Anna Bull

Report: Approaches to memory in dealing with difficult/dissonant heritage.

24 March 2021

1) Issues of terminology

There are different terms used to refer to potentially problematic or controversial heritage. Sites of heritage linked to bloody conflicts and atrocities have increasingly been defined as 'dark heritage sites' attracting 'dark tourism' (Foley and Lennon 1996) or 'thanatourism' (Seaton 1996). Stone (2006) listed seven 'dark history products' within a spectrum from darkest to lightest. The darkest product of all he labels 'Dark Camps of Genocide', while the next along the spectrum he defines as 'Dark Conflict Sites'. Among the latter are the battlefields of the First World War. According to Stone (2006, 152), the lightest products, defined as 'Dark Fun Factories', like the London Dungeon, 'predominantly have an entertainment focus and commercial ethic'. By contrast, Dark Camps of Genocide and Dark Conflict Sites have primarily an educational and commemorative focus, even though the latter have increasingly adopted a more commercial character.

An alternative definition is that of 'dissonant heritage': this has been defined as 'the heritage «that hurts» or that recalls past events not easy to be reconciled with visitors' values and everyday experience' https://dissonantheritage.wordpress.com/). Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996, 21-27) use the concept to refer to a lack of agreement in representing and interpreting such sites. However, I agree with those, like Kisić (2013: 56) who argue that the term 'heritage dissonance' is more appropriate than 'dissonant heritage', since 'dissonance exists as a latent quality of any heritage – it is present as a passive potential. This latent quality becomes active only when new voices are articulated (Laclau/Mouffe 1985; Laclau 1993; Couldry 2010) and unlock the already established discourse related to that particular heritage'.

For instance, if a site of heritage has been neglected and largely forgotten, it could be argued that there is no dissonance around it. Or a site can be presented and interpreted in ways that play down its potential dissonance, for instance a fascist building can be interpreted almost exclusively in terms of its aesthetic quality, which successfully obscures its potential for generating dissonance.

It should be clear that dissonance has for me positive connotations. It is true that dissonance can be viewed as problematic, indicating that heritage management should strive to achieve consonance, for instance by recasting fascist and Nazi heritage sites as places for promoting democratic values and human rights through an alternative

narrative to the one originally envisaged for such sites. However, dissonance can have a positive role in challenging established and hegemonic discourses and allowing for that peaceful contestation of values and meanings which is at the basis of democratic coexistence.

Conflict, in fact, is constitutive of democracy, and as such it should be regulated as opposed to suppressed. As Krzysztof Czyżewski et al. (2011: 400), of the Borderland Foundation based in Seiny, Poland, put it: 'We should learn […] to "teach conflicts" […] to teach a culture that would let people live in diversity, tension and conflict, and at the same time the culture would stay on guard over these tensions and not allow them to pass the brink of destruction'.

Dissonance requires active agents and hence participation on the part of diverse/contrasting actors, in the shape of discussions and debates, even controversies, with the help of oral histories, artistic installations, multiple narratives, so as to promote multiperspectivity and critical thinking.

In short, it depends on the uses we make of heritage as to whether the latter has the potential of generating (agonistic) dissonance. I relate dissonance in a positive way to agonistic democracy and agonistic memory (see below). An agonistic conception of democracy, precisely because it acknowledges and values disagreement and conflict, might help revitalise the European democratic project, especially when applied to the field of memory around problematic heritage related to mass crimes, civil wars and the two World Wars. By remembering past bloody conflicts in an agonistic manner, bringing to light the passions, identities and interests that led ordinary people to turn to violence, we can both understand, reflect on and counter contemporary antagonistic movements on the one hand and practice the dissonance of democracy on the other.

2) Distinguishing between different memory approaches and discourses.

In my 2016 paper with Hans Hansen which was the basis for the EU UNREST project, we argued that it is possible to distinguish between three generic, ethico-political modes of remembering, which we labelled *antagonistic*, *cosmopolitan* and *agonistic*. Their main traits are summarised below.

a) Antagonistic memory

Antagonistic memory is closely linked to and helps to reinforce group identity. There is always an **'us'**, which is contrasted against a **'them'**, in a combative or hostile way. Moral categories are also linked to these binary group identities. The group 'us' is attributed with categories that are good, and the 'them' is imbued with categories that are bad or evil. The antagonism is then between **'us = good'** and **'them = bad.'** Roles are adopted

and assigned within these moral categories, for example in the 'us' category we may have heroes and/or victims, who are perceived as positive and good, and in the 'them' category there are villains and perpetrators, who are negative and evil.

Emotions and passions are key to antagonistic memory which privileges these raw feelings to secure a strong sense of belonging to a certain community. It focuses on the suffering inflicted on those within this community by 'evil perpetrators' who are demonised. A strong empathy with shared past sufferings is created to the point where those who identify as part of the community are ready to fight against the 'other' who threatens it.

Antagonistic memory is un-reflexive and monologic, in other words individuals or groups are not required to reflect critically upon themselves or give an account to themselves about their own feelings and rationality.

This memory discourse in modern times is closely associated with nationalism and nationalist movements. In recent times, antagonistic memory has proved crucial to the rise of neo-nationalism and the populist right, which pits the 'elite' vs the 'people', connected to a memory of betrayal.

Antagonism always potentially contains an element of violence, or can lead to violence. The antagonistic mode of remembering, in fact, recognizes conflict as a means to eradicate the enemy with the purpose of creating a conflict-free society, typically represented in the image of a fictionalised or even mythologised past of peace and ethnic purity.

b) Cosmopolitan memory

Cosmopolitan memory is associated with the transnational memory of the Holocaust, which emerged in the 1970s, gaining wide public recognition through mass media. For example, the famous television series *Holocaust* in 1978, a four-part TV drama created in the United States was shown world-wide. Memory studies researchers consider this mini-series as a watershed production, which not only significantly increased public awareness, but also deeply influenced (trans)national memorialisation of the Holocaust by focusing on the suffering of its victims.

Cosmopolitan memory is also associated with the desire to come to terms with the violent past of the twentieth century, influenced by a human rights agenda which also emerged in the 1970s, but which then became particularly prominent after the end of the Cold War.

The transnational memory of the Holocaust and the human rights agenda were brought together in a strong theoretical framework under the term 'cosmopolitan memory' by Daniel Levi and Natan Sznaider (2006).

A specific attitude towards victimhood characterises cosmopolitan memory. Narratives of the past which are influenced by this approach focus strongly on the suffering of the victim, whilst erasing the traditional image of the hero, and the perpetrator. Good and evil are considered to be abstract categories, with human rights and democracy seen as good, and totalitarianism as evil.

Whereas antagonistic memory promotes the pre-eminence of the nation state, cosmopolitan memory believes that nation states are interconnected and stresses that divisions between nations are being broken down. This memory mode easily fits with supranational organisations like the European Union. It emphasises positive, but abstract, notions of European-ness over nationalist sentiments. The EU, not the least in its own House of European History in Brussels, has itself championed a cosmopolitan memory discourse in which the wars and the violence that once tore the continent apart are memorialised in such a way as to allow a common European heritage to move to the fore (Kaiser and MacMahon 2017; Rosenberg 2018).

Unlike antagonistic memory, cosmopolitan memory discourse is reflexive and dialogic, it promotes an awareness that our memories are constructed. It considers dialogue as a means of achieving reconciliation, as opposed to being open-ended. By placing the victim centre-stage, cosmopolitan memory prioritises consensus over conflict. In order to do so, this memory approach does not incorporate the perspectives of undesirable agents and actors like the perpetrator or other ambiguous figures, such as the collaborator or the bystander. While cosmopolitan memory can incorporate multi-perspectives, it aims to harness them to a single overarching narrative, eschewing controversial or undesirable perspectives. In a similar way, cosmopolitan memory discourse is wary of the role of emotions and passions, not least because they are viewed as potentially dangerous and leading to conflict. Emotions are restricted to compassion for the suffering of the victims.

c) Agonistic memory approach

Agonistic memory was conceived as a way to overcome the lack of interaction between the cosmopolitan mode and the antagonistic way of remembering, what Ang (2017: 4) has referred to as 'the friction between nationalism and cosmopolitanism' that 'has become paralysing'. Agonistic memory favours the re-politicization of the public sphere by unsettling both discriminatory and xenophobic discourses on the one hand, and a consensual approach primarily framed by human rights on the other.

Unlike antagonistic memory, agonistic memory avoids pitting 'good' against 'evil' and instead acknowledges the human capacity for evil in specific circumstances and in certain social and political contexts. Focusing on 'us' and 'them' constructs history as something done to people, negating individual agency. Both antagonistic and cosmopolitan modes of memory tend to simplify past historical events, either to misrepresent the past to further certain political agendas (antagonism), or de-contextualise the past to promote a new kind of universalism (cosmopolitanism). Agonistic memory aims to revitalise democracy and 'teach conflict', therefore it focuses

instead on reconstructing the historical context, specific socio-political struggles, and the individual and group stories which led either to peaceful contestation or to violence and war.

Hearing the testimonies of both victims AND perpetrators is crucial in agonistic memory, as well as witnesses, bystanders, spies, and traitors. The testimonies of all these actors can help us to understand when, how, and why people take on certain roles. We need to learn from these different perspectives.

Emotions and passions are important in agonistic memory, they do not undermine democracy or preclude understanding. In antagonism, passions and emotions cement a sense of belonging to a certain community or national group, and in cosmopolitanism, the focus is on empathizing with the suffering of the victims. Agonism argues that passion is an important force to reinvigorate democracy and can be used to create a sense of solidarity without demonising the 'evil other.' Empathy with victims is the first step in promoting understanding and acknowledging civic and political passions.

Agonistic memory is radically multiperspectivist, that is to say it incorporates controversial, unsettling and undesirable perspectives as much as possible, in order to 'teach conflict' and promote critical reflection. It does not strive to achieve a single overarching narrative on the past but to show that there are many narratives and viewpoints, including contrasting ones.

Summary and recommendations

Main traits of the three memory modes:

Modes of remembering past conflicts (Cento Bull and Hansen, 2016)

Mode	Nature of Conflict	Focalization	Reflexivity	Affect
Antagonistic Mode	Good and evil as moral categories related to characters Us= good Them= evil	Heroes (vs villains)	Unreflexive, monologic	Passion of belonging
Cosmopolitan Mode	Good and evil related to ideologies Democracy =good Totalitarianism = evil	The suffering of the individual victim Limited multi-perspectivity We are all victims	Consensually dialogic (Habermas)	Compassion with victims
Agonistic Mode	Social and historical contextualization of conflict and violence	Radical multi-perspectivity	Openendedly dialogic (Bakhtin)	Passion of solidarity

Why do we recommend agonistic memory?

National and European policy-makers, heritage practitioners and educationalists increasingly acknowledge that in these times of great structural inequalities those who feel marginalised rally around a national culture and identity pitted against a global culture perceived as sustained and promoted by privileged elites for their own interests.

Against the rise of these antagonistic movements, the cosmopolitan approach promoted until recently by national and European policy-makers has proved inadequate. For too long national and European interests and cultures have been deemed to enjoy a harmonic relationship to each other, with overlapping identities and belonging, ignoring underlying conflicts. Also, the EU has fostered the foundational myth of the union itself as a story of transnational reconciliation and peace and relies upon a consensual approach to the traumatic memories of the conflicts of the past (especially the two World Wars and the Holocaust) as the basis of social cohesion. This myth has been challenged heads-on by antagonistic movements which deliberately fuel the memory of past wars in order to recreate feelings of animosity and enmity.

In view of the above, the 'cosmopolitan' vision and narrative should be replaced with an 'agonistic' approach which recognises that relationships between and within nations can be conflictual and confrontational. Agonistic interventions around difficult heritage can help raise public awareness of antagonistic conflict and the best ways to promote democracy-building without suppressing conflict altogether.

3) Which modes of remembering are prevalent in heritage management across Europe?

As part of the UNREST project we analysed a number of war museums and heritage sites across Europe, with a view to assessing the dominant approach to memory adopted in different contexts. Our analysis points to important differences between western and eastern Europe with regard to prevalent modes of remembrance. The memory of the Second World War in particular in east central and eastern Europe is often bound up in intricate ways with the revival of national(ist) memorial cultures after the collapse of communism around 1990 (Koposov 2018). In this atmosphere a national 'us' is more easily constituted and contrasted with various foreign 'thems', in particular Germans, Russians but also sometimes 'Brussels' as head of an allegedly western-centric EU, ignorant of and not interested in the specific memorial landscapes of territories formerly behind the Iron Curtain (Karge 2010). The desire to 'return to Europe' and to fit into wider European memorial landscapes here contrasts and frequently clashes with the wish to re-establish their national memorial cultures.

One example is that of Poland. One of the museums we analysed was the Oskar Schindler's Factory in Kraków. A branch of the Kraków City Museum, it is located on an historic site, the former Enamel factory owned during the Second World War by Oskar Schindler made famous by Steven Spielberg's film *Schindler's List*. The permanent

exhibition, 'Kraków under Nazi Occupation 1939–1945', was opened in 2010, the first in Poland to attempt to combine both the Jewish and Polish war experience in one narrative. The museum has around 240,000 visitors per year. The resulting exhibition is a mix of antagonism and cosmopolitanism, where the former approach predominates. The Germans are portrayed as villains (though partially redeemed by the story of Schindler as hero), the Jews as mainly passive victims and the Poles as both victims and heroes (because they tried to help and save Jews). The moral categories of good and evil therefore underpin the permanent exhibition in which the Germans are portrayed in a dehumanised manner with a focus on hatred and cruelty. Controversial issues like pogroms are not dealt with, even though the first post-war pogrom in Poland took place in Krakow in 1945 - but technically outside the period officially covered by the exhibition. Antisemitism is largely blamed on German propaganda, and the role of the Catholic Church in relation to Jews is presented in a very positive light.

Since 2015, the trend towards an antagonistic and nationalist approach to heritage has accelerated in Poland. 'Poland's art institutions have increasingly become a vehicle for the ruling right-wing Law and Justice party's (PiS) cultural reform efforts' (https://news.artnet.com/art-world/poland-museums-conservative-1767513). The fate of the Second World War museum in Gdansk is an interesting case in point, as a cosmopolitan exhibition design was being replaced, under political pressure from the right-wing populist Polish government, by a more antagonistic and national interpretation of events in Poland during the Second World War (Machcewicz 2019).

In western Europe, by contrast, a cosmopolitan approach to memory and heritage seems to predominate, at least as far as past wars are concerned. Here the need is greatest to confront national historical master narratives, in which war and the military have played a prominent role (Berger 2020). While traditionally, war museums and heritage sites were the archetypal places for an antagonistic memory of a national 'us' against a foreign 'them' that celebrated the heroic deeds of 'our own' and denigrated the cowardice and inferiority of 'others' (Kavanagh 1994), by the second decade of the twenty-first century such antagonistic modes of remembering were downplayed while stories of universal victimhood and suffering in war took central place. Such emphasis on the victims of war sometimes brings with it a shallow, abstract, de-personalised and de-politicised portrayal of perpetratorship. Understanding perpetrators as three-dimensional human beings and comprehending the phenomenon of the bystander in war-time atrocities might involve difficult questions of responsibilities and of human guilt that complicate the stories of universal suffering and ask questions about who caused that suffering and what the reasons for causing such suffering were.

We should, however, be wary of straightforward dichotomies between western and eastern Europe, when it comes to memorial regimes, for two reasons. First, there are many examples of heritage management approaches that defy the dominant trend in both parts of Europe.

In Poland, for instance, the Polin Museum of the History of Polish Jews, opened in Warsaw in October 2014, located on the site of the former Nazi ghetto, and housed in a building designed by Finnish architect, Rainer Mahlamäki, stands in contrast to the Oskar

Schindler's Factory discussed in the previous section. In Polin, in fact, the complex range of Catholic Poles' views on, and behaviour towards, Jews is displayed in an open-ended manner, with no authorial voice suggesting that the attitudes of 'good Poles' prevailed. The exhibition portrays a multifaceted view of the behaviour of Polish people during the war, including unsettling instances of poles threatening, blackmailing or denouncing Jews, occasionally even murdering them for financial gain. The exhibition covers the 1941 massacre of Jews at Jedwabne, clearly stating that the perpetrators were Poles and not Germans. Artistic installations, innovative scenography and multilingual texts help display a wide range of human emotions and passions and contrasting viewpoints and attitudes.

One example of a cosmopolitan approach to both a war museum and a war site is that of the town of Kobarid in Slovenia, near the border with Italy. The town and surrounding area were the site of twelve battles, fought between the Austro-Hungarian (and German) forces and the Italian army between 1915 and 1917. The museum opened in 1990, one year before Slovene independence, to commemorate the twelfth battle, which marked a catastrophic defeat for the Italian army. The museum proved successful, both in terms of number of visitors and in terms of gaining international recognition. Nowadays it attracts roughly 70,000 visitors per year, mostly made up of an international audience, mainly Italians to whom the museum was originally addressed, as well as Slovenes, followed by Austrians and Germans, and, in fewer numbers, Hungarians, Americans, British, Czechs, Croats, Israelis and other nationalities. Furthermore, the area around Kobarid became an important dark heritage site. In 2002, the Slovenian state established the Pot Miru Foundation 'in order to preserve, restore and present the historical and cultural heritage of the First World War in the Soča Region'[1]. The Foundation in turn promoted the Walk of Peace project in collaboration with Italy as part of the EU cross-border cooperation programmes (Nadalutti 2012; Likar and Klavora 2015). The Walk of Peace extends for over a hundred kilometres, incorporating numerous historic sites, monuments and cemeteries from the First and Second World Wars.

The museum was planned with a clear anti-war message in mind. The founder and organisers of the museum favoured a cosmopolitan mode of remembering, avoiding conflicting interpretations and contrasting perspectives and focusing on shared experiences of suffering by soldiers of all nationalities. The explicit absence of historical and socio-political contextualisation aims at promoting peace and mutual empathy across national groups. The anti-war message of the museum was officially recognised and acknowledged at national and EU level. In 1993, it was one of the finalists for the European Museum of the Year award. In the same year, it received the Council of Europe Museum Prize. Since then, the Soča valley dark heritage site, with its numerous international cemeteries, and the Kobarid museum itself have increasingly come to play a high-level diplomatic role, hosting official commemorative events attended by the Prime Ministers and Presidents of former enemy countries, including Italy and Russia (Clarke, Cento Bull and Deganutti, 2017). As the authors argued (2017: 671), the cosmopolitan narrative of peace and reconciliation promoted by the museum, 'allows Slovenia to present itself as a niche advocate for the normative values of the EU'. The Kobarid museum, therefore, stands in contrast to, and explicitly aims to overcome, the divided memories of the First

---

[1] "Walk of Peace in the Soča Region Foundation", the Pot Miru Foundation, www.100letprve.si/en/po_miru/about_fundation

World War in this borderland, by emphasising the shared experiences of the foot soldiers, whichever side they fought on, and implicitly blaming, as Likar had remarked, 'the generals and politicians who triggered this unprecedented butchery'. By shifting the emphasis on the sufferings of ordinary soldiers, the museum curators and managers (and policymakers) hope for a rapprochement between ordinary visitors from former enemy countries.

As for Western Europe, there are various instances of a persisting antagonistic approach to heritage and museology. In Britain, one of the prime national war museums, the Imperial War Museum can be analysed, at least partially, as a nationalistic museum, in which antagonistic perspectives on war are strong and where we can still find a 'heroes' gallery' celebrating the heroism of British soldiers in the many wars in which Britain has been involved and continues to be involved in. In Italy, the fascist monument and ossuary of Redipuglia, containing thousands of soldiers killed in the First World War, continues to this day to retain its blatantly militaristic character. No attempt has been made to counter (or critically reflect upon) this explicit message with written labels, artistic installations, or other devices, despite the monument being part of the Walk of Peace (see above). These two examples should serve as a cautionary reminder that antagonistic modes of remembering war cannot only be found in Eastern Europe (Berger 2020b). Furthermore, vernacular antagonistic memories of war are mobilised by right-wing populist movements across Europe in order to undermine the cosmopolitanism espoused by the EU (Wodak, KhosraviNik and Mral 2013).

The second reason why we should be wary of straightforward dichotomies between western and eastern Europe when it comes to memorial regimes, is that most heritage sites tend to adopt hybrid approaches. At times they even stand in open contradiction to each other. For instance, the Kobarid museum embraces the cosmopolitan approach when dealing with the relatively uncontentious (and until then largely disregarded) memory of the First World War. However, its exhibition is much more antagonistic in the two rooms dedicated to the much more divisive and antagonistic memory of the Second, when the country was divided between pro-Tito partisans and collaborators of the fascist and Nazi occupiers. In these rooms, partisan fighters are contrasted to Italian fascists and Slovene collaborators. The former are presented as positive heroes, the latter two categories as villains and perpetrators. Another example is that of the Imperial War Museum, which has partially adopted a cosmopolitan approach while retaining heroic representations of war from a nationalist perspective. For example, it has a section on conscientious objectors. Yet another example is provided by the town of Kobarid, where another blatantly militaristic fascist monument and ossuary, property of the Italian state, dominates from above the entire town (not least at night, when it is lit up), in stark contrast to the cosmopolitan approach adopted by the museum and surrounding battlesites.

Summary and recommendations

Current practices around difficult heritage —for instance, museums of the First World War, which the UNREST project engaged with— tend to adopt either heroic, antagonistic representations, focused on telling a national narrative, or they tend to focus on the terrible conditions of the soldiers in the conflict, in an attempt to promote cosmopolitan solidarity beyond winners and losers. The former approach is prevalent in Eastern Europe, the latter in Western Europe, although there are important exceptions. It is also the case that often a hybrid approach is adopted, usually combining elements of both antagonism and cosmopolitanism.

The problematic issue with telling a traditional national heroic narrative around difficult heritage is that it excludes many important voices, not least those of ethnic minorities, pacifists and anti-war protesters, army deserters, etc. Above all, this narrative cannot incorporate acts of perpetration carried out by US as opposed to THEM, hence it perpetuates the myth of US = good, THEM = bad.

The issue with telling a cosmopolitan narrative of reconciliation and suffering is that it focuses on passive victims and downplays agency, e.g. the agency of the wagers of war, of the soldiers, of civilians, of protesters.

We recommend adopting an inclusive approach that incorporates different and even contrasting voices, fully acknowledges agency (including the agency of perpetrators), and recognises the bad in US as well as the good in THEM.

4) Can we find examples of practices of agonistic memory across Europe?

Various examples of agonistic memory practices can be found embedded within hybrid approaches. It is more difficult to find agonistic practices which are self-standing.

a) Agonistic practices/elements within hybrid approaches

In many museums and heritage sites, we find individual agonistic interventions within a mainly cosmopolitan approach.

Such agonistic interventions seem strongest where art is incorporated in the displays, as art often has the capacity to work memory in an agonistic mode (Piotrowski 2012: 239ff.). Furthermore, it would appear that the involvement of social actors 'from below' is an important way of incorporating more agonistic perspectives into the memory of problematic heritage, as they can introduce an element of controversiality into heritage discourses that is capable of strengthening agonistic interventions.

The already mentioned POLIN Museum in Poland, as we saw, can be considered as partially agonistic, as it often portrays critical and/or unsettling perspectives which challenge the dominant representation of Poles as victims of Nazi Germany and/or heroes in defending and protecting the Jews during the Holocaust. Another example is provided

by the artistic installations which in the city of Bolzano-Bozen have modified two fascist monuments in 2014 and 2017 respectively: The Victory Monument and the Casa del fascio. The former consists of a three-banded LED ring around one of the columns, with the title of the exhibition hosted in the crypt below in three languages: English, German, and Italian. The latter consists of another LED-illuminated inscription modifying the original fascist motto 'Believe, Obey, Fight' which appeared next to a bas-relief of Mussolini on horseback. The new LED installation offers a citation from Hannah Arendt in three languages, Italian, German and Ladin, which directly challenges the fascist motto, as it reads: 'Nobody has the right to obey'. While these installations can (and indeed have) been criticised for simply replacing a fascist message with a democratic one, their removable nature may also be seen as aiming to 'problematize the monument (and political power) in both its totalitarian and democratic guises' (Cento Bull and Clarke, 2020).

The problem with relying on artistic installations, however, is that they

> 'do not go beyond a deconstructing phase of provocation and contestation. They can unsettle visitors and disrupt dominant linear narratives, but in themselves cannot provide radical multiperspectivism. This would require artwork to be complemented by narrative-based interventions able to give voice to the "other" in its various guises, create space for subaltern stories, reveal the agency of historical actors, and expose power imbalances and inequalities'. (Cento Bull and Clarke, 2020)

In our UNREST fieldwork at mass graves sites linked to past conflicts, including bloody civil wars, we also found examples of agonistic behaviour. in Spain, for instance, as the dominant post-Franco discourse was one of forgetting, promoting mass exhumations to reopen the issue of the civil war and the mass extermination of republican opponents during the Francoist regime was in itself a counter-hegemonic disruption. In the post-Franco climate, in which contestation on this issue was barely accepted in the public sphere, victims' associations which adopted a cosmopolitan mode - because they linked their demands to human rights and the suffering of victims -, such as the Spanish Association for the Recovery of Historical Memory (ARMH), were able to establish transnational links and obtain international resonance. In particular, 'the "language of rights" this Association adopted, rather than only triggering a cosmopolitan apolitical memorial frame through its focus on victimhood, has also led to substantial politicization processes' (Ferrandiz and Hristova, forthcoming).

We have to conclude, therefore, that in many contexts where adopting a straightforward agonistic memory approach may be too problematic or fraught with difficulties, we might have to settle for introducing agonistic elements into predominantly cosmopolitan approaches. However, the following example will show that adopting a bold agonistic approach even in difficult contexts can prove highly rewarding.

b) Self-standing agonistic practices

There are also examples of integrated interventions which together form a comprehensive agonistic approach to heritage.

Conceived by Professor Chris Reynolds in collaboration with Ulster Museum Director, William Blair, the *Voices of 68* project has explicitly adopted an agonistic approach from the outset (Reynolds and Blair 2018). As elsewhere in Europe, 1968 in Northern Ireland was a period of protests and demonstrations, which brought to light the issue of discrimination against the Catholic Community. Soon after these events the so-called Troubles marked the start of thirty years of violence. To this day, 1968 is remembered very differently among the two communities in Northern Ireland; the civil rights movement, in particular, is viewed as a peaceful attempt to bring about much needed reforms among the Catholic community but as an unnecessary uprising or even as a vehicle for the political aims of the Irish Republican Army among the protestant one. The *Voices of 68* project started with a temporary exhibition hosted by the Ulster Museum in September 2018, which then developed into an itinerant exhibition and was also incorporated into the permanent exhibition. The project also consisted of a series of study days with schoolchildren, as well as public meetings and debates, online resources and an educational package for inclusion in the Northern Irish school curriculum. Professor Reynolds referred to the combination of all these activities as 'agonistic contamination', as he argued that agonistic practices need to involve a multiplicity of activities targeting a variety of audiences, so as to promote as much discussion and participation as possible. The exhibition itself revolved primarily around a series of oral history interviews with past activists. Unlike previous projects, the interviews deliberately aimed at widening the range of perspectives on the past, incorporating contested voices, including those of people who continue to deny the existence of policies and practices discriminating against Catholics in the period preceding the Troubles. Of course, the easiest possibility would have been just to reject these voices, to reject these witnesses, not to hear them. But rejecting them does not mean they do not exist or did not have a significant influence on how events developed in Northern Ireland. Furthermore, all participants were informed of the aims of the project and of the inclusion of these controversial perspectives and the vast majority agreed to have their interviews reproduced alongside those of 'less desirable' witnesses. During the study days, schoolchildren were exposed to this wide range of views and perspectives, an approach which the vast majority appreciated, as it helped them understand socio-political divisions in the past and in the present.

The educational package produced as part of the project is also informed by agonistic memory theory. It includes a wide range of educational and role-playing activities which aim at encouraging pupils to take on board the disparity of views. For instance, in one role-playing activity pupils have to simulate producing contrasting reports for submission to various Commissions of Inquiry. In another activity, pupils are asked to write very different articles on 1968 protests and demonstrations for publication in very different (including controversial) newspapers and bulletins. Pupils are also asked to understand how and why people in the past made certain choices and decisions in given circumstances or indeed whether they could have acted differently. See: https://www.nmni.com/learn/1968-history-resource/1968-History-Resource-A4.pdf

In short, *The Voices of '68* project can be considered as an exercise in 'teaching conflict', or as an exercise in performing (agonistic) democracy, as opposed to attempting to superimpose a shared narrative of the past upon audiences that are still deeply divided over how they perceive and remember that past. Instead of attempting to replace

dissonance with consonance, dissonance is exposed, reflected upon and debated. By widening the range of narratives and perspectives, it is also possible to counter the binary categories of Us = good and Them = evil on which antagonistic memories thrive as well as to show the impact such binary thinking can have in closing off all avenues for democratic contestation in favour of a violent 'final solution'.

Summary and recommendations:

There are many instances of individual agonistic interventions within mainly cosmopolitan approaches to heritage management. More rarely we find instances of integrated agonistic practices. While the former are valuable interventions capable of unsettling visitors and audiences and promoting critical reflection among them, integrated agonistic practices can go much further, actively incorporating dissonant voices, encouraging discussion and debate, replacing binary representations of the past with complex understanding.

In cases of extreme antagonistic confrontation or in societies which are emerging from a bloody conflict promoting purely agonistic approaches may - and this is the most recurrent objection raised by critics - refuel conflict. By revisiting the conflicts and struggles of the past the old animosities may resurface, whereas by focussing on just the suffering on all sides can help heal divisions.

How might these be overcome?

In 2 ways:

First, by conceiving agonism and cosmopolitanism as ideal types acknowledging that in some contexts it might be more desirable to introduce elements of agonism where possible rather than opting for all aspects of an agonistic approach. There is also a temporal element involved, therefore it may become possible to press for an agonistic approach to memory once pacification has been assured (e.g. Northern Ireland).

Second, by accepting that in extreme contexts it may be desirable to manage heritage so as to promote those traits shared among the cosmopolitan and the agonistic approaches as follows;

- Reflexivity exposing the socially constructed nature of cultural memory
- Recognition of the 'other' as a human being
- Recognition of the need to respect basic human rights

5) How do we account for these different heritage management approaches, especially for the ones that defy the dominant ones?

This is obviously an important question as adopting one memory approach in preference to another is not simply a question of choice but it depends to a large extent on the (politico-

institutional) context, which can have an enabling or constraining effect. National, regional and local governments play an important role. As we saw in the case of Poland, the national government has deliberately steered heritage management away from a cosmopolitan approach towards a more traditional nationalist/antagonist approach. This has had a hugely constraining effect on cultural and heritage management, not least on museums, but also in the case of mass exhumations, national monuments, concentration camps and so forth. Dissonant approaches, for instance in the case of the Polin Museum discussed above, can be explained in view of exceptional circumstances. Polin was founded in 2005 under the initiative of the Association of the Jewish Historical Institute of Poland, supported by the City of Warsaw, the then Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage as well as a plethora of associations representing the Jewish diaspora, especially in the USA. This diversity of stakeholders allowed a greater focus on Polish Jews as a differentiated social community and a more critical approach to the attitudes of Catholic Poles compared to other Polish museums. Furthermore, establishing strong relations with the United States and Israel was a strategic goal for Poland in the 2000s and the Polin museum played a role in this diplomatic goal. In 2014, in fact, the museum was inaugurated by the Polish President Bronislaw Komorowski and the Israeli President Reuven Rivlin while a Jewish Professor from New York University, Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, became the chief curator of its core exhibition. As Barber (2014) explains, 'the museum is part of an effort, now more than 20 years old, by the new democratic state and independent professional and social groups to rebuild trust between Poland's non-Jewish majority and Jews both in and outside Poland. The core exhibition takes care, therefore, to address historical episodes of Polish anti-Semitism and outright violence towards Jews'. Since then, the new PiS government has made various attempts to steer this museum in a new direction but as it does not depend on the state for its governance these attempts have been strongly resisted.

In Slovenia, the Kobarid Museum is privately run, so again it is not dependent on state funding or state governance and can make autonomous decisions. Indeed, the part of the exhibition dedicated to the Second World War depicting Tito's partisans in a positive light has been at odds with a national trend towards historical revisionism rehabilitating the 'domobranski' or those Slovenes who had collaborated with fascists and Nazis. Yet anti-fascism is still strong in Kobarid (which spent several years under fascist occupation) and thus far the Museum has stood its ground.

As the Polin example showed, we should not underestimate the agency of grassroots associations and movements in countering dominant national approaches. In Spain, for instance, victims and associations of victims have played an important role in countering the dominant memory regime, as they started exhuming the bodies of the Republicans killed during the civil war in defiance of the political agreement promoting forgetting the past. In the UK, the Black Lives Matter movement has been at the forefront of attempts to deal with the (largely invisible) legacy of slavery, including the recent protests in Bristol culminating in the forceful removal of the statue of Edward Colston on 7 July 2020. The controversial statue, erected in honour of a slave owner who was also a benefactor to the city of Bristol was rolled by protesters into the harbour. It was later recovered but not replaced where it stood. Several projects are now underway to decolonise museums and monuments in the UK, generating debates on the persisting legacy of slavery in terms of institutional and cultural racism.

Educational and cultural agents and institutions are obviously highly relevant in fostering critical reflection, including museums, schools, but also literary and artistic projects like films, plays, novels as well as the debates that they generate. There can be important synergies between cultural and artistic agents and local governments, which together can defy dominant national approaches. In Budapest, for instance, after opposition parties won the local elections in 2019, the municipality has sponsored alternative heritage interventions through public art, countering the national government's culture policy (https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jan/05/budapest-black-lives-matter-artwork-rightwing-backlash).

Considerations of state diplomacy also influence the adoption of a specific approach to heritage. We discovered in the course of our UNREST project that many museums play a diplomatic role in relations between states. The Polin Museum, as we saw, was partly intended to foster good relations with Israel and the United States, which allowed a more critical depiction of Polish attitudes towards Jews. In contrast, the Kobarid Museum was intended to foster good relations with neighbouring Italy, which played a part in depicting all soldiers as victims and in erasing from the exhibition the representation of Italy's shaming defeat in 1917. In fact, the Kobarid Museum and surrounding area has become an important venue for hosting diplomatic encounters with European leaders (and also Putin) in the name of reconciliation and peaceful relations. This reinforces the Museum's cosmopolitan approach.

In view of this, it can be more difficult to engage in promoting dissonance and agonistic memory in heritage sites which play a role in external diplomacy. The emphasis is on reconciliation/good relations/consonance of views as opposed to 'teaching conflict'. Therefore, a cosmopolitan approach with elements of agonism is probably the most that can be achieved at such sites. However, where reconciliation involves each nation-state being prepared to acknowledge perpetration on one's own side, elements of agonism can be fostered. As part of a long-standing process towards reconciliation between Italy and Slovenia, for instance, a recent online exhibition (http://www.reteparri.it/eventi/ferro-fuoco-loccupazione-italiana-della-jugoslavia-1941-43-6580/) on Italian occupation of the former Yugoslavia clearly deals with Italy's brutal treatment of local partisans and citizens, which had for long been removed from Italian collective memory.

In heritage sites linked to domestic conflicts and civil wars, it should be possible and above all desirable to adopt a bolder agonistic approach, precisely because it is increasingly crucial to teach and learn how to negotiate dissonance and conflict in democratic co-existence without wanting to physically eliminate opponents or having recourse to violence.

Summary and recommendations

A variety of agents and stakeholders are involved in heritage management and memory politics and can have a restricting or enabling role in promoting specific approaches to heritage. The policies that have to deal with heritage institutions and memory spaces in democratic societies – including as far as possible those which have undergone civil or international war, genocide, or have emerged from a dictatorship or from a colonial

context- should be designed as to permit the interaction of contested perspectives within a negotiated legal and political frame of dissent. This is a key to the resignification of 'memoryscapes' inherited from authoritarian experiences and to the agonistic interpretation of shared but disputed pasts.

How can we represent contested perspectives?

- Incorporating contrasting narratives and viewpoints, e.g. through oral history
- Relying on unsettling and thought-provoking artworks and installations
- Linking past to present injustices and inequalities
- Giving voice to the 'others' in their own right
- Showing the socio-political struggles around hegemony in the past and in the present
- Challenging and disrupting binary representations of US vs THEM, through the memory of protests and struggles which cut across the binary divide by articulating new demands.
- Promoting alternative democratic imaginings and alliances by creating space for subaltern narratives.
- Allowing for different and contrasting voices to enter into a dialogue without the imposition of an overarching consensual narrative (weak curatorial control).

6. Can a pattern be discerned where we can associate specific levels of policy-making with particular approaches to memory policies?

At a superficial level, it might seem that the answer to this question is relatively straightforward. Supranational institutions and organisations tend to foster a cosmopolitan approach to memory, while at state level there is still adherence to antagonistic stances and positive, heroic narratives of the past. Social movements and minority groups, on the other hand, especially at local level, are able to open up conflictual dynamics, contesting hegemonic memories in order to claim collective rights in the present. Such a simplistic representation can be inaccurate in at least two ways. First, the alignment between governmental levels, civil society groups and modes of remembering is far from clear. Social groups and minority groups can adopt and promote antagonistic modes of remembering as much as agonistic ones. State-level policy-makers, in turn, can themselves promote cosmopolitan practices and themes. Second, the picture is complicated by the fact that social groups and policy-making levels can adopt a particular mode of remembering yet reshape it to suit their specific needs and thus behave in very different ways. Thus, in Northern Ireland, an overarching cosmopolitan approach to memory work, promoted by the EU, leaves space for both agonistic and antagonistic practices and modes, not least in a "national policy vacuum". In Bosnia, as we found when researching mass grave exhumations for UNREST, the cosmopolitan approach promoted by the EU is reshaped to suit antagonistic policies and practices by regional-level ethnic leaders.

Grasping the wider implications of these and other case studies would bring us closer to understanding the articulations between how we remember the past, which socio-political

agents and governmental levels promote certain approaches to memory, and the reasons why they do so.

References

Ang, I. (2017). What are museums for? The enduring friction between nationalism and cosmopolitanism. *Identities*, *24* (1), 1–5.

Barber, T. (2014). A new Warsaw museum devoted to Jewish-Polish history, *Financial Times Magazine*, 26 October.

Berger, S. (2020a). "National Historical Master Narratives and War Museums in Contemporary Europe: A Comparative Analysis". In: Thomas Maissen and Niels Freitag (eds.). *History Writing and Nationalism in Contemporary Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming.

Berger, S. (2020b). "National Museums of War in Britain Between Antagonism and Agonism: A Comparison of the Imperial War Museum with the National Army Museum". *Annali dell' Istituto Storico Italo-Germanico* 46(1): 133 - 160.

Cento Bull, A. and Hansen, Hans Lauge (2016). On agonistic memory. *Memory Studies*, *9* (4), 390–404.

Cento Bull, A. and D. Clarke, Agonistic interventions into public commemorative art: An innovative form of counter-memorial practice? *Constellations*,2020, 1–15

Clarke, D., Cento Bull, A. and M.Foley Deganutti (2017). "Soft Power and Dark Heritage: Multiple Potentialities". *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 23 (6): 660-674.

Czyżewsk, W., Kulas, J. and M. Golubiewski (2011), eds, *Handbook of Dialogue, Trust and Identity*, Fundacja Pogranicze, Sejny.

Ferrándiz, F. and M. Hristova (forthcoming). The Production of Memory Modes during Mass Grave Exhumations in Contemporary Europe, in Stefan Berger and Wulf Kansteiner, *Agonistic Memory and Representations of War in Twentieth-Century Europe*, Palgrave.

Foley, M., & Lennon, J. J. (1996). JFK and dark tourism: A fascination with assassination. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *2* (4), 198–211.

Karge, H. (2010). "Practices and Politics of the Second World War Remembrance: (Trans-)National Perspectives from Eastern and South-Eastern Europe". In: Malgorzata Pakier and Bo Strath (eds.), *A European Memory?* Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 137-146.

Kavanagh, G. (1994). *Museums and the First World War*: A Social History. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Koposov, N. (2018). *Memory Laws, Memory Wars: The Politics of the Past in Europe and Russia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levi D. and N. Sznaider (2006). *The Holocaust Memory in the Global Age* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

Likar, Z. & Klavora, M. (2015). WWI and the possibilities for developing historical tourism–The case of the walk of peace from the Alps to the Adriatic'. In A.Gosar, M.Koderman, & M.Rodela (Eds.), *Darktourism: Post-WWI destinations of human tragedies and opportunities for tourism development* (pp. 97–106).

Machcewicz, P. (2019). *The War That Never Ends:* The Museum of the Second World

War in Gdansk – Development and Fight. Berlin: deGruyter.

Nadalutti, E. (2012). Is cross-border governance emerging over the border between Italy and Slovenia? *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* , *20* (2), 181–197.

Piotrowski, P. (2012). *Art and Democracy in Post-Communist Europe*. London: Reaktion Books.

Reynolds, C. and W. Blair (2018). Museums and 'Difficult Pasts': Northern Ireland's 1968, *Museum International*, 70 (3-4), 12-25.

Rosenberg, D. (2018). "Exhibiting Post-National Identity: The House of European History". In: Stefan Berger and Caner Tekin (eds.). *History and Belonging:* Representations of the Past in Contemporary European Politics*.* Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 21-36.

Seaton, A. V. (1996). Guided by the dark: From thanatopsis *to* thanatourism. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *2* (4), 234–244.

Stone, P. (2006). A dark tourism spectrum: Towards a typology of death and macabre related tourist sites, attractions and exhibitions. *Tourism*, *54* (2), 145–160.

Tunbridge, J. E. and G.J. Ashworth (1996) *Dissonant heritage: The management of the past as a resource in conflict* (Wiley, Chichester).

Višnja K., *Governing Heritage Dissonance*, European Cultural Foundation 2013, p. 56, https://www.europanostra.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Governing_Heritage_Dissonance.pdf

Wodak, R., KhosraviNik, M. and Mral, B. (eds) (2013). *Right-Wing Populism in Europe:* Politics and Discourse, London: Bloomsbury.

Wolfram, K. and R. McMahon (2017). "Narrating European Integration: Transnational Actors and Stories", *National Identities* 19 (2): 149-160.