzle and M. Mayr (eds), *The Changing Place of Europe in Global Memory Cultures: Usable Pasts and Futures* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2017), 49–62.
- Mithander, C., J. Sundholm and M. Holmgren Troy (eds), *Collective Traumas: Memories of War and Conflict in Twentieth-Century Europe* (Brussels: Peter Lang, 2007), 79–110.
- Mouffe, C. 'An Agonistic Approach to the Future of Europe'. *New Literary History* 43(4) (2012), 629–40.
- Nora, P., and D.L. Kritzman (eds). *Realms of Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
- O'Keefe, T. 'Landscape and Memory: Historiography, Theory, Methodology', in N. Moore and Y. Whelan (eds), *Heritage, Memory and the Politics of Identity: New Perspectives on the Cultural Landscape* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 3–18.

- Pakier, M., and B. Stråth. 'Introduction: A European Memory?' in M. Pakier and B. Stråth (eds), *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 1–20.
- Patel, K.K. 'In Search of a Second Historicization: National Socialism in a Transnational Perspective', in K.H. Jarausch and T. Lindenberger (eds), *Conflicted Memories: Europeanizing Contemporary Histories* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), 96–116.
- Robertson, I., and T. Hall. 'Memory, Identity and the Memorialisation of Conflict in the Scottish Highlands', in N. Moore and Y. Whelan (eds), *Heritage, Memory and the Politics of Identity: New Perspectives on the Cultural Landscape* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 19–36.
- Rüsen, J. 'Historical Thinking as Intercultural Discourse', in J. Rüsen (ed.), *Western Historical Thinking: An Intercultural Debate* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2002), 1–14.
- Settele, V. 'Including Exclusion in European Memory? Politics of Remembrance at the House of European History'. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23(3) (2015), 405–16.
- Shore, C. *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration*. London: Psychology Press, 2000.
- . "'In Uno Plures' (?) EU Cultural Policy and the Governance of Europe'. *Cultural Analysis* 5 (2006), 7–26.
- Sierp, A. *History, Memory, and Trans-European Identity: Unifying Divisions*. London: Routledge, 2014.
- Sierp, A., and J. Wüstenberg. 'Linking the Local and the Transnational: Rethinking Memory Politics in Europe'. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23(3) (2015), 321–29.
- Sterling, G.E. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).
- Stråth, B. 'Methodological and Substantive Remarks on Myth, Memory and History in the Construction of a European Community'. *German Law Journal* 6(2) (2005), 255–71.
- Sumartojo, S. 'On Atmosphere and Darkness at Australia's Anzac Day Dawn Service'. *Visual Communication* 14(3) (2015), 267–88.
- . 'Commemorative Atmospheres: Memorial Sites, Collective Events and the Experience of National Identity'. *Transactions* 41(4) (2016), 541–53.
- Sumartojo, S., and B. Wellings (eds). *Nation, Memory, and Great War Commemoration: Mobilizing the Past in Europe, Australia, and New Zealand*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2014.
- Taylor, A.J.P., et al. 'What is European History?' in J. Gardiner (ed.), *What is History Today?* (Houndmills and London: Macmillan Press, 1988), 143–54.
- Tekin, C. 'Discussing Turkey in "European Terms"? Conceptualisations of Turkey and the European Union between European Political Camps during the Accession Talks in the 2000s'. Unpublished PhD thesis. Bochum: Ruhr Universität Bochum, 2016.
- Wellings, B., and B. Power. 'Euro-myth: Nationalism, War and the Legitimacy of the European Union'. *National Identities* 18 (2015), 157–77.
- Woods, E.T., and R. Tsang. 'Ritual and Performance in the Study of Nations and Nationalism', in R. Tsang and E.T. Woods (eds), *The Cultural Politics of Nationalism and Nation-Building, Ritual and Performance in the Forging of Nations* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), 1–18.
- Woolf, S. 'Europe and its Historians'. *Contemporary European History* 12(3) (2003), 323–37.
- Zuev, D., and F. Virchow. 'Performing National Identity: The Many Logics of Producing National Belongings in Public Rituals and Events'. *Nations and Nationalism* 20(2) (2014), 191–99.