

## INTRODUCTION



# Representing the Second World War in German and European Museums and Memorials

JÖRG ECHTERNKAMP and STEPHAN JAEGER

The Second World War, as the last “total war,” has been in recent years at the center of various national and European debates surrounding the interpretation of the past. In many countries, it is still an, if not the most, important historical resource for discourses of political mobilization, legitimization, and national identity.<sup>1</sup> A renewed interest in the advancing of national narratives runs contrary to the tendency to “Europeanize” collective memories,<sup>2</sup> especially since 1989 and 1990, when the Holocaust became a common negative focus in Western Europe.<sup>3</sup> At the same time, post-Soviet Eastern European countries have attempted to juxtapose the memories of two eras from the twentieth century, Stalinism and Nazism, which they have interpreted as equally criminal totalitarian regimes.<sup>4</sup> Narratives of genocide confront narratives of national victimhood. Public representations of these narratives (national or European) reflect the ways in which they have been constructed, and have been evolving ever since.

Therefore, museums and memorials lend themselves to an analysis of such shifts in memory culture.<sup>5</sup> This holds particularly true for those representing the Second World War, as can be seen in the controversies surrounding the House of European History in Brussels, which opened in May 2017, particularly during the museum’s planning phase. Journalists and politicians, most of them British, questioned whether there was a coherent enough “European” identity to warrant a European history museum.<sup>6</sup> The question also arose as to whether a single European master narrative can represent the Second World War or whether each member state in the European Union should have its own version(s) and interpretation(s) of how the war has shaped modern European history. Additionally, it must be asked whether a museum is able to express the tensions stemming from different interpretations of history.<sup>7</sup>

The new Muzeum II Wojny Światowej (Museum of the Second World War, MIIWŚ) in Gdańsk is another striking example of recent memory debates about the war. In April 2016, the Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage announced a new administrative structure in which the museum would merge with another new museum, which has yet to be constructed but will be located on Gdańsk's Westerplatte peninsula, where the Second World War began, and will focus solely on the events in Poland during 1939. Polish and international historians, as well as the city of Gdańsk, protested the Polish federal government's interference. These protests demonstrate the deep tensions in contemporary Polish society and memory culture about whether the Second World War should be remembered and represented in a comprehensive European framework or through a nationalistic emphasis on Polish heroism and suffering.<sup>8</sup>

Because the Provincial Administrative Court in Warsaw reconsidered and temporarily suspended the previous court order, which permitted the museum merger and the new administrative structure, on 30 January 2017, the founding director, Paweł Machcewicz, was able to open the museum on 23 March 2017. On 5 April 2017, the Supreme Administrative Court of the Republic of Poland revoked the suspension decision, allowing the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage to merge the two museums and replace Machcewicz with Karol Nawrocki.<sup>9</sup> The museum remains open today. The consequences of the approved merger and change of directorship have only slowly started to reveal themselves through minor but telling changes in the permanent exhibition<sup>10</sup> design, implying a considerably more heroic tone.<sup>11</sup> The Second World War has become the primary event for the current Polish government's memory politics.

A third example demonstrating current controversies around the interpretation of the Second World War is the Memorial to the Victims of the German Occupation by the sculptor Péter Párkányi Raab, erected in Budapest in July 2014. In the ruins of a temple with broken columns, a bronze eagle representing Nazi Germany towers over a bronze statue of Archangel Gabriel representing "innocent" Hungary. The memorial has triggered a protest movement, which has manifested itself in the hundreds of spontaneous remembrance notes and objects located opposite the memorial. An emotionally charged public debate indicates the problematic relationship between the Hungarian people and the current government's interpretation of Hungary's role in the Second World War.<sup>12</sup> It remains to be seen whether the monument will end up working in favor of a nationalist revisionist narrative or becoming an unintended agent of change through memory controversy. Consequently, James E. Young sees monuments increasingly as sites "of contested and competing meanings," more likely sites "of cultural conflict than of shared national values and ideals. . . . The state's need for a monument is acknowledged, even as the traditional forms and functions of monuments are increasingly challenged."<sup>13</sup>

Indeed, the subject matter of war, and the Second World War in particular, in museums and memorials has become the object of recent research in numerous fields such as history, heritage and museum studies, literary studies, cultural studies, and Holocaust and genocide studies.<sup>14</sup> On the one hand, museums, memorials, and monuments reflect public discourse and/or official politics. On the other hand, they are themselves agents of memory politics. Even before they open their doors or are inaugurated, they have most likely already triggered public debates on how the past should be referenced in form and content, and how this relates to prevailing national narratives. Museums and memorials are embedded in complex regional, national, and European narrative processes. They can turn either to universal ideas such as peace, tolerance, or human rights, or else to specific historical formations of victory, defeat, suffering, and atrocity. They can target specific agents and their roles, such as victims, perpetrators, bystanders, collaborators, soldiers, civilians, and resistance fighters. Exhibitions can highlight themes one would expect to see in a traditional war museum, such as specific battles and combat experiences, military equipment such as weapons and uniforms, distinctions of honor, and so on.<sup>15</sup> They can reflect the relationship between society and war, for example, through exhibiting themes such as toys, fashion, language, or memory and war, as can be seen in the 2011 exhibition of the Militärhistorisches Museum der Bundeswehr in Dresden (Bundeswehr Military History Museum, MHM) or in the “society” gallery of the 2017 exhibition of the National Army Museum in London.

For the researcher, it is crucial to explain the ethical, legal, aesthetic, and affective dimensions of the war’s representation and remembrance. These understandings are important in determining whether such roles blur together and make visitors reflect on the Second World War’s past and present complexities, or whether they reinforce societal assumptions. Contrary to the genre of academic research, museums and memorials depend on public acceptance, visitor numbers, and funding sources. Since exhibitions and memorials are not the result of individual research but rather the culmination of longer processes, accompanied by advisory boards, bureaucrats, politicians, and public debate, they appear to represent an “official” view of the past. They can also highlight the stories of individuals, which can supplement, diversify, or subvert master narratives. Similarly, by depicting history, museums and memorials contribute to the construction of collective identities. Jenny Kidd has argued that “the relationship between the museum’s role as an arbiter of collective memory and as an active constituent in the making and re-making of individual identities renders ambiguous any sense of an objective past, especially when it comes to heritages that challenge in the ways outlined above.”<sup>16</sup> Thus, by analyzing the debates around the construction of museums and memorials, the production and reception of exhibitions, and the strategies of visualization, we can gain considerable insight into recent understandings of the past and their political implications.

Additionally, we can learn about the decisions that inform the selection and the exclusion of specific themes, stories, objects, and perspectives of war.

Because of the recent generational shift, museums and memorials that reference the Second World War have become public venues for negotiating interpretations of the past to an even greater degree than for previous generations. With the death of the last eyewitnesses, “communicative memory” is turning into “cultural memory.”<sup>17</sup> When it comes to the Second World War and the commemoration of its victims and heroes, any interpretation *ex cathedra* is especially contested.<sup>18</sup> This can be seen in particular when a museum takes on the hybridized goal of representing history and commemorating the past, or when a memorial is charged with expectations from numerous and starkly different interest groups. On the one hand, there are many types of historical museums, some of which create an intentional overlap in the concepts of museum and memorial: traditional military history museums, modern cultural history museums, memorial museums or memorials,<sup>19</sup> documentation centers, memorial sites situated at authentic historical locations (which focus on learning through commemoration and history), and ideas museums.<sup>20</sup> At the same time, a memorial (from *memoralis*) is a structure such as a monument that serves as a memory of an event or a person, frequently intended to celebrate it. War memorials, gravestones, mausoleums, and memorial plaques are common examples of memorials. But there are also memorial benches, even “ghost bikes,”<sup>21</sup> and other less common memorials.

When the memorial is constructed in order to commemorate something considered to be of national importance, the term national memorial or monument can be used. The term is also used for the acts relating to it, such as a service of remembrance or commemoration. The German use of “memorial” (*Gedenkstätte*) refers to a particular place—a memorial park, for instance—that may or may not contain monuments. The distinction between museum and memorial becomes increasingly blurred here, as Silke Arnold-de Simine notes: “New museums commemorating violent histories often double as memorials and quite a few memorials feature information centers.”<sup>22</sup> Generally, memorial places serve the (negative) memory of Nazism, war, and genocide on the one hand and of Soviet occupation and socialist dictatorship in East Germany on the other. Concentration camps, in particular, are considered memorials that serve to remind visitors of a terrible past through their authentic setting, and often with the help of a permanent exhibition. Memorials in this sense are supposed to preserve the relics of that past and serve as a place of learning. In cases in which the memorial is closely linked to a monument built as a warning to future generations, the German translation of “memorial” would be *Mahnmal*, a particular form of *Denkmal* (monument/memorial). Most prominently, the popular shorthand for the Berlin Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe is Holocaust-Mahnmal.

Monuments that function without supplementary exhibitions work have different spatial functions than museums. At the intersection of memory and space, historians have related social memory to the construction of symbolic places. The term “landscape” reflects the idea that nature is a human construct: it characterizes a *Kulturlandschaft* (cultural landscape) where constructs of the imagination are projected onto water and rock, as Simon Schama has rightly underlined.<sup>23</sup> The coast of Normandy, where numerous monuments supplement the natural setting of the Allies’ landing on the beaches of Normandy (D-Day), is a case in point.<sup>24</sup> Historians, as well as geographers and social scientists, analyze the “text” of the landscape, the framework in which this text is produced, and the ways in which it functions. In memorial landscapes where objects such as statues or plaques remind visitors of past events or persons, the landscape adds an emotional element of experience that allows visitors to connect the past to their present. Visitors might actively seek to visit primarily symbolic monuments for commemoration or to learn about the symbolic memory of the past, whereas museums contain contextual and interpretive information that have been actively and purposefully created for visitors.

Wolfgang Muchitsch and others have asked whether war belongs in the museum.<sup>25</sup> How can museums express the trauma, bereavements, horrific bodily experiences, atrocities, complex issues of guilt, and hope that occur in war? The interconnection of war and atrocity in the Second World War further complicates this question. Jay Winter argues: “All war museums fail to represent ‘the war,’ because there was then and is now no consensus as to what constituted the war. . . . They never describe war; they only tell us about its footprints on the map of our lives.”<sup>26</sup> Winter maintains that war museums should resist the temptation of realistic-mimetic presentation and emphasize that these museums are sites of interrogation and contestation in order for visitors to understand the links between the past and a present shaped by the consequences of war.

There is a trend of experiencing or reenacting the past, particularly in the Anglo-American world, in contrast to the “traditional” Second World War museum that emphasizes objects and artifacts.<sup>27</sup> Since the so-called Beutelsbacher Consensus of 1976, German memorial sites have tended to avoid emotionally overwhelming visitors and stress the need for cognitive distance so that visitors can reflect and learn from history.<sup>28</sup> Since this volume focuses on German museums and memorials in the European context, it is important to scrutinize this apparent contrast more closely. Both traditions highlight the importance of learning and emphasize the importance of performativity in museum exhibitions.<sup>29</sup> German institutions still seem to be more documentary, whereas the Anglo-American museum landscape highlights the transformative educational value of history museums, as, for example, Kidd argues: “Heritage institutions contribute variously to a number of educative endeavours: to increase knowledge about the past; to aid in the understanding and construction of identity;

to transform our relationships with our landscape, communities and ‘nation’; and, with any luck, to make us ‘good citizens,’ increasingly, enmeshed within talk of ‘social justice.’”<sup>30</sup> This educational interest in the present connects with the concept of “difficult knowledge” as knowledge that does not fit into traditional discourse and forces visitors to challenge their own experiences.<sup>31</sup>

Every Second World War exhibition in the twenty-first century faces the representational and experiential challenges of how to involve the visitor and of how to connect “difficult” pasts to the present. Globally, contemporary museums use a variety of methods to create “experiences” of the past, often surrounded by vigorous debates over the degree to which representations of the Second World War should be emotional or documentary, or else how these modes can be complementary.<sup>32</sup> This includes displaying authentic or simulated objects, documenting factual evidence, and combining text, images, film, and other forms of visualization and digitization. Historical authenticity can be defined in two ways: witnessing the past through firsthand accounts, auratic places, or objects from the past; and experiencing a simulated “authentic” past through replicas and historical reenactment.<sup>33</sup> Some even have the visitors *produce* their own visions of the violent past. In contrast to a linear book, museum visitors choose what to read and perceive in a museum, making the recipient essential to the analysis of the cognitive, ethical, and aesthetic dimensions of a museum’s representation. Thus, how a museum controls its narrative or experiential message—and whether it allows visitors to explore tensions or different, ambiguous versions of the violent past—is significant.

Violence, including the “history of violence” (*Gewaltgeschichte*), has become a contemporary category of interdisciplinary research. Not until the 1990s did violence become an object of historical, sociological, and ethnological research. Current scholarship is not only interested in the social, political, or cultural conditions that make violence possible. Instead, researchers look more closely at the process of violence itself to better understand its mechanisms. This new perspective has been influenced by the “cultural turn” through its focus on actors and meanings; the symbolic dimension of violence also plays a role. On the one hand, violent processes have come to be considered the basis of “spaces of violence” or “communities of violence.”<sup>34</sup> On the other hand, the representation of violence, rather than violence itself, has become an object of research. After all, historians, literary critics, and other scholars deal with texts and images related to violence. Although they cannot and should not replace the study of violence as such, the analyses of textual and visual representations of violence enhance our understanding of the meaning ascribed to violence after it occurs. This holds particularly true when it comes to the representation of mass violence typical of war.

Different forms of cultural representation have strongly influenced historical perspectives on violence. On the one hand, countless memorials have

commemorated those who suffered and/or died because of violence, oscillating between grief and glorification. On the other hand, objects of war have been collected and arranged in museums, evoking the time and experiences of the war. Both representational forms of military violence have reflected contemporary ideas of war, the role of soldiers and civilians, and the self-perception of those doing the remembering. A logical consequence of these phenomena, for example, is that the MHM's new permanent 2011 exhibition pursues the goal of representing the history and anthropology of violence.<sup>35</sup> Similarly, the Mémorial de Caen, in Normandy, France, which opened in 1988, emphasizes in the latest version of its permanent exhibition (it underwent strong revisions in 2009 and 2010 in its third section, "World War, Total War") how a particular concept of violence and the increasing brutalization on all sides provides an explanatory pattern for understanding the Second World War. The anthropological effects of violence also form the core of the permanent exhibition in the MIIWŚ, although they operate within a clearer victim-perpetrator frame (the Polish nation and other occupied states versus the totalitarian states, particularly Germany and the Soviet Union).<sup>36</sup>

The concept of violence allows all three museums to interweave the Holocaust with a Second World War narrative, despite their different memory contexts, demonstrating a clear trend in military history and Second World War museums. The Nazis' program of conquest and genocide affected the course of the war that in turn led to the radicalization of their racial politics.<sup>37</sup> The analysis of museums and memorials also points to important changes in cultural and societal value systems, such as the replacement of the epic vision of war following 1945, in favor of a more sober "post-heroic" view of military conflicts in many European societies. This new perspective highlights individual stories—that are not synthesized into master narratives—by depicting history from below, as well as the anthropological and cultural impact of war on society. Indeed, such new political paradigms can cause changes toward multidirectionality.<sup>38</sup> At the same time, trends like these remain dynamic, and depend on constantly shifting paradigms, as the debates about the MIIWŚ indicate. Museums and memorials are consistently situated between regional, national, and inter- and transnational frameworks.

*Views of Violence* analyzes the representational and commemorative strategies in twenty-first-century museums and memorials in order to understand the most recent views on the violent pasts of the Second World War in German, Austrian, and European contexts. Analyzing the specific media/genres of museums and memorials in the wider context of European memory culture<sup>39</sup> reveals the complexities of exhibiting and memorializing the Second World War in history museums and special exhibitions, memorial museums, memorial sites/exhibitions, documentation centers, memorial landscapes and discourses, monuments, and cemeteries. Whereas American scholarship

strongly focuses on Holocaust representation (as can be seen, for example, in the works of Michael Bernard-Donals, Jennifer Hansen-Glucklich, and Alison Landsberg),<sup>40</sup> this volume highlights the complex relationship of Second World War, Holocaust, and other discourses of suffering and commemoration. Several chapters in this volume also relate to observations about how past and present can be linked to each other. Bernard-Donals has argued by example of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC, that the museum “conveys historical and cultural memory but also—in its inculcation of individual memory—encourages visitors to remember events that bear little relation to the Holocaust as such but that are intimately connected to the visitors’ present, the moment of ethical engagement from which they are propelled to become witnesses.”<sup>41</sup>

This volume analyzes how museums, memory landscapes, and monuments visualize, verbalize, and mediate the Second World War for contemporary European audiences between experience, commemoration, and historical knowledge. The volume focuses on German and Austrian representations, supplemented by contemporary representations in the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Poland, and Canada. Its comparative approach, centering on German and Austrian memory, has allowed us to develop answers to the various functions of current representation and commemoration techniques in the German and European memory landscape of the Second World War. Such a comparative approach has also allowed us to avoid the difficulty found in other collections, which seem to simply assemble individual case studies. Certainly, this demonstrates that there is not one, single, consistent memory of the Second World War, concerning either national master narratives or a (Western) European narrative. Indeed, complex entanglements exist and can only be understood through a multitude of studies surrounding the practices of representation and remembrance of the Second World War in museums, memorial landscapes, and monuments. The comparative approach is significant, with all contributions revealing the tensions between national and European (or universal) discourses. This volume highlights different visualization, spatialization, narrativization, and framing techniques that are employed by museums and memorials, including the use of perspective; the creation of historical proximity and distance; the use of text, photography, film, and multimedia installations; and the temporal and spatial layers of memory with their cognitive, ethic, and aesthetic implications.

## Museums

This book focuses on museum representations, memory landscapes, and memorials. The first part, “Museums,” analyzes contemporary representational



techniques in their historical tendencies. Additionally, it explores museum-specific techniques of creating experiential views of the past, as well as the use of space and visualization in the museum, and questions how perpetration can be represented in the museum and what it means to house a museum in a perpetrator country. Furthermore, it analyzes comparative narrative patterns, political discourses, and memory politics in the contemporary museum, marking the complexities between national and transnational trends. All the chapters are situated around questions concerning whether exhibitions are presented as fact-based places for learning, as entertainment, or as experience. The chapters also discuss whether the museum visitor is encouraged to think independently or is mainly prompted to digest a preconstructed version of the past. Another strand that connects the chapters is the notion of authenticity in relation to historical objects or media, as well as the location of an exhibition and building in which it is housed.

In chapter 1, Thomas Thiemeyer provides an overview of historical and current trends in Second World War and Holocaust museal representation in Germany, highlighting the ways in which war representation in the media has changed in its transference from communicative into cultural memory. Thiemeyer identifies four phases of German museum representation, beginning with 1945–1960, which was shaped by the near disappearance of war representation in the museum in West and East Germany. Distant, intentionally objective memorial sites that remember Nazi history and atrocities characterize the second phase (1960s–1990s). The third phase (1990s–2000s) concentrates on new perpetrator research. Most recently, in the fourth phase, there are five clear trends in German museums. (1) Museums and memorials are geared primarily no longer toward veterans but rather toward younger people who have no firsthand memory of the war. (2) Therefore, remembering the war in museums has become more professionalized and institutionalized, exceeding the interests of military historians. (3) Historical events, such as the Second World War and the Holocaust, have become a prominent part of what is called the “heritage industry.” (4) Museums and memorial site exhibitions have changed according to their underlying political, educational, and historiographical concepts; they have become “performative spaces” in which people are supposed to “experience” the past rather than reflect on it. The historical object has become only one of many means to attract the museum’s potential audience, which in turn has become more important than the museum’s collection. (5) Finally, as discussed earlier, the concept of military history has undergone far-reaching methodological changes since the 1980s. Military historians no longer restrict their studies to military operations and organizations, but most importantly include approaches and topics including cultural studies, as well as the sociology of violence. Recent exhibitions increasingly focus on everyday life and individual experiences rather than the history of battles. People on the

home front, prisoners of war, and crimes against humanity are some of the new topics under discussion.

Chapter 2, by Stephan Jaeger, connects to Thiemeyer's question of how to mediate the Second World War in the European museum in the contemporary historiographical and memory environment. The chapter develops a theoretical framework for understanding how contemporary museums mediate war through the narratological concept of "experientiality" in order to understand and theorize historiographical approaches for varying museal representations of the Second World War in the second decade of the twenty-first century. The approaches that are analyzed create a fine balance between representing historical knowledge, simulating historical structures and entanglements rather than historical events, and emotionalizing the visitor on various levels. Though almost all newer museums construct their own simulated historical, poetic worlds, they vary in their representational strategies. For example, variations occur in the historical distance between visitor and museum contents, the focus on individual voices and collective perspectives, and the use of narrative and scenography in relation to exhibited objects. The museum as a genre expands the notions of time and space, leading to a dynamic relationship between history and memory, while aiming to involve the present visitor's future behavior in different emotional, moral, reflexive, and pedagogical dimensions. There are variations between museums that suggest differing primary experiences of the past, which allow the museum visitor to empathize with concrete historical perspectives. However, these perspectives are marked by their constructed nature and their structural experientiality. This can allow the visitor either to empathize with constructed collective perspectives or to experience simulated abstract effects of war in multifaceted ways. These effects are not historical events but rather constructions of historical knowledge that are clearly not in themselves historical. This chapter contextualizes such forms of experientiality in the context of the Western European museum, with particular emphasis on new exhibitions in the Second World War battleground regions of Normandy and the Ardennes, as well as the most recent German war exhibitions in Berlin-Karlshorst and Dresden.

Exhibitions are sensual experiences that rely particularly on visual perception. In chapter 3, Jana Hawig explores specifically how historic images are used in contemporary Second World War representations. Museums use the power of images to construct forms of reality in the spectator's gaze. They must also deal with the challenge that governments, as means of propagandistic war communication, have heavily used photography and video footage from the world wars. Visual media such as photography and film are used in exhibitions to depict scenes or people of the past. Today, visual material reveals what can no longer be seen: scenes of battlefields, victims, perpetrators, or atrocities. The comparative analysis of images in the MHM in Dresden and the Imperial War

Museum North in Manchester reveals potential differences in the use of visual material in Germany and Great Britain in order to shed light on exhibition practices in modern museums. It does so while bearing in mind the differing national methods of Second World War remembrance. The findings illustrate that the heritage of the two countries' war history in the twentieth century influence the use of images in museums today, with a tension between learning from media in Germany and affect-based representation in the United Kingdom. Furthermore, the findings deal with the degree to which each respective style aims to unsettle the visitor through confrontation with images in order to make them reflect on different meanings of the Second World War. This analysis demonstrates numerous representational tensions, such as that between the academic referencing of images and entertainment, and the cognitive and emotive dimensions of exhibiting historical sources in visual media.

As discussed earlier, any analysis of the representation of the Second World War is closely entangled with the representation of the Holocaust. Erin Johnston-Weiss, in chapter 4, continues this volume's exploration of the aesthetic and representational effect of visual media by examining empathy and distancing in the museum visitor while being confronted with Holocaust photography in the *Topographie des Terrors* (Topography of Terror) and the Canadian Museum for Human Rights. The chapter analyzes the intricacies of creating numerous levels of visitor empathy with victims, perpetrators, and bystanders. Consequently, empathy evidently is not opposed to cognitive-based learning about the past but rather can supplement such a learning process. This chapter demonstrates how empathy can be created through an exhibition's way of allowing the visitor to take on the gaze of perpetrator and bystander through photographic collage. This concept of "gaze as empathy" challenges the visitor to rethink their relation to the "difficult knowledge" of the Holocaust and the Second World War. By contrasting a German documentation center and a Canadian museum, we can understand how different national narratives can contribute to how empathy and distancing are perceived in two museums with similar subject matters. These representational techniques are used in specific ways for distinct audiences dealing with atrocities and human rights in the twenty-first century. The visitor is forced into a global perspective of war and human rights that is relevant to their present and goes beyond the goal of historical documentation. This link between past and present also indicates perspectives for the future analyses of genocide and mass atrocities in museums.

In chapter 5, Sarah Kleinmann asks how museums can represent the National Socialist perpetrator in the context of a museum exhibition. She compares two exhibitions from the perpetrator countries of Germany and Austria, located at authentic sites of the "euthanasia killings": the Museum Gedenkstätte Grafeneck (Grafeneck Museum memorial site) in southern Germany and the Lern- und Gedenkort Schloss Hartheim (Hartheim Castle Learning

and Memorial Site) in northwestern Austria. The chapter demonstrates recent progress in representing perpetrators in a museum context, as well as ongoing curatorial, representational, and financial challenges of perpetrator exhibitions. Kleinmann analyzes representational means and sources, normative frames, explanations for the euthanasia killings, narrative structures, and the curatorial decisions of both exhibitions. In particular, Kleinmann underlines that the gender-specific dimensions of persecution could be further reflected in the exhibitions. Both exhibitions highlight a factual and documentary approach in their representation of perpetrators, based on both research and the demands of victims' relatives. Despite the differences in memory debates and historical developments in Austria and Germany since 1945, there are analogous patterns of interpretation between the two exhibitions, proving that there is a transnational effect within the fields of perpetrator research, museum work, and memory politics. Kleinmann chooses a political-ideological framework for her chapter in order to highlight the potential for political and ideological pressures to reverse the insights of contemporary perpetrator research, making it even more important to reflect on the ways in which perpetrators can be represented in a museal context.

Winson Chu concludes the first half of this volume with chapter 6, which demonstrates particularly how exhibition narratives are embedded within political and ideological contexts, blending national and European narratives. An analysis of how the Warsaw Uprising of 1944 has been portrayed in historical exhibitions in Germany reveals the difficulties of finding a shared European identity and the function of memory politics in the German-Polish discourse. This is especially highlighted in relation to the 2014 special exhibition developed for the seventieth anniversary of the uprising by the Warsaw Rising Museum at the Topography of Terror in Berlin. The site of the former Gestapo and SS headquarters on Wilhelmstraße was symbolic in displaying the genesis, development, and consequences of the epic struggle, which claimed the lives of some two hundred thousand Poles and temporarily wiped the city of Warsaw from the map. Supplemented by reflections on other projects in Poland and Germany, the chapter shows that Polish-German historical exhibitions since the 2000s have sought to portray a European paradigm of reconciliation that relies on the narrative of totalitarian oppression and victimization at the hands of Nazis and Soviets lasting from 1939 to 1989. Subordinating the uprising into this narrative of an eternal Polish search for independence has made any discussion about the causes and consequences of the uprising nonnegotiable. In the 2014 Berlin exhibition, the "bloody" defeat was transformed into a moral victory by emphasizing an uncompromising quest for freedom that justified the lives lost. Although the Europeanization of Second World War history has meant that national museums across Europe have begun to engage with their own countries' participation in the persecution of Jews during the Holocaust,

the Polish sponsor used the Berlin exhibition to reinforce nationalist narratives about Polish heroism and philosemitism. Exhibitions on German-Polish history have reflected increasingly divisive developments in European memory politics and the continuing nationalization of history writing. Indeed, the division of memory labor across Europe today ensures that even when projects have transnational cooperation, visitors seeing the same exhibition will come away with little that alters their own national viewpoints.

## Monuments and Memorial Landscapes

The second part of this book focuses on monuments and so-called memorial landscapes. Several contributions also analyze the role of museums and exhibitions in memorials as part of a wider memorial landscape. These monuments and memorial landscapes evoke various stages and problems of the war: D-Day; the Battle of Hürtgen Forest (1944–1945), east of the Belgian-German border; the death and suffering of civilians who fled the Red Army, and non-German populations taking revenge on Germans in formerly German or occupied territories from 1945 through the immediate postwar years; and the millions of fallen soldiers (and small number of deserters) in the Wehrmacht—a problem dealt with only recently. On the one hand, these aspects of war are referenced in “authentic” places where one can visit the remains of warfare, such as the bunkers on Omaha Beach or the fortifications of Hürtgen forest. On the other hand, monuments were also erected in centralized locations to send their message to a wider audience, such as the monument of the deserter, inaugurated in 2014, on the Ballhausplatz next to Vienna’s Heldenplatz, which is one of the most important public spaces in the capital. Additionally, different institutions have shaped the various views of violence they offer: central and regional, national and foreign, public and private.

The fierce battles fought between US forces and the Wehrmacht on the Western Front in and around the *Hürtgenwald* (Hürtgen forest), from September 1944 to February 1945, are among the final and longest battles on the territory of the German Reich. In chapter 7, opening the “Memorial” part, Karola Fings analyzes how a memorial landscape has developed in the Hürtgenwald region in recent decades, consisting of monuments, war gravesites, memorial stones, and a museum. This memorial landscape has been characterized by a practice of remembrance and commemoration, with an emphasis on the memory of the German 116th Panzer Division and the victims of war. In particular, the two large war graves in the villages of Hürtgen and Vossenack are places to commemorate those who fell in the battle. In these representations, Wehrmacht soldiers are commonly presented as heroes, while German civilians are considered victims of war. Contrary to the development of national discourse,

any critical historicization has been set aside. Thus, this memorial landscape has become a place of fascination for revisionist and right-wing groups. This chapter analyzes how the museum's representation of the past fits into this ideologically charged memorial landscape; contextualizes the complex question of victimhood and perpetratorship, the involvement of social groups and institutions, and the public's perception of commemoration practices; and demonstrates how increasing criticism has led to a shift of perspective in regional memory politics.

This shift away from the glorification of German soldiers to a more critical and more inclusive view is also apparent in the Austrian case. Chapter 8 focuses on ongoing social and political processes and practices that have shaped and transformed two memorials at the renowned Heldenplatz and the adjacent Ballhausplatz, both in the heart of Vienna, during the past two decades: the Heldendenkmal (Heroes' Memorial), and the Memorial for the Victims of Nazi Military Justice. The latter was only inaugurated in October 2014. The former was established in 1934, during the Austrofascist era, for the fallen soldiers of the First World War. Since the end of the Second World War, it has also been used for the soldiers of that war. Additionally, since 1965, the *Weiheraum* (consecrated space) inside the same building has been established as a memorial for the Austrian resistance fighters. These two memorials to obedient and disobedient actors are part of a database consisting of about 1,700 symbols of remembrance in Vienna. Peter Pirker, Magnus Koch, and Johannes Kramer highlight the necessity of analyzing the plurality and interrelations of sectional memories in society to understand the mechanisms of the politics of memory in democracies. The chapter explores social and political frameworks, as well as the driving force behind transformative agency in one specific cycle of war memorialization. This cycle ran through imperial, postimperial, fascist, National Socialist, and democratic constructions and appropriations. The chapter serves as an intensive case study of the country's "working through the past" regarding the Second World War, ending in today's new, complex national and European narratives.<sup>42</sup> The creation of the deserters' memorial on the Ballhausplatz reveals the possible impact of a small group of actors with a single issue, at an intersection of party politics, scholarship, and civil society activism. This has brought the National Socialist persecution of Wehrmacht deserters to light and has allowed for their legal and social rehabilitation. The incomplete musealization of the Heldendenkmal has also been mainly advanced by experts, who have found little advocacy in civil society.

The same holds true when one examines yet another reminder of the Second World War, as well as its consequences on local and regional levels: monuments commemorating flight and expulsion in Central and Eastern Europe. There are more than 1,400 local expellee monuments in Germany today. Few of them, however, mark historical sites. To encounter such authentic memori-

als, one must travel to Germany's neighboring countries, where, over the years, criticism of the expellee organizations and Germany's official remembrance of flight and expulsion has been most vociferous. Nevertheless, over the past quarter-century, expellee organizations and other groups have erected more than one hundred local onsite monuments at mass graves, internment camps, and elsewhere to memorialize the violent excesses perpetrated against ethnic Germans after the demise of the Nazi regime. In chapter 9, Jeffrey Luppés illustrates how monuments in the former "German East" have commemorated flight and expulsion. This chapter tracks the development of this memorial architecture to highlight the commonalities and divergences between memorialization of this topic at the local level, within both Germany and its eastern neighbors. Luppés particularly emphasizes the public debate over a memorial plaque in Postoloprty (Postelberg) in the Czech Republic to understand how these monuments (placed at authentic sites) use different terminologies to describe the forced migration of ethnic Germans and the atrocities committed against them. Additionally, he explores the possibilities that monuments and public discourse hold for a less contentious model of the remembrance of flight and expulsion. This chapter contributes to larger debates about German suffering during the Second World War and the history of war and violence in the twentieth century. It also offers a transnational comparison of the forms, inscriptions, and iconographies of local expellee monuments to understand this specific dimension of German postwar memory.<sup>43</sup>

Jörg Echternkamp concludes the volume's second part with chapter 10. Similarly to Fings and Luppés, Echternkamp argues that memory culture develops at authentic sites or in authentic spaces. The landing operations on 6 June 1944 in Normandy have historically been presumed to be the decisive step toward liberation of German-occupied northwestern Europe, and the most important contribution to the Allied victory on the Western Front. While the particular landscape of the Normandy coast marked this military operation, the battles have left their marks on the coastline. The materiel traces of Operation Neptune cannot be overlooked even today: German fortifications as part of the Atlantic Wall, the aerial and naval bombardment by the Allies, the amphibious landings in the five sectors, and the tedious battle against the Wehrmacht that followed all altered the landscape. In addition to those authentic imprints of military history, a second historical layer has changed the landscape since the 1950s. War cemeteries, monuments, memorials, and museums of various kinds have reshaped the area. Thus, the Normandy battleground can be considered an example of the interaction between humans and space. With the "spatial turn" of cultural history in mind, and a focus on the history of memory, this chapter examines the transformation process by charting how the battlegrounds have been turned into a memorial landscape since the end of the Second World War. It identifies different historical "markers" of the memory space in Nor-

mandy today, and demonstrates its symbolic meanings through its relation to the European master narrative of liberation and integration. Since 2014, the Normandy region has been trying to get the coastline on the list of UNESCO World Heritage sites, implying its outstanding universal value. The inclination toward an idealizing narrative in accordance with the framework of the World Heritage criteria also reflects the much more sobering logic of economy, “heritage tourism,” education, and remembrance against the backdrop of generational change. As in Thiemeyer’s chapter 1, Echternkamp concludes with the challenging question of whether the symbolism situated between culture and nature can replace the loss of eyewitnesses in representing the Second World War for future generations.

In his afterword, Jay Winter situates the commemoration of the Second World War in a wider context of technologically driven memory booms in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries since the end of the First World War, highlighting how the changes in forms of remembrance affect what is remembered. Besides the link between media and memory, Winter emphasizes the role of the experiential: the way in which war is imagined and simulated in a globalized and commercialized world. He then contrasts the categories of secular and existential memory regimes. Winter captures the former in its relation to the mainly Western concept of human rights, whereas the latter is visible in numerous dimensions of the “sacred” languages of martyrdom, and thus a shared memory of the Second World War in Europe remains a utopian idea in the constant memory battles between the secular and the sacred.

**Jörg Echternkamp** is Research Director at the Center for Military History and Social Sciences of the Bundeswehr, Potsdam; Associate Professor of Modern History at Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg; and coeditor of *Militärgeschichtliche Zeitschrift*. He has worked widely on German and European social and cultural history (nineteenth to twenty-first centuries), focusing on nationalism, National Socialism and the Second World War, postwar memories, and historiography. His publications include seven monographs, recently, *Das Dritte Reich* (2018) and *Soldaten im Nachkrieg* (2014); two edited volumes, including *Germany and the Second World War, Volume IX/1–2: German Wartime Society 1939–1945* (2014); and eight coedited volumes, most recently, *Geschichte ohne Grenzen?* (2017) and *Gefallenengedenken im globalen Vergleich* (2013). He is currently editing a book on military and society in East and West Germany from 1970 to 1990.

**Stephan Jaeger** is Professor of German Studies and Head of the Department of German and Slavic Studies at the University of Manitoba. He researches on narratives, representations, and memory of war in German and European literature, film, historiography, and museums. His publications include two



monographs, *Theorie lyrischen Ausdrucks* (2001) and *Performative Geschichtsschreibung* (2011); and seven coedited publications, including *Fighting Words and Images: Representing War across the Disciplines* (2012) and “Representations of German War Experiences from the Eighteenth Century to the Present,” a special issue of *Seminar* (2014). He is currently completing a monograph on twenty-first-century museum representations of the Second World War in Europe and North America.

## Notes

1. See, e.g., Kerstin von Lingen, ed., *Kriegserfahrung und nationale Identität in Europa nach 1945: Erinnerung, Säuberungsprozesse und nationales Gedächtnis* (Paderborn, 2009).
2. See Stefan Berger, “Remembering the Second World War in Western Europe, 1945–2005,” *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*, ed. Małgorzata Pakier and Bo Stråth (New York, 2010), 119–36; Jörg Echternkamp and Stefan Martens, eds., *Experience and Memory: The Second World War in Europe* (New York, 2010); Manuel Bragança and Peter Tame, eds., *The Long Aftermath: Cultural Legacies of Europe at War, 1936–2016* (New York, 2016); Jörg Echternkamp and Hans-Hubertus Mack, eds., *Geschichte ohne Grenzen? Europäische Dimensionen der Militärgeschichte vom 19. Jahrhundert bis heute* (Berlin, 2017). For the discussion of the Holocaust as negative founding myth of Europe, see Claus Leggewie, “Seven Circles of European Memory,” *Eurozine*, 20 December 2010, <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2010-12-20-leggewie-en.html>; cf. Claus Leggewie and Anne Lang, *Der Kampf um die europäische Erinnerung: Ein Schlachtfeld wird besichtigt* (Munich, 2011).
3. For reading the Holocaust as vehicle of an institutionalized Pan-European memory, see Oliver Plessow, “The Interplay of the European Commission, Researcher and Educator Networks and Transnational Agencies in the Promotion of a Pan-European Holocaust Memory,” *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23, no. 3 (2015): 378–90. For the prevailing national narratives of basically all European nations as victims and resisters in the Second World War, see Monika Flacke, ed., *Mythen der Nationen: 1945—Arena der Erinnerungen: Eine Ausstellung des Deutschen Historischen Museums—Begleitbände zur Ausstellung 2. Oktober 2004 bis 27. Februar 2005. Ausstellungshalle von I. M. Pei, 2 vols.* (Berlin, 2004). For the increasing status of the Holocaust as globalized memory, see Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider, *Erinnerung im globalen Zeitalter: Der Holocaust* (Frankfurt, 2007); Aleida Assmann, “The Holocaust—a Global Memory? Extensions and Limits of a New Memory Community,” in *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*, ed. Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad (Basingstoke, 2010), 97–117.
4. Cf. Zuzanna Bogumił, Joanna Wawrzyniak, Tim Buchen, Christian Ganzer, and Maria Senina, *The Enemy on Display: The Second World War in Eastern European Museums* (New York, 2015); Timothy Snyder, *Bloodlands: Europe between Hitler and Stalin* (New York, 2010); Volker Knigge and Ulrich Mählert, eds., *Der Kommunismus im Museum: Formen der Auseinandersetzung in Deutschland und Osteuropa* (Cologne, 2005).
5. For the German Second World War experience in the twenty-first century, see also Susanne Vees-Gulani and Stephan Jaeger, “Introduction: Representations of German War Experiences and the Legacy of the Second World War,” in “Representations of

- War Experiences from the Eighteenth Century to the Present,” ed. Stephan Jaeger and Susanne Vees-Gulani, special issue, *Seminar: A Journal of Germanic Studies* 50, no. 1 (2014): 1–17. For the changing configuration of museums, see Simon J. Knell, Suzanne MacLeod, and Sheila Watson, eds., *Museum Revolutions: How Museums Change and Are Changed* (New York, 2007).
6. See, e.g., Chris Doidge, “Does Europe Need a £44M History Museum?” *BBC News*, 12 February 2013, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-21383375>. For the problems of musealizing Europe, see Wolfram Kaiser, Stefan Krankenhagen, and Kerstin Poehls, eds., *Exhibiting Europe in Museums: Transnational Networks, Collections, Narratives, and Representations* (New York, 2016).
  7. For discussion on the limitations of the museum’s approach, see Veronika Settele, “Including Exclusion in European Memory? Politics of Remembrance at the House of European History,” *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23, no. 3 (2015): 405–16. See also Oliver Grimm, “Kampf und Krampf um ‘Haus der Europäischen Geschichte,’” 25 January 2012, *Die Presse*, <http://diepresse.com/home/ausland/eu/726922/Kampf-und-Krampf-um-Haus-der-Europaeischen-Geschichte>.
  8. See also Winson Chu, this volume.
  9. The discussion has also been well documented in the international press. See, e.g., Rachel Donadio and Joanna Berendt, “Poland’s Second World War Museum is Imperiled,” *New York Times*, 24 January 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/24/arts/design/polands-world-war-ii-museum-is-imperiled.html>.
  10. Note that this volume uses “exhibition” throughout; “exhibit” is only used, as is common in British English, to signify a single object in an exhibition.
  11. Cf. Julia Michalska, “Outcry over Polish Government’s Changes to Second World War Museum,” *The Art Newspaper* 21 December 2017, <https://www.theartnewspaper.com/news/outcry-over-polish-government-s-changes-to-second-world-war-museum>. For an analysis of the original exhibition, see Anna Muller and Daniel Logemann. “War, Dialogue, and Overcoming the Past: The Second World War Museum in Gdańsk, Poland,” *Public Historian* 39, no. 3 (2017): 85–95.
  12. For further details, see Silke Arnold-de Simine, “The Ruin as Memorial—The Memorial as Ruin,” *Performance Research* 20, no. 3 (2015): 97.
  13. James E. Young, “Memory and the Monument after 9/11,” in *The Future of Memory*, ed. Richard Crownshaw, Jane Kilby, and Antony Rowland (New York, 2010), 78.
  14. For Eastern Europe, cf. Ekaterina Makhotina, Ekaterina Keding, Włodzimierz Borodziej, Etienne François, and Martin Schulze Wessel, eds., *Krieg im Museum: Präsentationen des Zweiten Weltkriegs in Museen und Gedenkstätten des östlichen Europas* (Paderborn, 2015); Monika Heinemann, *Krieg und Kriegserinnerung im Museum: Der Zweite Weltkrieg in polnischen historischen Ausstellungen seit den 1980er-Jahren* (Göttingen, 2017); Stefan Troebst and Johanna Wolf, eds., *Erinnern an den Zweiten Weltkrieg: Mahnmale und Museen in Mittel- und Osteuropa* (Leipzig, 2011). For the Second World War in museums in Western Europe, see Thomas Thiemeyer, *Fortsetzung des Krieges mit anderen Mitteln: Die beiden Weltkriege im Museum* (Paderborn, 2010); Jay Winter, “Museum and the Representation of War,” in *Does War Belong in Museums? The Representation of Violence in Exhibitions*, ed. Wolfgang Muchitsch (Bielefeld, 2013), 21–37; Silke Arnold-de Simine, *Mediating Memory in the Museum: Trauma, Empathy, Nostalgia* (Basingstoke, 2013). For an eclectic collection of mostly case studies, see Muchitsch, *Does War Belong in Museums?* For a theoretical discussion of war

- in memorial landscapes, see Keir Reeves, ed., *Battlefield Events: Landscape, Commemoration and Heritage* (London, 2015); Annika Björkdahl and Susanne Buckley-Zistel, eds., *Spatializing Peace and Conflict: Mapping the Production of Places, Sites and Scales of Violence* (Basingstoke, 2016); Marie Louise Stig Sørensen and Dacia Viejo-Rose, eds., *War and Cultural Heritage: Biographies of Place* (New York, 2015).
15. For the evolution of the German war museum from 1945 to the present, see Thomas Thiemeyer, this volume.
  16. Jenny Kidd, "Introduction: Challenging History in the Museum," in *Challenging History in the Museum: International Perspectives*, ed. Jenny Kidd, Sam Cairns, Alex Drago, Amy Ryall, and Miranda Stearn (London, 2014), 4.
  17. For the concepts of communicative and cultural memory, see Jan Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1992), 48–56. For the German context, see Aleida Assmann, *Shadows of Trauma: Memory and the Politics of Postwar Identity*, trans. Sarah Clift (New York, 2016).
  18. See Bill Niven, ed., *Germans as Victims: Remembering the Past in Contemporary Germany* (New York, 2006); Helmut Schmitz, ed., *A Nation of Victims? Representations of German Wartime Suffering from 1945* (Amsterdam, 2007).
  19. See esp. Paul Williams, *Memorial Museums: The Global Rush to Commemorate Atrocities* (Oxford, 2007), 7–9. For the merging of museum and memorial, here in the French term *historial* for the Historial de la Grande Guerre (Historial of the Great War) in Péronne, see also Jean-Jacques Becker, "The Origins of the Historial," in *The Collections of the Historial of the Great War*, ed. Caroline Fontaine, Annette Becker, Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau, and Marie-Pascale Prévost-Bault (Paris, 2008), 31–32.
  20. For the concept of the "ideas museum," see Karen Busby, Adam Muller, and Andrew Woolford, eds., *The Idea of a Human Rights Museum* (Winnipeg, 2015).
  21. A ghost bike is a bicycle roadside memorial, placed where a cyclist has been killed or severely injured.
  22. Arnold-de Simine, *Mediating Memory*, 76.
  23. Simon Schama, *Landscape and Memory* (New York, 1995).
  24. Cf. Jörg Echternkamp, this volume.
  25. Muchitsch, *Does War Belong in Museums?*
  26. Winter, "Museum and the Representation of War," 23.
  27. Cf., e.g., the subtle discussion by Arnold-de Simine, *Mediating Memory*.
  28. For further details, see Thiemeyer, this volume.
  29. E.g., Rosmarie Beier-de Haan, "Re-staging Histories and Identities," in *A Companion to Museum Studies*, ed. Sharon Macdonald (New York, 2006), 186–97; Sharon Macdonald, *Difficult Heritage: Negotiating the Nazi Past in Nuremberg and Beyond* (New York, 2008); Aleida Assmann, *Geschichte im Gedächtnis: Von der individuellen Erfahrung zur öffentlichen Inszenierung* (Munich, 2007), 136–79.
  30. Kidd, "Introduction," 7.
  31. Cf. Erica Lehrer, Cynthia E. Milton, and Monica Patterson, eds., *Curating Difficult Knowledge: Violent Pasts in Public Places* (Basingstoke, 2011); Julia Rose, *Interpreting Difficult History at Museums and Historic Sites* (Lanham, MD, 2016). For the Second World War, see esp. Macdonald, *Difficult Heritage*.
  32. The tension between distant reflection and the emotional involvement of the visitor is crucial for museums' representational decisions concerning the Second World War. For example, the MIIWŚ quoted the German historian Stefan Troebst on its website

after a roundtable discussion in the museum as follows: “German museums are totally bleached of any emotion when touching on such topics as the Holocaust, occupational terror, mass executions, or other terrifying events”—Prof. Troebst said and continued to explain that German exhibitions typically limited themselves to presenting documents, black-and-white photographs, and the like.” Muzeum II Wojny Światowej, “Whats On,” entry 23 January 2017, last accessed 23 March 2017, <http://www.muzeum1939.pl/en/aktualnosci/act/news-info/type/month/y/2017/m/01#article-1c79554cb2f8541728cca66701fb6ab6>. These entries have disappeared after a complete website redesign as a consequence of the director change. In contrast, scholars such as Thiemeyer, *Fortsetzung des Krieges*, 248–49, have repeatedly warned that experiential museums can manipulate the visitor through scenographic spectacles and reduce the visitor’s capacity for reflection. For a discussion of different layers of “experientiality” that museums can express or create, see Stephan Jaeger, this volume.

33. Eva Ulrike Pirker, “Authentizitätsfiktionen in populären Geschichtskulturen: Annäherungen,” in *Echte Geschichte: Authentizitätsfiktionen in populären Geschichtskulturen*, ed. Eva Ulrike Pirker, Mark Rüdiger, Christa Klein, Thorsten Leiendecker, Carolyn Oesterle, Miriam Sénécheau, and Michiko Uike-Bormann (Bielefeld, 2010), 17–18.
34. Jörg Baberowski, *Räume der Gewalt* (Frankfurt, 2015); Winfried Speitkamp, ed., *Gewaltgemeinschaften: von der Spätantike bis ins 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 2013); Stefan Kühl, *Ganz normale Organisationen: Zur Soziologie des Holocaust* (Berlin, 2014); Axel T. Paul and Benjamin Schwalb, eds., *Gewaltmasse: Über Eigendynamik und Selbstorganisation kollektiver Gewalt* (Hamburg, 2015).
35. Cf. Stephan Jaeger, “Temporalizing History toward the Future: Representing Violence and Human Rights Violations in the Military History Museum in Dresden,” in Busby et al., *The Idea of a Human Rights Museum*, 229–46.
36. Muller and Logemann, “War, Dialogue, and Overcoming the Past,” 89, contextualize violence in the MIIWŚ as follows: “The similarities between the murderous ambitions of both Germany and the Soviet Union bring to focus the urgency of the war machine and an internal logic of violence.”
37. Doris L. Bergen, *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust*, 2nd ed. (Lanham, MD, 2009).
38. Cf. Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford, CA, 2009).
39. E.g., Muchitsch, *Does War Belong in Museums?*; Makhotina et al., *Krieg im Museum*; Troebst and Wolf, *Erinnern an den Zweiten Weltkrieg*; Olga Kurilo, ed., *Der Zweite Weltkrieg im Museum: Kontinuität und Wandel* (Berlin, 2007).
40. E.g., Michael Bernard-Donals, *Figures of Memory: The Rhetoric of Displacement at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum* (Albany, 2016); Jennifer Hansen-Glucklich, *Holocaust Memory Reframed: Museums and the Challenges of Representation* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2014); Alison Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture* (New York, 2004).
41. Bernard-Donals, *Figures of Memory*, 17.
42. Because of its status as a national case study, the chapter is approximately double the length of other chapters in this volume.
43. See also Christopher Whitehead, Katherine Lloyd, Susannah Eckersley, and Rhianon Mason, eds. *Museums, Migration and Identity in Europe: Peoples, Places and Identities* (London, 2015).

## Bibliography

- Arnold-de Simine, Silke. *Mediating Memory in the Museum: Trauma, Empathy, Nostalgia*. Basingstoke, 2013.
- . "The Ruin as Memorial—The Memorial as Ruin." *Performance Research* 20, no. 3 (2015): 94–102.
- Assmann, Aleida. *Geschichte im Gedächtnis: Von der individuellen Erfahrung zur öffentlichen Inszenierung*. Munich, 2007.
- . "The Holocaust—a Global Memory? Extensions and Limits of a New Memory Community." In *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*, edited by Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad, 97–117. Basingstoke, 2010.
- . *Shadows of Trauma: Memory and the Politics of Postwar Identity*. Translated by Sarah Cliff. New York, 2016.
- Assmann, Jan. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. Munich, 1992.
- Baberowski, Jörg. *Räume der Gewalt*. Frankfurt, 2015.
- Becker, Jean-Jacques. "The Origins of the Historial." In *The Collections of the Historial of the Great War*, edited by Caroline Fontaine, Annette Becker, Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau, and Marie-Pascale Prévost-Bault, 30–33. Paris, 2008.
- Beier-de Haan, Rosmarie. "Re-staging Histories and Identities." In *A Companion to Museum Studies*, edited by Sharon Macdonald, 186–97. New York, 2006.
- Bergen, Doris L. *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust*. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD, 2009.
- Berger, Stefan. "Remembering the Second World War in Western Europe, 1945–2005." In *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*, edited by Małgorzata Pakier and Bo Stråth, 119–36. New York, 2010.
- Bernard-Donals, Michael. *Figures of Memory: The Rhetoric of Displacement at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2016.
- Björkdahl, Annika, and Susanne Buckley-Zistel, eds. *Spatializing Peace and Conflict: Mapping the Production of Places, Sites and Scales of Violence*. Basingstoke, 2016.
- Bogumił, Zuzanna, Joanna Wawrzyniak, Tim Buchen, Christian Ganzer, and Maria Senina. *The Enemy on Display: The Second World War in Eastern European Museums*. New York, 2015.
- Bragança, Manuel, and Peter Tame, eds. *The Long Aftermath: Cultural Legacies of Europe at War, 1936–2016*. New York, 2016.
- Busby, Karen, Adam Muller, and Andrew Woolford, eds. *The Idea of a Human Rights Museum*. Winnipeg, 2015.
- Doidge, Chris. "Does Europe Need a £44M History Museum?" *BBC News*, 12 February 2013. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-21383375>.
- Donadio, Rachel, and Joanna Berendt. "Poland's Second World War Museum Is Imperiled." *New York Times*, 24 January 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/24/arts/design/polands-world-war-ii-museum-is-imperiled.html>.
- Echternkamp, Jörg, and Stefan Martens, eds. *Experience and Memory: The Second World War in Europe*. New York, 2010.
- Echternkamp, Jörg, and Hans-Hubertus Mack, eds., *Geschichte ohne Grenzen? Europäische Dimensionen der Militärgeschichte vom 19. Jahrhundert bis heute*. Berlin, 2017.

- Flacke, Monika, ed. *Mythen der Nationen: 1945—Arena der Erinnerungen, eine Ausstellung des Deutschen Historischen Museums, Begleitbände zur Ausstellung 2. Oktober 2004 bis 27. Februar 2005, Ausstellungshalle von I. M. Pei*. 2 vols. Berlin, 2004.
- Grimm, Oliver. "Kampf und Krampf um 'Haus der Europäischen Geschichte.'" *Die Presse*, 25 January 2012. <http://diepresse.com/home/ausland/eu/726922/Kampf-und-Krampf-um-Haus-der-Europaeischen-Geschichte>.
- Hansen-Glucklich, Jennifer. *Holocaust Memory Reframed: Museums and the Challenges of Representation*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2014.
- Heinemann, Monika. *Krieg und Kriegserinnerung im Museum: Der Zweite Weltkrieg in polnischen historischen Ausstellungen seit den 1980er-Jahren*. Göttingen, 2017.
- Jaeger, Stephan. "Temporalizing History toward the Future: Representing Violence and Human Rights Violations in the Military History Museum in Dresden." In Busby et al., *The Idea of a Human Rights Museum*, 229–46.
- Kaiser, Wolfram, Stefan Krankenhagen, and Kerstin Poehls, eds. *Exhibiting Europe in Museums: Transnational Networks, Collections, Narratives, and Representations*. New York, 2016.
- Kidd, Jenny. "Introduction: Challenging History in the Museum." In *Challenging History in the Museum: International Perspectives*, edited by Jenny Kidd, Sam Cairns, Alex Drago, Amy Ryall, and Miranda Stearn, 1–22. London: Routledge, 2014.
- Knell, Simon J., Suzanne MacLeod, and Sheila Watson, eds. *Museum Revolutions: How Museums Change and Are Changed*. New York, 2007.
- Knigge, Volker, and Ulrich Mählert, eds. *Der Kommunismus im Museum: Formen der Auseinandersetzung in Deutschland und Osteuropa*. Cologne, 2005.
- Kühl, Stefan. *Ganz normale Organisationen: Zur Soziologie des Holocaust*. Berlin, 2014.
- Kurilo, Olga, ed. *Der Zweite Weltkrieg im Museum: Kontinuität und Wandel*. Berlin, 2007.
- Landsberg, Alison. *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*. New York, 2004.
- Leggewie, Claus. "Seven Circles of European Memory." Translated by Simon Garnett. *Eurozine*, 20 December 2010. <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2010-12-20-leggewie-en.html>.
- Leggewie, Claus, and Anne Lang. *Der Kampf um die europäische Erinnerung: Ein Schlachtfeld wird besichtigt*. Munich, 2011.
- Lehrer, Erica, Cynthia E. Milton, and Monica Patterson, eds. *Curating Difficult Knowledge: Violent Pasts in Public Places*. Basingstoke, 2011.
- Levy, Daniel, and Natan Sznaider. *Erinnerung im globalen Zeitalter: Der Holocaust*. Frankfurt, 2007.
- Lingen, Kerstin von, ed. *Kriegserfahrung und nationale Identität in Europa nach 1945: Erinnerung, Säuberungsprozesse und nationales Gedächtnis*. Paderborn, 2009.
- Macdonald, Sharon. *Difficult Heritage: Negotiating the Nazi Past in Nuremberg and Beyond*. New York, 2008.
- Makhortina, Ekaterina, Ekaterina Keding, Włodzimierz Borodziej, Etienne François, and Martin Schulze Wessel, eds. *Krieg im Museum: Präsentationen des Zweiten Weltkriegs in Museen und Gedenkstätten des östlichen Europas*. Paderborn, 2015.
- Michalska, Julia. "Outcry over Polish Government's Changes to Second World War Museum." *The Art Newspaper*, 21 December 2017, <https://www.theartnewspaper.com/news/outcry-over-polish-government-s-changes-to-second-world-war-museum>.
- Muchitsch, Wolfgang, ed. *Does War Belong in Museums? The Representation of Violence in Exhibitions*. Bielefeld, 2013.

- Muller, Anna, and Daniel Logemann. "War, Dialogue, and Overcoming the Past: The Second World War Museum in Gdańsk, Poland." *Public Historian* 39, no. 3 (2017): 85–95.
- Niven, Bill, ed. *Germans as Victims: Remembering the Past in Contemporary Germany*. New York, 2006.
- Paul, Axel T., and Benjamin Schwalb, eds. *Gewaltmasse: Über Eigendynamik und Selbstorganisation kollektiver Gewalt*. Hamburg, 2015.
- Pirker, Eva Ulrike, and Mark Rüdiger. "Authentizitätsfiktionen in populären Geschichtskulturen: Annäherungen." In *Echte Geschichte: Authentizitätsfiktionen in populären Geschichtskulturen*, edited by Eva Ulrike Pirker, Mark Rüdiger, Christa Klein, Thorsten Leiendecker, Carolyn Oesterle, Miriam Sénécheau, and Michiko Uike-Bormann, 11–30. Bielefeld, 2010.
- Plessow, Oliver. "The Interplay of the European Commission, Researcher and Educator Networks and Transnational Agencies in the Promotion of a Pan-European Holocaust Memory." *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23, no. 3 (2015): 378–90.
- Reeves, Keir, ed. *Battlefield Events: Landscape, Commemoration and Heritage*. London, 2015.
- Rose, Julia. *Interpreting Difficult History at Museums and Historic Sites*. Lanham, MD, 2016.
- Rothberg, Michael. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.
- Schama, Simon. *Landscape and Memory*. New York, 1995.
- Schmitz, Helmut, ed. *A Nation of Victims? Representations of German Wartime Suffering from 1945*. Amsterdam, 2007.
- Settele, Veronika. "Including Exclusion in European Memory? Politics of Remembrance at the House of European History." *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23, no. 3 (2015): 405–16.
- Snyder, Timothy. *Bloodlands: Europe between Hitler and Stalin*. New York, 2010.
- Sørensen, Marie Louise Stig, and Dacia Viejo-Rose, eds. *War and Cultural Heritage: Biographies of Place*. New York, 2015.
- Speitkamp, Winfried, ed., *Gewaltgemeinschaften: Von der Spätantike bis ins 20. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen, 2013.
- Thiemeyer, Thomas. *Fortsetzung des Krieges mit anderen Mitteln: Die beiden Weltkriege im Museum*. Paderborn, 2010.
- Troebst, Stefan, and Johanna Wolf, eds. *Erinnern an den Zweiten Weltkrieg: Mahnmale und Museen in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Leipzig, 2011.
- Vees-Gulani, Susanne, and Stephan Jaeger. "Introduction: Representations of German War Experiences and the Legacy of the Second World War." In "Representations of War Experiences from the Eighteenth Century to the Present," edited by Stephan Jaeger and Susanne Vees-Gulani. Special issue, *Seminar: A Journal of Germanic Studies* 50, no. 1 (2014): 1–17.
- Whitehead, Christopher, Katherine Lloyd, Susannah Eckersley, and Rhiannon Mason, eds. *Museums, Migration and Identity in Europe: Peoples, Places and Identities*. London, 2015.
- Williams, Paul. *Memorial Museums: The Global Rush to Commemorate Atrocities*. Oxford, 2007.
- Winter, Jay. "Museum and the Representation of War." In Muchitsch, *Does War Belong in Museums?* 21–37.
- Young, James E. "Memory and the Monument after 9/11." In *The Future of Memory*, edited by Richard Crownshaw, Jane Kilby, and Antony Rowland, 77–92. New York, 2010.