TRACES —

—

D 3.1

Conflict learning: Questions for engagement with contentious heritage

Authors: Karin Schneider,

Nora Landkammer

February 2017

Table of Contents

Introduction: Who learns? Which conflict? 3

1_What Does Learning Itself Have to Do with Conflict? 5

1_1_ 'Difficult Knowledge' and Commemorative Museum Pedagogy 7

1_2_Learning Crises and Historic Trauma 12

1_3_Agonism and the Contact Zone 14

Annotated Reading list 16

2_Who Has a Stake? Which Community is Addressed, and How? 19

2_1_Collaborative Museology, Source Communities and Learning 22

2_2_Community in Education at Memorial Sites 24

2_3_Community Engagement and Collaborative Approaches in Museum Learning 26

2_4_Cross-Reading Approaches to Community Collaboration for TRACES 29

Annotated Reading list 30

3_How to Unlearn? 36

3_1_Unlearning Coloniality 37

3_2_Unlearning in Holocaust Education 42

Annotated Reading List 45

TR-
ACE
S—

Introduction: Who learns? Which conflict?

> *A school group visits an ethnographic museum. The program the educators have prepared is ambitious: engaging with the photographic archive of the museum – containing ethnographic and anthropological images from different periods and contexts – the students are invited to analyse colonial patterns of representation and the entanglement between image-making in the colonial context and racism, and to get a view of current continuities in racist imagery in commercials and media. The group visits the archive, and after a careful announcement of the potentially unsettling content, views anthropometric photographs depicting the naked bodies of workers on a South Asian plantation, against a uniform backdrop. The educator asks what the students can read from the images. One student replies: they were standing in a row and then it was decided who could work, and the other ones were killed. Although he doesn't name it, he refers to 'selection' in Nazi concentration camps. Another student speculates that the photos were taken by the police.*

Our research focuses on educational approaches to dealing with conflictual and traumatic pasts. We are interested in pursuing methodological models that approach conflicts embedded in the memory of these pasts in a direct, productive way, and that see the potentials in such an open approach. Since we conceive of our research as being closely connected to educational practice, we acknowledge its political dimension and focus on projects that connect the history education with current forms of racism and anti-Semitism.

In this context, Michael Rothberg's concept of "multidirectional memories" (Rothberg, 2009) emerges as a productive theoretical starting point. The concept of multidirectional memories seeks to bring together legacies of the Holocaust and colonisation. Rothberg suggests approaching these different conflictual and traumatic pasts productively through negotiation and cross-referencing, and opposes the idea and practice of "competitive memory".

Rothberg's suggestions might also enable a focus on connections between different spaces and fields of history education such as ethnographic museums (approaching the colonial past through postcolonial critique) and commemoration sites (approaching Holocaust and Nazi-era education through forms of critical civic education) – connections that are not usually drawn in the research on teaching methods.

TR–
ACE
S—

As a result of initial fieldwork, we came to the understanding that there is not primarily an abstract necessity to "entangle" the different histories. They start to intersect in educational practice – in the way people approach images, draw connections, build associations. One cannot keep the conflicts apart – their relations occur organically. In the area of conflictual, multidirectional and globalised memories, a set of educational and methodological skills and reflections is needed that enables an engagement with these contradictory connections and their embedded conflicts. The aim of 'intertwining histories' in education about conflictual pasts is not to create some kind of 'comparison' or to equate very different histories or kinds of 'contentiousness' of heritage, but to simultaneously establish an understanding of differences and a connection between discourses.

The following text is an initial attempt at cross-reading traditionally distinct discourses in Holocaust education, gallery education, postcolonial pedagogy and museum anthropology. It focuses on literature in German and English. The outcome of this cross-reading is an unconventional textual form, which at many points juxtaposes contexts and approaches that seem to have little to do with each other, as we try to connect educational concepts and experiences within the context of post-colonial and Holocaust approaches to un/learning. In some aspects, these connections seem obvious, and in others, they raise new, different questions.

The text pursues a set of initial questions from the first phase of our fieldwork, the critical investigation of our own educational strategies and the literature review. That the text takes the form of questions is directly related to the structure of our research: the literature review and the study of educational practice (Task 3.1.) intersect closely with the joint research on learning and community involvement we conduct with the TRACES CCPs (Task 3.2). In this form, it makes the literature and examples reviewed for the practice developing in TRACES available, while attempting to provoke new responses from the CCPs. Hence the questions also developed from our initial interviews with CCP members[1] and workshops with some of the CCPs[2] on their concepts of learning and stakeholder involvement.

[1] Skype interviews with all CCPs, spring 2016

[2] Workshop with CCP1, CCP4; follow up group-discussions with CCP4

1_What Does Learning Itself Have to Do with Conflict?

> *We are in an exhibition about the life stories of black people in a European city after World War II. The young people participating in the schools program we are visiting have explored the panels and videos on different biographies, and present the information and their impressions to the group. A (white) girl retells the story of a young woman in the '70s, and mentions both her trouble with her hair, and her passion for playing the drums in a band. The (white) teacher asks: now what does the hair have to do with playing the drums in a band? Nothing, she just liked playing the drums, replies the student. The (white) museum educator takes the opportunity to give some context to the hair story, explaining the exotisising images people of African descent are confronted with. To problematise stereotyping and racialising images, she mentions the well-known children's book called 10 little [N-word].[3] The teacher interrupts: that's not how I perceived the book! The educator follows up with another explanation of how people become fixated on stereotypical images. The teacher asks: but what's the background of the author? Do they have a racist background? The educator seems slightly insecure now; she doesn't know the author's name and says as much, and adds that they were probably not intentionally racist. She adds that she only wanted to provoke reflection on the topic, that of course it was possible to have differing opinions.*

Later on, in conversation, the educator spoke about how the teacher had interrupted her program. At first glance, the episode can be viewed as the teacher subverting the learning process, undermining the educator's goals by positing a legitimating, apologetic view of racism in popular culture. The educator is intimidated by this other authority figure in the room, who shows her disagreement with the contents of the program. Effectively, her insecurity teaches students that racism is merely a matter of opinion. But looking more closely, we might ask if it is only the learning of the students that should be taken into account. The person who was actually going through a learning process was the teacher. The teacher was questioning, requiring more information, because she saw her frames of reference challenged. "That's not how I perceived the

[3] The books and nursery rhyme in german take up the narration of an American song, „Ten Little Injuns" by Septimus Winner from 1868 and exist in multiple versions. In english, the version „10 little indians" is known. The rhyme is a key example in the discussions on racism in children's literature in german speaking countries.

book" refers to her previous perceptions. Neither this statement, nor the question of whether the author was racist, requires the educator to question her definitions of exoticism and racism in the way that she did. Through the apparent conflict, rather, an attempted learning process becomes visible – the teacher requires more proof that the book is racist in order to be able to change her perception.

That learning is related to conflicts between new information and the previous knowledge of learners is already a pillar of constructivist and social constructivist theories of learning, which have become influential in museum and heritage education. Constructivist pedagogy, with Jean Piaget as a founding figure, states that individuals learn by relating new experience with previous knowledge – knowledge cannot be "added" to the mind, but rather begins to make sense if the learner integrates it with the explanations and experiences they have of the world. Social constructivism builds on this basic principle, but critiques the individualising view of this process. Learning is not only influenced by the social conditions of the learner, it also takes place through dialogue and collaboration in a social setting (Vygotsky 1978).

Museum learning based on a (social) constructivist paradigm has emphasised the need to connect to visitors' lifeworlds and previous experiences. While much practice in museum education suggests that the task is already accomplished if visitors are approached "where they stand", influential museum learning theorist George Hein talks about a balance. Building on a constructivist paradigm, he suggests that learning in the museum requires both the recognition of the familiar, and new experiences that challenge the known.

> *People need to connect to what is familiar, but learning, by definition, goes beyond the known; it leads to new "agreeable places." How is this accomplished? I have suggested above that one path is seduction, enticing the learner by the lure of the familiar, the comfortable, the known, to explore more deeply. But another well-recognized path is the lure of a challenge. The trick, of course, is to find just the right degree of intellectual challenge to leave the learner slightly uncomfortable but sufficiently oriented and able to recognize the challenge that she will accept it. This central dilemma of all learning, alternatively called the problem of match (Hunt, 1961), cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957/1962), disequilibrium (the Piagetian term), or, to emphasize the social aspect of learning, the Zone of Proximal Development – an intellectual "space" you can only reach with the guidance of a "teacher" (Vygotsky, 1962/1978) – needs to be emphasized in every exhibition.* (Hein 1998, 176)

Hein here draws in part on the theory of cognitive dissonance, originally developed by Leon Festinger (1957) in the field of social psychology. Cognitive dissonance occurs when several cognitions are not congruent with each other, a situation which is experienced with discomfort. To produce coherence, beliefs and knowledge systems have to be modified, through self-convincing strategies. The theory of cognitive dissonance posits that this process of self-convincing is more effective in changing attitudes than any external reward. To return to our initial question of conflict and learning: not only must conflict be seen as something integral to learning processes, it is also a pedagogical aim within constructivist paradigms to induce conflict or dissonance in order to foster learning. Objects and visual stimuli like museum displays have been assigned a specific role in managing the double task of seduction and dissonance.

> *Museums are particularly effective in providing novel, interactive settings where children and adults can encounter striking, unusual and surprising objects and settings, thus capitalizing on the learning potential of 'cognitive dissonance'….* (ebd., 152)

If dissonance or conflict is at the heart of learning as such, it is even more so when learning about uncomfortable, difficult histories. Building on the general constructivist framework outlined here, we wish to review some of the more recent theoretical perspectives on the role of conflict in learning about difficult heritage and history. The theory and practice-based approaches we will present in this paper are selected to posit different viewpoints, without seeking to be representative of the various fields of study. With reference to theories that we find useful, we examine more precisely what it means to work with the productivity of conflict at this point in our study.

1_1_ 'Difficult Knowledge' and Commemorative Museum Pedagogy

In museum learning, Julia Rose's concept of commemorative museum pedagogy is a proposal for understanding the conflictual processes of learning difficult histories. Drawing on museum programs on the history of slavery in the US, (especially the museum she directs at West Baton Rouge in Louisiana[4]) she takes a psychoanalytic approach to analysing the conflictual dimension of learning. She brings insights from psychoanalytical theory in education to the practice of

[4] http://westbatonrougemuseum.com/home/ (5.2.2015)

museum learning, such as the work of Shoshana Felman and Deborah Britzman. From Britzman she takes up the concept of learning “difficult knowledge” (Britzman 1998). Difficult knowledge is knowledge about oppression and violence, as it is connected with historical traumas such as the Shoah, slavery, colonialism or war and genocide more generally. What makes Rose’s writing particularly interesting for our work is that her theorising starts from the hands-on difficulties museum workers encounter in interpreting difficult knowledge. These are, as Rose recounts from slavery exhibitions, reactions of resistance and denial.

> *The person who is faced with learning difficult knowledge that she or he cannot bear represses that information and returns to it through expressions of resistance that appear as negativism, irreverence, jokes, and denials.* (Rose 2014, 116)

As in our initial example of the museum educator intimidated by the teacher’s opposition, museum educators struggle with these reactions and find it hard to address violent histories: “Learners’ observable resistances to traumatic histories discourage museum workers from attempting to interpret sensitive topics”. Yet, as Rose states, “visitors’ resistances are also the keys to understanding the process of learning the hard stuff” (ebd., 115). Attending to expressions of resistance, to silences and denials is central, because the experience of the visitors can be described as “loss in learning” (ebd., 119). If the history of violence is felt to be dissonant with the visitor’s previous understanding, this internal conflict leads to an experience of loss, which is comparable to a process of mourning. Freud himself had already described the mechanisms of mourning not only in the loss of a beloved person, but also in losing closely held ideas such as an identification with a country or an ideal. He distinguishes between mourning and melancholia, with mourning being a process of “working through” the loss, slowly attaching the libido to other objects taking the place of the one that was lost. In melancholia, the subject is unable to work through the loss, subsuming the lost other into the self. Repetition is key to the process of working through loss. Mourners revive the memory of that which is lost, testing reality by repeating the loss to distinguish their own feelings from external stimuli, and finding new attachments for their psychic energy. Applying these mechanisms to the setting of a museum visit, Rose states:

> *The visitor, as a learner, will repeat the parts of the difficult knowledge in a mournful state in the process of working through the internal loss; or the visitor might find the difficult knowledge too much to bear and foreclose on learning the*

difficult knowledge and flounder in a melancholic state unable to work through the internal loss (ebd., 121)

It becomes apparent that what is at stake in learning about oppression, what actually makes knowledge "difficult" here, is not only the violence itself, but the challenges that assimilating this knowledge poses to the concepts of self of the visitors and the perceptions of the world they hold dear. To go back to our initial example: the teacher experiences loss, not strictly because she is informed that people of African descent have been humiliated by books like *10 little [N-word]* for decades, but because it is a children's book that she probably read herself or read to her children. What is lost is the image of a "good" and innocent childhood that suddenly appears entangled with racism. This leads to defence mechanisms, and requires repetition: was the author really racist?

Yet this loss of convictions and of self-image is not the only aspect Rose addresses. When being confronted with human suffering, it is not only the fact that "this history took place" and the challenges this may pose to one's perception of history that is at stake, but also coming face to face with the pain of the other (ebd., 124). Drawing on the work of Felman and Eppstein, Rose describes the mechanisms associated with learning about the other's pain. Either visitors attempt to remain disengaged from the events, or, in a melancholic state, visitors identify with victims, and cannot distinguish between their own pain and the pain of others. The narcissistic response is problematic, on the one hand because it denies the difference of the real pain suffered by the historical others, but also because it doesn't allow the learner to develop a sense of responsibility towards the history from their actual position and situation. Melancholic identification ultimately impedes learning. Mourning consists of working through the feelings of pain, re-building an identity that can become answerable to the injustice and violence that have been learned about. This is ultimately the condition for transformative action in the present:

When the visitor is able to distinguish himself or herself from the people and events represented in the exhibit, he or she can begin to bring justice to those whose lives he or she has imagined (see Eppert, 2002a, p. 60).

Out of these insights, Rose develops a five phase model for museum education. The five stages of commemorative museum pedagogy are reception, resistance, repetition, reflection and reconsideration. This phase-based model should help in the design of programs, but most of all for educators to be attentive to the individual stages of learning that visitors go through, recognising the signs of different stages of a learning crisis and responding to it. While the first stage is

concerned with reception of information, images and exhibits, the second phase describes reactions of resistance if this knowledge produces discomfort:

> *Resistance can be detected through expressions like "I would like substantial information to back that up!" and "This is unbelievable!" and "I am not going in there!" Language challenging the accuracy or significance of the information, sometimes expressed as criticism, skepticism and or sarcasm about the displays, is indicative of resistance. Visitors' ambivalence or loss of interest signaled by the visitor choosing another activity such as texting, using the water fountain, or simply walking out of the space, are indications that the visitor is likely contending with a personal learning crisis* (ebd., 127 f.)

Rose describes how this resistance is also a part of the "healthy" doubt of visitors toward the authority of the museum, and underlines that reactions of resistance are not about a lack of knowledge, but a sign of negotiating the information with previous convictions and knowledge.

Activities such as questioning the information given or re-reading panels are indicative of the stage of repetition, that museum educators should engage in. Repeating the same information once again by educators should not be viewed as undue insistence, but as a need responding to visitors' processes of mourning.

> *When visitors return to a panel or image to view it again, or ask docents multiple questions, or even when they purchase a book in the museum shop on the same topic as the exhibit, they are likely seeking opportunities to work through the difficult knowledge.* (ebd., 128)

The next necessary stage is reflection, which can happen both in solitary moments or in dialogue. In this stage, visitors draw connections between their own pre-existing knowledge or experiences and the exhibit, they try to relate and orient themselves in relation to it. For educators, providing visitors with an opportunity to think for themselves and to engage in dialogue are important for facilitating reflection. Lastly, Rose speaks of "reconsideration". As the last stage of the process, it suggests that visitors come to an altered understanding. Rose specifies that this need not be some huge revelation, but is rather indicated through small signs that visitors can relate to the difficult knowledge: through subtle nodding, or requests to engage with the topic beyond the museum visit.

While Rose's practically oriented considerations seem very useful for planning and analysing settings for learning about contentious heritage, her proposal also demands criticism. Both critiques that we want to pose here have to do with

what is taken for granted in the theory described, both about difficult history and about the people visiting the museum.

Concerning the visitors, Rose begins by acknowledging that "each visitor is an individual learner and simultaneously a member of multiple collective communities that he or she identifies with" (ebd., 115). While this points to the different positions that visitors might have in terms of race, class, gender, religion or personal history, and therefore also to how they relate differently to the knowledge presented in exhibits, the following framework and examples are geared toward one specific visitor position: the privileged visitor who is not affected by the difficult history in their present life, and who are confronted by having their comfortable self-image challenged. In Rose's specific setting of a museum interpreting the history of slavery, these are white visitors. At one point, she mentions the example of an African-American girl refusing to enter into a historical reconstruction of a slave shed. But she does not comment in any way on how this resistance might be of a different kind from that of the white parent who does not want their children to learn about slavery. The mechanisms of mourning and loss for people who bear an identification with the victims of historical trauma is neglected in her approach. Not only is this difference not outlined, the neglect to even mention these different positionalities contributes to a structural whitewashing of the whole setting. It seems as if learning about slavery in museum exhibits is a task reserved for people who have no idea about the topic and are white.

Here, the second necessary critique begins to become evident. In this approach, 'difficult knowledge' is portrayed in relation to correct and critical information that has to be understood and assimilated by visitors. Conflict only emerges in the resistance to historical truth. Of course for an issue such as slavery, this line of argument is an important one. Knowledge about the magnitude of suffering caused by slavery and the crucial role of slavery in bringing about current conditions in the US, and of the transatlantic slave trade for the creation of the global economy as we know it has to be spread and understood. But this perspective renders contentious history one-dimensional, locating it primarily between the poles of "knowing" and "not knowing". More importantly, it situates the museum as the unequivocal site of critical historical truth. Although Rose mentions the "healthy doubt" of visitors towards museum narratives, the possibility that the museum itself could have blind spots in its narration of history – and that visitors could question it because they have other, additional knowledge – doesn't figure in Rose's proposal. In this way, the insightful approach of understanding conflictual learning processes paradoxically re-establishes the relationship that has been the target of deconstruction in

museum learning for decades, namely that the museum is the proprietor of the truth, which has to be transmitted to the visitors who represent only a lack of knowledge and understanding. In opposition to this, critical museology has long insisted that civil society's engagement is necessary to deconstruct the claims of truth and identity of museum narratives (Sandell 2002; Sandell/Nightingale 2012). Theories of critical museum education have emphasised the need to question – together with visitors – the ways "truth" is constructed in museums, and to make the knowledge and experiences of participants relevant to the topic of the exhibition (Güleç, Hummel, Schötker, Wieczorek & Parzefall, 2009; Jaschke & schnittpunkt. ausstellungstheorie & praxis, 2005; Carmen Mörsch & Research team of documenta 12 education, 2009; Sturm, 2003). This tradition of thought and practice is absent in Rose's considerations. To move forward from this critique, we propose to look more closely at Shoshana Felman's work (which Rose also draws on), who instead of a binary of 'knowing' and 'not knowing', emphasises the incommensurability of traumatic history. From there, we will look at approaches to conflict in learning difficult history that take into account different positionalities of learners and the possibilities of complicating history through the learners' knowledge and perspectives.

1_2_Learning Crises and Historic Trauma

According to Felman, teaching is not only knowledge transfer, it needs to make something happen, it has a performative, transformative aspect. This kind of teaching is "interested not merely in new information but primarily in the capacity of their recipients to transform themselves in function of the newness of that information. "(…) I want my students to receive information that is dissonant and not just congruent, with everything that they have leaned beforehand." (Felman, 1992, p.53) This approach is based on openness to the cognitively dissonant, and to surprises that provoke crises.

Dealing with Holocaust and literary testimonies, Shoshana Felman asks if trauma can instruct pedagogy, and if pedagogy can shed light on the mystery of trauma (Felman, 1992, p.3) . She proposes understanding the unforeseeable effects of teaching and the uncanny experiences of pedagogy as fundamental elements of a teaching process.

She outlines a classroom event that, while unique, is revealing more generally for processes of teaching. Watching the story of a Holocaust survivor, students broke into tears and were left speechless. Such reactions are not unusual. What was unusual were the endless discussions in the following week that broke the very

TR-
ACE
S

framework of the class: “I realized that something strange was going on when I started getting phone calls from the students at my home at all odd hours, in a manifest wish to talk about the session, although they did not quite know what to say.” (Felman, 1992, p.48). The students were only able talk about the session and could not focus on any other subject. “They were set apart and set themselves apart from others who had not gone through the same experience. They were obsessed. They felt apart, and yet not quite together. They sought out each other and yet could not reach each other (…) They felt alone, suddenly deprived of their bonding to the world and to one another. As I listened to their outpour, I realized the class was entirely on a lost, disoriented and uprooted.” (Felman, 1992, p. 48)

It was a chance occurrence which revealed the vicissitudes of teaching as the generic pedagogical event. Felman suggests that teaching in itself, teaching as such, takes place through crisis: “If teaching does not hit upon some sort of crisis, if it does not encounter either the vulnerability or the explosiveness of a (explicit or implicit) critical and unpredictable dimension, it has perhaps not truly taught (…).” (felman, 1992, p.53). From this perspective the task of the teacher is to provoke the most acute crisis within the class, without “driving the students crazy”.

“The question for the teacher is then, on the one hand, how to access, how not to foreclose the crisis, and on the other hand, how to contain it, how much crisis can the class sustain. It is the teacher’s task to re-contextualise the crisis and to put it back into perspective, to relate the present to the past and to the future and to thus regenerate the crisis in a transformed frame of meaning”. In this context of crisis Felman developed the method of writing a “precocious testimony”, a one-page text to testify to the right and obligation to count, to re-possess oneself; she encouraged the students to write about their experiences of crisis, although they did not yet feel ready, she asked them to (referencing Paul Celan) “shoot ahead of [themselves]”. (Felman, 1992, p. 53)

In this sense, Shoshana Felman’s theory provides alternate openings to Rose’s museum learning framework, because it deals not only with “truth” and “resistance to it”, but with learning crises as intrinsically linked to the un-understandable, the un-processable aspect of historic trauma.

1_3_Agonism and the Contact Zone

Another important theory-based concept that provides the foundations for our own research is suggested by art educator and theorist Nora Sternfeld, in her study on learning about the Holocaust in the 'migration society'. Long neglected in Holocaust education, the question of whether and how the teaching of the history of Nazism must evolve in a plural society – in which students have different points of reference to the history to those that can clearly be identified as being part of a perpetrator society or as descendants of victims – has been a key topic of debate in recent years. For our aim to understand learning on difficult heritage, Sternfeld's proposal in this debate is particularly relevant, as she focuses not only on the relevance of resistance and trauma in learning processes, but on the need for pedagogical situations to give space to conflict. She initially proposes to understand memorial sites as contact zones(Sternfeld, 2011). In the context of our own concept of conflictual learning, Sternfeld's approach is crucial, as she proposes to understand the term "contact zone" – originally coined by the post-colonial theorists Mary Louise Pratt and James Clifford in the 1990s – with emphasis on its original meaning as a "conflict zone". In order to develop this concept even further, she suggests linking it with an approach to dealing with dissent informed by Chantal Mouffe's theoretical discussions of democracy: the concept of agonism (Sternfeld, 2013, p.45-61).

According to Mouffe, the concept of agonism – that which includes incorporates conflicts in a productive way – is the basic fundament for true democratic processes. She argues that:

> *pluralist democracy is characterised by the introduction of a distinction between the categories of enemy and adversary. This means that within the 'we' that constitutes the political community, the opponent is not considered an enemy to be destroyed but an adversary whose existence is legitimate. His ideas will be fought with vigour but his right to defend them will never be questioned. The category of enemy does not disappear, however, for it remains pertinent with regard to those who, by questioning the very principles of pluralist democracy, cannot form part of the agonistic space. With the distinction between antagonism (friend/enemy relation) and agonism (relation between adversaries) in place, we are better able to understand why the agonistic confrontation, far from representing a danger for democracy, is in reality the very condition of its existence. Of course, democracy cannot survive without certain forms of consensus, relating to adherence to the ethico-political values that constitute its principles of legitimacy, and to the institutions in which these*

TR–
ACE
S—

> *are inscribed. But it must also enable the expression of conflict, which requires that citizens genuinely have the possibility of choosing between real alternatives. (Mouffe, 2014, n.p.)*

Above all, understanding agonism and conflicts as an aspect of history education is also helpful for taking the reality of a 'migration society' into consideration in a productive way. In Holocaust education as well, the presence of different narratives and different historical backgrounds demands the establishment of open spaces in which they can be performed. Sternfeld argues that by implementing the concept of agonistic contact zones in the educational work on heritage/commemoration sites, "it is possible to imagine connections between different positions against the background of the history of Nazi crimes, but without making appropriating or unifying assumptions"(Sternfeld 2011, n.p.). One other advantage of this concept is that a contact zone can be understood as a space where different people from different backgrounds can interact with each other, but "without making appropriating or unifying assumptions". If we aim to translate Rothberg's concept of "conflicted memories" to the reality of educational activities (at commemorative sites, for instance), the term "agonistic contact zones" is immensely productive.

Sternfeld's research includes not only theoretical concepts but also the experiences of the participatory research and education project "What does this have to do with me?", which, as a member of office trafo.k, she launched with an Austrian school class 2009-2011 (Sternfeld, 2013, p. 153-172). In this project, in a participatory fashion, they developed new concepts for the commemorative exhibition in the school building together with the students. As many students had migrant backgrounds and did not necessarily identify with the hegemonic Austrian narrative, they were encouraging them to include histories that might challenge these narratives. As a part of their research, the trafo.k team experimented with open discussions and found the need to find a balance – methodologically and theoretically –between openness and closure in the participatory process. In this respect too, Sternfeld's work cannot be underestimated as a foundation for thinking about our own research. However the proposed concepts are developed more on a theoretical level than based on the analysis of the empirical data (for example the analysis of sequences of the direct communication processes of the educational activities). Hence it remains unclear how the concept of agonistic conflict zones is to be established in specific educational settings. Inspiring as it is, the concept remains abstract, and requires further research on the contradictions and micro-practices of communication to draw conclusions for the practical approaches.

TR-
ACE
S—

Setting out from concepts such as the “agonistic conflict zone”, how can we research activities that allow us to understand what an open learning crisis looks like? What actions do educators launch to foster a conflictual communication situation? What do educators do to repress conflicts, and how and why do they become productive despite the anti-conflictual bias of educators? When does an educator fail to address conflicts despite seeking to establish a productive conflictual (agonistic) situation?

Annotated Reading list

Britzman, Deborah P (1998). Lost subjects, contested objects : toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Felman, Shoshana (1991). "Education and crisis: or The vicissitudes of teaching", in: American Imago, Vol. 48(1), 13–73
See text

Güleç, A., Hummel, C., Schötker, U., Wieczorek, W., & Parzefall, S. (Eds.). (2009). Documenta 12 education 1: Engaging Audiences, Opening Institutions. Methods and Strategies in Gallery education at Documenta 12.
This volume presents and reflects educational projects and programmes at the documenta 12 exhibition in Germany, many of which aimed to make local knowledge relevant and visible in dealing with the international art show.

Hein, G. (1998). *Learning in the Museum*. London: Routledge.
See text

Jaschke, B., & schnittpunkt. ausstellungstheorie & praxis (Eds.). (2005). Wer spricht? Autorität und Autorschaft in Ausstellungen. Wien: Turia + Kant.
The papers in this reader question the power of definition in exhibitions and their interpretation in different fields of practice such as the writing of exhibition texts or education.

Mouffe, Chantal (2014). Agonistic Democracy and Radical Politics. In: Pavilion. Journal for Politics and Culture, retrieved from: http://pavilionmagazine.org/chantal-mouffe-agonistic-democracy-and-radical-politics/ (accessed 20.02. 2017)
See text.

Mörsch, C., & Research team of documenta 12 education (Eds.). (2009). documenta 12 education 2: Between Critical Practice and Visitor Services. Results of a Research Project. Zürich, Berlin: Diaphanes.
The volume, result of research conducted by gallery educators on their job at the documenta 12 exhibition in germany, explores the meanings of critical gallery education and the conflicts that arise when setting these aims to practice. It is an example of practiuoner research in gallery education.

Rothberg, Michael (2009). "Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization". Stanford: Stanford University Press.
See text.

Rose, Julia (2014). "Commemorative Museum Pedagogy", in: Trofanenko, Brenda/Segall, Avner (Eds.): Beyond Pedagogy SE - 9, SensePublishers, 115–133, Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-632-5_9 (20.1.2017)
See text

Sandell, R. (Ed.). (2002). Museums, society, inequality. London: Routledge.
Key volume for the aim to bring critical museology to museum practice.

Sandell, R., & Nightingale, E. (Eds.). (2012). Museums, equality and social justice. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
The volume poses the critique that social concerns have been established at the margins of museum practice, and need to move "from the margins to the core" of the institution.

Sternfeld, Nora (2011). " Memorial Sites as Contact Zones. Cultures of Memory in a Shared/Divided Present ", retrieved from: http://eipcp.net/policies/sternfeld/en (20.2.2017)
See text

Sternfeld, Nora (2013). "Kontaktzonen der Geschichtsvermittlung. Transnationales Lernen über den Holocaust in der postnazistischen Migrationsgesellschaft". Wien: Zaglossus
See text

Sturm, Eva (2003). "Kunstvermittlung als Widerstand", in: Schöppinger Forum der Kunstvermittlung in der Stiftung Künstlerdorf (Ed.): Transfer:

Beiträge zur Kunstvermittlung Band 2. Zum Stand der Kunstvermittlung heute. Ansätze. Perspektiven. Kritik, Schöppingen: Verlag Stiftung Künstlerdorf Schöppingen, S. 92-110
Sturm poses the task of gallery education as creating a space of dissensus.

Smith, Laurajane (2011). "Affect and registers of engagement: navigating emotional responses to dissonant heritages", in: Smith, Laurajane/Cubitt, Geoff/Fouseki, Kalliopi/Wilson, Ross (Eds.): Representing enslavement and abolition in museums : ambiguous engagements, New York ; London: Routledge
Empirical research conducted in the context of the exhibitions on centenary of the abolition of slave trade in UK. The author analyses visitor responses to the exhibits, her exemplary analysis provide valuable examples for the forms resistance to difficult knowledge takes.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind and Society*. Cambridge (Mass.): Univ. Pr.
See text

TR-
ACE
S—

2_Who Has a Stake? Which Community is Addressed, and How?

> *TRACES's CCP1, "the project Absence as Heritage draws from archives and other material found in the Medias Synagogue (Romania) to engage the local community with the cultural heritage of absent populations". "In light of this absence", CCP1 asks "whose duty is it to care for this material? How and why should the Jewish history of Medias be made relevant for local citizens today?" (all quotes TRACES Journal 01)[5]. From this perspective, the notion of "community" plays a crucial role in this project. The community that is the main stakeholder in this heritage – the Jewish community – is absent; at the same time, the project seeks to address "local citizens today", who do not possess direct symbolic ownership of the heritage, but who are intended to learn in the process that they are also dealing with a shared history. At the workshop in Sept 2016 that WP3 held with CCP1 participants, we collectively developed the understanding that today's "local citizens" are also composed of a variety of groups, and that such a project needs to develop approaches for addressing and including today's present minorities, like Roma communities. In this respect, we understand that we are dealing with a shared but conflicted history that also matters for communities today. There is no such thing as a single local community of citizens. We tend to easily create new blind spots as we forget, in the engagement with "the local community", minority groups which are present. As a result of the WP3-CCP1 workshop, we developed a new understanding of the difficulties in community work and stakeholder involvement, and formulated the inclusion of Roma people and an enhanced understanding of "local citizens" as a common research perspective.*

In this chapter, we want to connect approaches to community involvement from the different discourses around contentious heritage: from Holocaust education, museum anthropology and the traditions of participation and collaboration in museum pedagogy. We begin by interrogating the terms themselves that we are discussing: stakeholders and communities.

Stakeholder involvement has become a key term in the museum and heritage landscape, not only in English-speaking countries, but also in German-speaking contexts, both using the English term, and in translations such as

---

[5] http://www.traces.polimi.it/category/european-contentious-heritage/ (accessed 27.2.2017)

Anspruchsgruppen (groups that have a claim) or *Interessengruppen* (interest groups). It is used to denote constituencies as diverse as people who live in the direct vicinity of the museum or heritage site, museum visitors, funders of a project, or politicians and policy-makers. This list shows that compared to traditional hierarchical museum structures, the notion of "having a stake" seems to establish a level playing field on which the interests of funders can be viewed in the same way as the interests of local residents. Agents in a position of power are referred to in the same way as those without traditional means of influence, but with legitimate interests in the heritage in question. For instance, the project overview of "SWICH", a current, EU-funded project focusing on ethnographic museums in Europe states that the project wants to develop new practices "aimed at serving our multiple stakeholders both at home and in a transnational/global context". The text goes on:

> *We will address ideas of relationality, as a way to explore how ethnographic museums and collections are sites around which relationships are built between the museums and its multiple stakeholders, both historical and contemporary. Such a relational approach takes into account co-creative knowledge production, experimental modes of engaging with the collections and the importance of contestation. Similarly it addresses issues of Europe's diversity by looking at the intersecting diasporas of objects and peoples. (SWICH project description).*[6]

As stakeholders, the text alludes to people who have possible claims to the ethnographic museum due to the history of objects that were collected from their home regions, as well as diaspora communities in Europe today. These stakeholders are envisaged as engaging in co-creative knowledge production, and in contesting the museum. While the notion of stakeholder involvement as it is described here seems appropriate for museums and cultural heritage institutions for a critical practice of relationship building, because it crosses the traditional distinction between the "subjects" and the "objects" of the ethnographic museum – naming the claims of represented populations as one constituency the museum serves – it also has other implications that need to be viewed critically. The stakeholder theory comes from organisational management, and entered the museum and heritage sector through marketing. Originally developed by R. Edward Freeman (1984), the stakeholder approach posits that a business needs to take into account the interests not only of the

---

[6] http://www.weltmuseumwien.at/fileadmin/content/KHM/Presse/2014/Swich/Switch_PT_lang_E.pdf (accessed: 20.1.2017)

TR-
ACE
S—

"owners" (shareholders), but also of those entities and groups without whom the company could not survive: customers, the state, workers. Although related in management to business ethics and social responsibility, referring to stakeholders in the heritage sector means viewing this sector through the logic of economics. It is revealing that in their attempt to promote their accountability to diverse communities, museums are drawing on a model from the field of business. Specifically, the fact that stakeholders are originally defined by being differentiated from "shareholders" proves problematic in the cultural sector. In a public institution, to take this economic logic seriously, the residents of the country, as taxpayers, would be shareholders – since they finance the institution. This also applies in the example cited above: the communities in the regions from which objects in the ethnographic museums were taken could in many cases also be considered their legitimate owners – see the extensive debates on restitution of cultural objects. As stakeholders, their relation to the objects is necessarily defined as different to that of the owners. Of course, these examples hypothetically apply the origins of the vocabulary to new contexts, and in practice, "stakeholder" has expanded meanings. But these reflections serve to illustrate that the stakeholder model is as such part of the economisation of the cultural sector, and therefore needs to be accompanied by reflections on culture's own economies.

Community is the second key term for involvement in the development of new approaches to contentious cultural heritage. In contrast to the business model, community evokes the *common* in the use and meaning of heritage. However, in discourses around contentious heritage, *community* has a wide range of specific meanings, which produce particular differences. We will look at some of these in the following. In line with our research focus, we look at the postcolonial debate on heritage, specifically with respect to ethnographic museums, and what community comes to signify in this debate. Secondly, we take up the constituencies that are described in education in memorial sites on the Holocaust. Thirdly, we look at the broader discourse of "community engagement" that developed out of museum learning departments, and the implicit assumptions connected to the term there. We assume that in thinking these three discourses together, the blind spots of each can be made visible, contributing to a reflection on why, how, and in which way particular communities should be involved in debating contentious heritage in TRACES.

2_1_Collaborative Museology, Source Communities and Learning

Collaborative museology developed out of the claims of people represented in museum collections for their rights to the objects collected and their representation. The “collaborative paradigm”, as explained by Ruth Phillips, the former curator of the University of British Columbia’s Museum of Anthropology in her influential text in the reader *Museums and Source Communities* (Peers and Brown, 2003), emerged in former settler societies in Canada, the US, Australia and New Zealand. The development of methods of co-curation, as well as legal frameworks that assure the right of indigenous communities to their cultural artefacts in museums gave shape to a collaborative museology in the 1990s, becoming a model for the interaction of museums with “source communities”, with representatives of the former owners of collections, including in the former imperial centres in Europe (Phillips, 2003, p. 157). Phillips describes the transformation in ethnographic museums as (among other characteristics) a shift from product to process orientation: the focus is no longer exclusively on the exhibition, rather the production of the exhibition is expanded into a project (including a wide range of activities) that allows for research, education and innovation. Phillips emphasises the pedagogical aspect of collaborative work, describing it as a double-sided learning process as defined by the theory of critical pedagogy, a “bilateral version of the radical pedagogy advocated by Paulo Freire” (Phillips 2003, 162). In terms of curating, she describes two models. In the community-based exhibit, museums give their professional knowledge and resources for the community to represent their interests and perspectives. In multivocal exhibits, by contrast, the negotiation and coexistence of different perspectives takes centre stage. Through articulating a range of perspectives in a collaborative process, these exhibits also provide a reflexive approach to interpretation and representation, scrutinising the museum’s traditions of how heritage has been viewed through the ethnographic gaze. The two approaches represent a double necessity for museums embarking on collaborative projects with the communities they represent: to effectively yield the power of definition over heritage and its representation to those speaking in “first person”, and to engage reflexively with the museum and its knowledge.

The basic claim underlying collaborative museology – that those being represented should have a say on their heritage in museums – has also gained recognition over the past two decades in European museums, reframing relationships both with communities of origin abroad, and with local diaspora groups. Robin Boast, writing from the context of the UK, states that “[...] there are few museums with anthropological, or even archaeological, collections that would consider an exhibition that did not include some form of consultation”

(Boast, 2011, p. 56). "Some form of consultation" refers to the different forms that source community involvement can take, from one-off consultations that cannot seek to achieve the goals of a negotiation process and collective decision-making envisaged in collaborative museology, through to extended processes of co-curation. Also, in considering Boast's statement, huge differences in discourse and practice have to be acknowledged between European countries. In ethnographic museums in the German-speaking countries, exhibitions resulting from collaborative processes continue to be much more the exception than the rule.

While collaborative museology is without a doubt the way forward if European ethnographic museums wish to decolonise their institutions, the notion of source communities is also subject to critical debate. The concept of 'source communities' can be broadly criticised in that it suggests an instrumental relationship between museums and community groups. The community is therefore portrayed as the 'source' of the collections. It becomes particularly problematic when the collaborative approach is applied to the former imperial centres and European migrant communities. Collaborative museology is understood in the 'centres' both as the cooperation with stakeholders in the countries from which the collections originated, and as the cooperation with the diaspora in Europe. According to Wayne Modest and Helen Mears, the concept of the source community is linked with a sense of identity fixated on origins, and runs the risk of reinforcing the historical classification of people which is present in the collections. For Modest and Mears, the model of the 'source' replicates

> *simplistic approaches based on what are seen as fixed cultural markers for historically unchanging, visibly 'different' homogeneous groups; the kinds of groups curators can find historically 'described' by groups of material culture and their documentation in museum collections.* (Modest/Mears 2012, 300)

Therefore, the source community concept does not take into account a contemporary understanding of identity as composite and influenced by multiple forms of belonging. This in no way undermines the right of communities who claim, through ethnicity or origin, to have a say on collections. But it cannot describe the diversity of claims people can have in a 'migration society' to having a say in an anthropology museum: is the legitimacy of the interests and right to participation only defined by the 'origin' of the collection?

This is strongly linked with another characteristic of the discourse of collaborative museology and its foundational notion of source communities. The strong emphasis on horizontal relationships and process-orientation in the

collaborations between museums and source communities is frequently combined with a purely instructive view on education when it comes to exhibition visitors. As opposed to the community which is addressed as a collaborator, the visitors are envisaged as a homogenous public to be educated by the newly collaborative museum. This unnuanced perspective of the 'public' is most prominent in the contributions from USA/Canada/Australia that work with a clear concept of 'source communities', which in the most radical cases has resulted in an actual shift in the balance of power (for a detailed version of this argument, see Landkammer, 2016). As Lainie Schultz argues:

> *Importantly, in pledging themselves to collaboration museums indicate their on-going commitment to it as a form of social activism, reflecting their belief that its relevance extends beyond those immediately participating in the process. Such a belief, however, implies the need for the visiting public to be a part of the process, a group that is frequently overlooked in discussions of collaboration.* (Schultz 2011, 2)

Especially in contemporary European 'migration societies', this tends to overlook the different positionalities of visitors in relation to colonialism and contemporary racism, and thereby neglect the possibly productive relationship with communities not based on the notion of a "source".

2_2_Community in Education at Memorial Sites

In contrast to the situation in ethnographic museums, commemoration sites that are related to the atrocities of e.g. the Nazi regime are often directly connected to the activity of specific stakeholder communities – the associations of survivors. Either the stakeholder themselves established the commemoration and/or educational activities at the site (as is the case at the former Mauthausen concentration camp in Austria), or the survivors, their associations, interest representatives or families are a constituency that is always present in some way or another. However this does not mean that the relationship between stakeholder, educators and curators at commemoration sites is less conflictual than in the context of museums. Survivors are by no means a homogeneous group, they may have interests that conflict with those of the educators (for example, viewing the location more as a site of commemoration and mourning than as a place of education; or presenting different ideas on the ways the knowledge about the events in a certain place should be publicised). One of the interesting things about memory work in Austria is that because the state was reluctant to accept responsibility for many decades (in some places,

TR-
ACE
S—

commemoration work only started within the last decade or so), local initiatives took up the slack, often in collaboration with, or initiated, by local artists. Such sites are also run and "owned" by stakeholders, but those groups consists of descendants of bystanders and perpetrators. In this respect, a commemoration site can be understood as a grass-roots practice of memory and commemoration work (examples for this approach are the former Roma concentration camp St. Pantaleon, the former Guntramsdorf concentration camp or the Rechnitz commemoration site in Burgenland).

In contrast to museums, a commemoration site "belongs" directly to a certain community of people that in many cases have no other place to mourn their loved ones – at least in many cases this is how some of the survivors and their families relate to the sites, as do national organisations and committees. Divergent interests between different stakeholder groups, educators and curators, as well as contradictory narratives are in this case performed and displayed on site. For example, at the former Gusen concentration camp in Upper Austria (over which a village was constructed soon after the war) between 1965 and 1967, a private initiative on the part of survivors from Italy, Belgium and France erected a memorial on the site of the former crematorium, funded by private donations. It wasn't until 1997 that the survivors organisation Comité du Souvenir du Camp de Gusen handed the memorial over to the Austrian government, with an official exhibition and visitor centre first opened by the government in 2004.[7]

In this village, right up to the present day, we have two different modes of approaching history, side-by-side, carried out by two different civil societies or communities. Firstly, the communities of survivors, their descendants and families, who in most cases are not connected with people living in the village. They use the memorial to mourn their relatives and friends. Travelling there by bus, leaving flowers, photographs, plaques or stones, they also mark the place in a political fashion. And secondly, the villagers, who do not want to be connected with this history, who feel that they are accused of something which they have nothing to do with, and who are bothered by an excess of spectators.

The notions of 'participation' or 'source communities' as we know them from museum discourse imply that those who own the museum allow others to 'participate'. The histories of many commemoration sites afford a different perspective on this situation: participation is there, it is not conceded, People

[7]http://www.wolfgangfreitag.com/wp/2007/01/gusen-neue-heimat-im-kz, accessed 20.02.2017

participate in the process of 'doing history' by connecting themselves to, or disconnecting themselves from, historical events. What's more, taking into account a historical connection to injustice and violence suffered as the foundation for the formation of a community can broaden the focus on ethnicity and origin in the discursive construction of the source community in ethnographic museums outlined above.

In this context it is necessary to understand the meaning of notions that are used in the field of Holocaust education. The notion of 'civil society', of bystanders and perpetrators. Taking a broad and neutral concept of 'civil society' as proposed by the political scientist Sheri Berman, a strong civil society is no guarantee for democratic stability (Berman, 1997). In this concept "civil society" includes every form of organisation between "the state" and "the family" that is based on voluntary participation and association. To understand the impact of violence in a totalitarian society the voluntary participation of its members needs to be taken into account. From this perspective, the distinction between "perpetrators" and "bystanders" appears overly simplistic, and adheres to a problematic dichotomy that does not allow for an understanding of how members of a society might engage with, or resist totalitarian systems. Hannah Arendt suggests linking "participation" with "support" rather than with "obedience", as is more typical. From this perspective, everyone who participate in a society, who follows its laws, is a "supporter", and the withdrawal of support becomes a possibility for resistance (Arendt, 1963). In this sense, the notion of "bystanders" would refer to a concept that can be interrogated. As discussed in many publications and conferences (see for example the conference 'Probing the Limits of Categorization: The "Bystander" in Holocaust History', 24.09.2015 – 26.09.2015 Amsterdam), the term "bystander" refers to an ambivalent figure that is not to be seen as a passive eye-witness, but rather as an active position, possessing a certain degree of autonomy of action. Dealing with ambiguities of these subject positions is also an important part of the agenda for educational activities.

2_3_Community Engagement and Collaborative Approaches in Museum Learning

Parallel to the collaborative paradigm in the curatorial work in anthropology and ethnography collections, museum learning has also turned to collaboration. The critique of the homogeneous voice of the institution has also been articulated by education departments. In recent decades, the field of learning and outreach work in museums has undergone a shift from imparting knowledge to visitors

towards participation and collaborative knowledge production. Carmen Mörsch speaks of a transformative function of museum education: while learning departments usually have an *affirmative* or *reproductive* role for the institution, they can also assume a *transformative* function. This means that it is not longer the different audiences that have to be "drawn closer" to the museum, rather the museum is seeking out its place within the surrounding communities. The institution's program and objectives are transformed and broadened through collaborations with different interest groups. Mörsch distinguishes the transformative from a *deconstructive* function of museum education, which, together with visitors, aims to analyse the mechanisms of value-coding which operate within museums, based on the traditions of institutional critique. Transformative museum learning, on the other hand, would attempt to actually alter the museum in collaboration with audiences (Mörsch, 2009).

In contrast to the curatorial discourse of collaborative museology in anthropology outlined above, the notion of "community" in the discourse of learning and community engagement practices in museums is an inherently plural one. It is not necessarily based on a particular connection to museum collections, but on the right of inhabitants or citizens to use cultural institutions and to participate in the representational practices there. In this sense, it is based on new museology's critique both of the museum as a disciplinary institution (Bennett 1995), and of the exclusions of the cultural sector (Sandell 2002). A community with which the museum engages can therefore be defined according to a particular age group, a neighbourhood, a profession, cultural identity, through being clients of a social service, or through sharing a joint interest. In this sense, the practice of community engagement coming from learning departments represents a plural approach in which communities intersect and overlap, and each individual forms part of a variety of possible communities. While this is a useful counterpoint to the homogenising notion of 'the public' and 'the visitor' often present in curatorial discourses (even when they work in a collaborative paradigm, as described above), the work of community collaboration from an educational tradition also struggles with inherent difficulties.

The first of these is the tendency of these engagements to **remain at the margins** of the museum. Bernadette Lynch has analysed in a participatory study the nature and difficulties of community engagement in museums in the UK, leading to the influential report 'Whose cake is it anyway?' (Lynch 2011). It makes sense to focus on the situation in the UK for our discussion here, because the UK has a long-standing tradition and dense landscape of participatory and collaborative practices in museums. From the 1990s to the 2010s, the New

Labour governments intensely promoted participation in the cultural sector. Many museums, in addition to traditional learning programs, have created outreach and community engagement departments, making long-term engagement with a variety of communities a central task of the museum's day-to-day practice, more than in any other European country. Even in this situation, Lynch comes to the conclusion in her study that the focus on project funding and the lack of organisational change led to a panorama where community engagement continues to be carried out at the margins of the institution, without affecting its core practices:

> *Despite presenting numerous examples of ground-breaking, innovative practice, the funding invested in public engagement and participation in the UK's museums and galleries has not significantly succeeded in shifting the work from the margins to the core of many of these organisations.* (ebd., 5)

As an offshoot of educational work, (an area traditionally at the bottom of the internal hierarchies of museums) community engagement often continues to be a peripheral activity. Participation and co-creation with communities takes place in settings where the central tasks of the institution – such as the management of collections and the distribution of resources – remain unaffected. This leads to the development of "empowerment lite" (Lynch, 2011, p. 6) where, to cite the report's main metaphor, small pieces of the cake are distributed among the community partners, without asking the question: whose cake is it anyway? The work of collaborative museology situated in curatorial departments and focusing on the interpretation and definition of collections represents a model for broader community engagement practices which would move from the margins to the core.

The second difficulty is that community engagement as an educational tradition continues to struggle with the **paternalism** inherent to the approach of inclusion and participation from which these projects originate. Arising from the democratic claim that museums should reach out to those who have been excluded from the cultural sector, learning or engagement departments tend to approach communities as marginalised or 'in need'. The debates in critical museum education revolve around strategies to break this relation (Lynch, 2002; Mörsch, 2012; Sternfeld, 2005). Despite the oft-proclaimed desire for horizontality, the paternalism of believing to know beforehand what participants need for their empowerment, and what their interests should be still influences community engagement, placing the museum in the role of giver, and communities in the role of beneficiaries. The persistence of this patronising approach is also described by Lynch, when she states that museums continue "to

undervalue the potential breadth of knowledge of its community partners. It invites – and often receives – the response from community partners that they are better able to think and act for themselves than they are being given credit or scope for" (Lynch 2011, 16). This often leads to a dynamic Lynch calls "false consensus", a coercive suppression of conflict and negotiation with communities based on a patronising claim that participation is already the goal in and of itself, and that all parties share the same interest (ebd., 11)

2_4_Cross-Reading Approaches to Community Collaboration for TRACES

The present chapter has juxtaposed three different discourses of collaboration and negotiation with communities. For the purpose of TRACES' attempts at building collaborative engagements with contentious cultural heritage, each of them has relevance: the collaboration with communities of origin in collaborative museology; the constitution of communities of commemoration which give rise to institutionalised heritage sites; and the democratic claim for local interest groups based on age or social background to co-determine the work of cultural institutions. However it is necessary to progress from mere juxtaposition to analysis, and this will be a significant strand of reflection in WP3's support of the CCP projects. Still, this initial cross-reading of approaches to 'community' already indicates that it is beneficial for collaborative engagement with contentious heritage in Europe to allow these three approaches to 'complicate' each other. An initial set of 'areas of attention' for community involvement in TRACES emerge through the intersections of the three discourses:

- Be aware of the danger of repeating the categorisations that have caused violence in the past in addressing contemporary communities. A focus on current self-organisation can prevent the reproduction of discriminating or objectifying categories.
- In addition to clear distinctions of communities as 'source' and 'recipient', or as 'victims' and 'perpetrators' attention needs to be paid to intersecting categories of inequality.
- Take into account that the 'public' (those who have no immediate relationship with the cultural artefacts in question), are also part of a variety of communities whose participation can be sought.

- Reflect on the relation of community collaborations to the central areas of decision-making on the heritage in question: what might be the impact of community interests, what is negotiable?
- Given the different categories of identity and interest around which a community can form, allow space for negotiating these interests, avoiding a false consensus based on pre-defined, apparently shared goals.

Annotated Reading list

Arendt, Hannah (1967). Personal Responsibility under Dictatorship. In: Jerome Kohn. Dictatorship and Judgement (2003) New York: Schocken Books.

Bennett, T. (1995). The birth of the museum. History, theory, politics. London: Routledge.
Reviewing the historical development of museums in Britain with Foucault and Gramsci, Bennett analyses the functions of museums in nationbuilding and their gouvernementality.

Berman, Sheri (1995). "Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic", in: World Politics, Volume 49, Issue 3, retrieved from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/world-politics/article/div-classtitlecivil-society-and-the-collapse-of-the-weimar-republicdiv/8F600974B874D9EF661AE3A0F1032551 (20.02.2017)
See text

Boast, Robin (2011). "Neocolonial Collaboration: Museum as Contact Zone Revisited", in: Museum Anthropology, Vol. 34(1), 56–70, Retrieved from: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1548-1379.2010.01107.x/full (21.4.2015)
This important text criticises the widespread use of Pratt's/Clifford's concept of the contact zone in museums and the neo-colonial relations that it serves to uphold if the idea of conflict and power initially inherent in the concept are not taken into account.

Fouseki, Kalliopi (2010). "„Community voices, curatorial choices“: community consultation for the 1807 exhibitions", in: museum and society, Vol. 8(3), Retrieved from: http://www.le.ac.uk/ms/museumsociety.html (10.2.2015)

TR-
ACE
S

Report from a research on community consultation in the framework of the exhibitions around the centenary of the abolition of the slave trade in Britain. Fouseki describes how unreflected assumptions and process design impacts on the perception of community representatives and their ability (or the lack thereof) to substantially co-create an exhibition.

Freeman, R. Edward (1984). Strategic Management: A stakeholder approach, Boston: Pitman.
See text

Golding, Viv/Modest, Wayne (Eds.) (2013). Museums and communities : curators, collections, and collaboration, London: Bloomsbury
The papers in this reader engage from a variety of perspectives with collaborative processes around mainly ethnographic collections. The strength of the book is that many chapter go into detail of collaborative processes and explore the challenges and contradictions they produce. Especially Wayne Modest's paper on collaborative curating with young people makes visible the possible integrations and potential conflicts between curatorial and educational perspectives on collaborative projects.

Kelly, Lynda/Gordon, Phil (2006). "Developing a Community of Practice: Museums and Reconciliation in Australia", in: Sandell, Richard (Ed.): Museums, Society, Inequality, Abingdon: Routledge, 153–174
The paper gives insight into the establishment of collaborative approaches in Australian museums.

Kidd, Jenny/Cairns, Sam/Drago, Alex/Ryall, Amy/Stearn, Miranda (Eds.) (2014). Challenging history in the museum, London: Routledge
The publication by the challenging history network dedicates a section to "teaching" challenging histories.

Krmpotich, Cara/Anderson, David (2005). "Collaborative Exhibitions and Visitor Reactions: The Case of Nitsitapiisinni: Our Way of Life", in: Curator: The Museum Journal, Vol. 48(4), 377–405, Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2005.tb00184.x (11.9.2014)
In a visitor study, Krmpotitch and Anderson work on an often neglected aspect of collaborative museology: how the aspect of co-curation and the community authorship of an exhibit is perceived by museum visitors. The case study shows that increased attention has to be paid to public communication of the process.

Lagerkvist, Cajsa (2006). "Empowerment and anger: learning how to share ownership of the museum", in: museum and society, Vol. 4(2), 52–68
Drawing on her work as a curator in the Museums of World Culture in Sweden under the direction of Jette Sandahl, Lagerkvist describes an approach to museum work in which conflict is understood as a productive part of the museum's social role and relevance. She pleas for the museum as a space in which interests and values of diverse communities as well as professional fields can collide and work on the tensions and conflict lines in society.

Landkammer, Nora (2016). "Visitors or Community? Collaborative Museology and the Role of Education and Outreach in Ethnographic Museums", in: Mörsch, Carmen;/Sachs, Angeli/Sieber, Thomas (Eds.): Contemporary Curating and Museum Education, Bielefeld: transcript
See text

Lynch, Bernadette (2011). Whose cake is it anyway? A collaborative investigation into engagement and participation in 12 museums and galleries in the UK, London: Paul Hamlyn Foundation, Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/4854738/Whose_Cake_is_it_Anyway_A_collaborative_investigation_into_engagement_and_participation_in_12_museums_and_galleries_in_the_UK._Dr_Bernadette_Lynch (23.3.2015)
The report on this research in the museum landscape in the UK diagnoses several problematics that hinder the widely common community engagement and collaboration activities from substantially impacting on museums and their social relevance: a focus on consensus leads to coercive suppression of conflicts, and the dynamics of "project work" hinder institutional change.

Lynch, Bernadette (2014). "'Generally Dissatisfied': Hidden Pedagogy in the Postcolonial Museum", in: THEMA. La revue des Musées de la civilisation, Vol. 1(1), 79–92, Retrieved from: http://thema.mcq.org/index.php/Thema/article/view/27/pdf (2.7.2015)
Building on the findings of "Whose cake is it anyway?" the paper addresses tensions between curating and education in collaborative projects with communities, and pleas for an engaged and conflict-oriented postcolonialism in the museum.

TR-
ACE
S—

Lynch, B. (2002). If the Museum is the Gateway, who is the Gatekeeper? Engage London Promoting Greater Understanding and Enjoyment of the Visual Arts, (engage 11 Sommer 2002 Inclusion under Pressure), 12-21. Retrieved from: http://www.engage.org/readmore/..%5Cdownloads%5C152E22BED_11.%20Bernadette%20Lynch.pdf (26.11.2012)
The paper develops a critique of the paradigm of inclusion in museums, questioning its patronizing and self-congratulating bases.

Mörsch, C. (2009). “At a Crossroads of Four Discourses: documenta 12 Gallery Education in Between Affirmation, Reproduction, Deconstruction and Transformation”, in: C. Mörsch & research team of documenta 12 education (Eds.), documenta 12 education #2: Between Critical Practice and Visitor Services. Zürich, Berlin: diaphanes, 9-31
See text

Mörsch, C. (2012). Sich selbst widersprechen. Kunstvermittlung als kritische Praxis innerhalb des educational turn in curating. In Schnittpunkt, B. Jaschke, N. Sternfeld, & Institute of Art Education der Zürcher Hochschule der Künste (Eds.), educational turn. Handlungsräunme der Kunst- und Kulturvermittlung. Wien: Turia + Kant, 55–78
Mörsch describes possible alliances between critical curators and educators in the educational turn, in dealing with the contradictions that affect both their practices. The desire to work horizontally with communities, while in fact there is a relation of power, is one of these contradictions.

Morse, Nuala/Macpherson, Morag/Robinson, Sophie (2013). "Developing dialogue in co-produced exhibitions: between rhetoric, intentions and realities", in: Museum Management and Curatorship, Vol. 28(1), 91–106, Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2012.754632 (2.3.2015)
The paper critically reflects on an experience in the project “Stories of the World” in the UK that aimed to combine different approaches of community collaboration: engaging young people in London as co-curators, and inviting representatives of source communities for consultation.

Muñoz, Adriana (2009). "The Power of Labelling. Report to Kulturrådet". Göteborg, Retrieved from: http://www.worldculture.se (2.4.2016)

TR-
ACE
S

Report on a project of revisiting collections at the Göteborg Museum of World Cultures. The report highlights the impact that engagement with experts from the originating contexts of "ethnographic" objects in a decolonial framework can have on the interpretation of material culture and questions of their current relevance.

Peers, Laura/Brown, Alison (2003). "Introduction", in: Museums and Source Communities. A Routledge reader, London: Routledge
Introductory reader in collaborative museology.

Phillips, Ruth B (2003). "Community Collaboration in Exhibitions. Toward a dialogic paradigm. Introduction", in: Peers, Laura/Brown, Alison K (Eds.): Museums and Source Communities. A Routledge reader, London: Routledge, 155–170
See text

Sandell, R., & Nightingale, E. (Eds.). (2012). Museums, equality and social justice. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
See Reading List chapter 1

Schiedel, Herbert (2007): "Der rechte Rand. Extremistische Gesinnungen in unserer Gesellschaft". Wien: Edition Steinbauer
See Text

Schultz, Lainie (2011). "Collaborative Museology and the Visitor", in: Museum Anthropology, Vol. 34(1), 1–12, Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1379.2010.01103.x (7.9.2014)
See text

Sekules, Veronica (2009). "The diversity of communities and cultures of the countryside", in: Journal of Education in Museums, (30), 46–52
The project "Cultures of the countryside" carried out by learning and research staff at the Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts in Norwich, UK, shifts common definitions of heritage and communities in the context of ethnographic and world art collections, by focusing on the "rural" as a connection point between the local neighbourhood of the museum and originating contexts of the world art collections.

Sternfeld, N. (2005). Der Taxispielertrick. Vermittlung zwischen Selbstregulierung und Selbstermächtigung. In schnittpunkt & B. M.-T. Jaschke Charlotte, Sternfeld, Nora (Eds.), Wer spricht? Autorität und Autorschaft in Ausstellungen. Wien: Turia + Kant, 15-33.

Sternfeld's paper describes participation and the desire of museums and educators to reach out for "new target groups" between self-empowerment, and gouvernemental self-regulation.

Strachan, Aileen/Mackay, Lyndsey (2013). "Veiled practice: reflecting on collaborative exhibition development through the journey of one potentially contentious object", in: Museum Management and Curatorship, Vol. 28(1), 73–90, Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2012.754981 (2.3.2015)
Analysing community collaboration for an exhibition, the article points out the need to negotiate between: museums as safe spaces for discussion and museums as a coercive authority; object and issue focus; community and curatorial knowledge; process and product; and the curator as expert and the curator as facilitator.

3_How to Unlearn?

> *A workshop on photographs from the archive of an ethnographic museum. The workshop aims to invite young people to analyse colonial patterns in historical images and to question the continuities in today's racist imagery in commercials and the media. The participating group from a local high school has visited the archive, where amongst other material they saw anthropometric photographs made to investigate the characteristics of supposed "races". They discussed the measuring gaze directed at the people in the photographs and the power relations between the photographer and the subjects, and racism more generally. They analyse images from colonial settings in small groups; for example, an image from a missionary school. The students are tasked with describing in detail the information which the image reveals to them through the people and objects depicted, as well as the angle of the camera or the framing. One of the students, who tells the group that he is from Togo, is particularly brilliant at analysing the pictures. From the fact that the sun is reflecting on the foreheads of the kids in the missionary school he deduces that the photograph was taken on a sunny day around midday. He goes on to explain that West Africans have these broad noses, so this is probably West Africa. The educator asks if this is important. The student affirms that it was important to get clues on the location, and if it was from a colony, he wanted to know which one.*

This episode demonstrates several aspects of learning about contentious heritage. Firstly, the whole program of revising the historical images is only in partially about learning something new. It is primarily about questioning the knowledge that has been passed on to us by institutions such as ethnographic museums. It is about de-colonising knowledge, which seems to be more of a subtractive operation that an additive one. It is about un-learning something. At the same time though, it shows that knowledge and ways of thinking and perceiving the world cannot be 'subtracted' from our minds. Knowledge of how people can be classified according to their physical characteristics is not something that can be 'removed' from the system of knowledge. It continually resurfaces. Drawing conclusions from the shape of someone's nose is inscribed into our ways of seeing and making sense of the world. It is inscribed in the thinking of the former colonisers as well as the former colonised, which is why we highlighted the young man's self-proclaimed origins. Additionally, the episode shows how it is difficult to draw boundaries and reject the knowledge production connected to racism in an isolated fashion. In what way is looking at the shape of somebody's nose actually intertwined with racism? When is

drawing on someone's physical appearance essentially normal, and when and how is it problematic? Is it not entirely legitimate for a person whose family is from West Africa to recognise people's appearances and traits? And furthermore, as the educator also recognised in this situation, it is surely not up to white people to define what a black person should see as implicated in a colonial gaze. And yet, in a context where the measuring of physical characteristics was part of the European appropriation of the world, doesn't it still reproduce those very instruments that we are seeking to problematise? It is asking precisely these kind of questions which constitutes a process of unlearning.

Postcolonial scholars have described education as a dialectic process between learning and unlearning (Spivak, 1995; cited in Castro Varela, 2007). In this work, unlearning is characterised as "critically working through one's beliefs, prejudices and assumptions. And of course by understanding how they developed and how they work"(Ortner 2010, 334).

3_1_Unlearning Coloniality

Effectively, learning programs in museums and heritage sites where difference is at stake often proclaim their aims not only in terms of content to be learned, but as a critical approach to received forms of knowledge. In ethnographic museums, questioning stereotypes, undoing the image of the exotic and breaking down clichés are central aims of education departments. An analysis of current educational discourse in ethnographic museums in Germany, Austria and Switzerland revealed that *questioning stereotypes* is one of the dominant functions of educational work in these museums.

Questioning stereotypes seems to be a good starting point for the process of unlearning, which we have identified as a basic requirement for colonial heritage education. Yet this particular take on unlearning also presents two problems. Firstly, one of the reasons that "stereotypes" are such a widespread topic in education programs is that it is socially recognised that everybody has them. As Ruth Vermot explains in an article from the 1970s on ethnology and its contribution to school learning: "Stereotypes [...] in children and adults are inevitable, taking into account that education is always culturally specific and builds on the norms and rules of our own society, guaranteeing the continuity of this society" (Vermot 1979, translation N.L.). Stereotypes, reductions and devaluations of other cultures are a "protective mechanism" for our own way of life. Another line of thought maintains that we need to reduce complexity, and creating stereotypes is a way to achieve this. In this context, debunking and critiquing stereotypes is certainly portrayed as a necessary intervention, but at the same time, it is declared to be a natural part of human behaviour. As such,

TR-
ACE
S—

unpacking stereotypes never places the self-image of the participants in question, which would be a necessary component of critically confronting the ways in which racism informs their thinking. This leads to a situation in which talking about stereotypes often replaces talking about racism and colonialism. Stereotypes become a 'screen narrative' for the entanglement with colonial history and contemporary racism in ethnographic exhibits. While talking about racism is a kind of social taboo (particularly in the German-speaking countries where racism is deeply connected to the history of the Nazi era), problematising stereotypes is acceptable. This does not just contribute to a continued silence about colonialism and racism, but rather the way 'stereotypes' frame the underlying problem of coloniality effectively contribute to this continuity. As Danielzik, Kiesel and Bendix explain in their analysis of educational materials on global learning, the approach to stereotypes suggests that what is at stake is a problem of knowledge and an insufficiently nuanced repertoire of images of alterity. "It suggests that the situation would change if we only had a more positive and less simplifying image of each other" (Danielzik/Kiesel/Bendix 2013, 29, translation N.L.). The first issue here is that it makes "knowledge about others" seem beneficial and innocent. Yet the collecting and exhibiting of knowledge about 'Others' in a European museum setting, is a core aspect of the colonial paradigm of "learning to divide the world" (Willinsky 1998). Additionally, focusing on stereotypes makes the problem seem mutual: people in other countries surely have stereotypes of Germans, and vice versa. With this take on critical education in a post-colonial context, power relations and privilege become invisible. As Bendix, Danielzik and Kiesel continue:

> *This makes it impossible to address the asymmetries of power (shaped by colonialism), meaning that 'our' images of the 'Other' [colonial production of difference] are, on a global scale, incomparably more influential than is the case the other way round. In this sense, the task cannot be to supplement 'our' images in an additive manner with more and more positive images. Rather 'our' positioning in society as well as 'our' entanglement in the reproduction of power relations in this society need to be fundamentally interrogated. (Danielzik et al., 2013, p. 29 f., Translation N.L.)*

Unlearning in a postcolonial perspective – as Danielzik, Bendix and Kiesel already indicate – has much more to do with the learner and the educator themselves than merely with the content being taught.

To outline what postcolonial unlearning might mean, we would like to examine a practical example from a university context. The blog *DecolonizeHU*[8] was created by students at Berlin's Humboldt University. The project was inspired by a course in the gender studies department of the university on 'German Colonial History' taught by Emily Ngubia Kessé.[9] The introductory text on the blog begins by stating that the course on German colonial history was an exception in the teaching program. "By the first session we immediately realised that most of us had little or no prior knowledge of German colonial history, and that the knowledge we had was influenced by racist and Eurocentric patterns of thought" (translation here and following quotes by N.L.). Unlearning here means **questioning the patterns of received knowledge**. But in the dialectic of learning and unlearning, this is also a matter of **addressing the forms of "sanctioned ignorance"** which constitute an education. Sanctioned ignorance – a term used by Spivak – refers to those things you are socially not required to know to count as "educated", or where ignorance actually serves to uphold privileges (Spivak 1999, in Castro Varela/Dhawan 2009). These privileges are addressed in the following point in the introductory text:

> *We, the initiators of this blog, through our socialisation as able, German, white cis women, profit from a racist system of domination […]. Our relationship to the Global South is shaped by European colonialism: as descendants of white colonisers we still profit from the continuities of colonialism. As students, these privileges are evident especially in the academic system. For example, as white people we have always learned to perceive ourselves as individuals and not as representatives of a certain group, to view white knowledge as universal and the benchmark against which other knowledge is measured, and to view non-white people as foreign, different and inferior […]*

What the students have done here is expressed in Maria do Mar Castro Varela and Nikita Dhawan's definition of postcolonial unlearning:

[8] https://decolonizehu.wordpress.com/ (accessed 26.2.2017)

[9] https://www.gender.hu-berlin.de/de/studium/Vorlesungsverzeichnis/kvv_ws_15_16.pdf, Kessé is the author of „Eingeschrieben. Zeichen setzen gegen Rassismus an deutschen Hochschulen“ [Inscribed. Standing up against racism in German Universities] (Kuria [Kessé] 2015), a study on the experiences of students of color in the university and of possibilities for action to transformt he structures and learning settings.

> *Postcolonial pedagogy problematises the silencing of, and complicity with, the imperialist and nationalist project which is inscribed in education. […] Anybody who wants to learn to construct a future has to be able to reflect upon the violence of 'how things got to be this way'. How have we become who we believe ourselves to be now? Which place do we occupy in the world? And at whose cost?* (ebd., 347, translation N.L.)

The students ask how their place in the world, their self-understanding, has come to be, and at whose cost. Unlearning here means understanding oneself as a subject of history, and "**persistently to critique a structure one cannot not (wish to) inhabit"** (Spivak 1990a, 795). This phrase by Spivak captures the difficulty of the unlearning project: it concerns the social and institutional structures in which we are embedded, on which we depend and in which we are implicated with our desires. It also becomes clear here that this project of unlearning concerns both those who are in the position of learners, and those who are teachers in the education system.

In this sense, for those in positions of privilege, unlearning is likely to lead to feelings of paralysis and helplessness. Talking about this feeling of paralysis of white male students, Spivak asks: why don't you "rage against the history that has written such an abject script for you that you are silenced?" (Spivak 1990b, 62). Unlearning is therefore not solely a project of self-critique, but also of **taking action and speaking up against the very exclusions and inequalities one may profit from**. The students' blog contains a section called "Speak out", in which the bloggers post their analyses of how colonial continuities are inscribed in their studies and the university, and encourage other students to participate. Taking action to critique and change the curriculum is transforming the unlearning exercise into a project of changing their own learning experiences and those of other students.

The students' blog also contains a section of local initiatives for decolonisation, and a section of portraits of activists, intellectuals and reference figures of colour who they encourage readers to learn from. Unlearning, in the dialectical process outlined above, must go hand in hand with learning. If it did not decentre this knowledge by looking for other points of reference, it would be a self-contained, self-indulgent exercise that would effectively re-centre the same kind of Eurocentric knowledge. **Learning from those whose knowledge has been excluded** is a necessary component of unlearning. The students are aware of the pitfalls of this aim:

TR-
ACE
S—

> *It is important to us to highlight that the information shared here was established by black and POC people, and that it was their actions, analyses, texts and critiques that have brought us to work on this topic. White people have already too often appropriated the work and knowledge of PoC and black people only to present them as their own accomplishments*

The need to effectively decentre a colonial European system of knowledge instead of merely engaging critically with it is highlighted by educators and scholars who draw on decolonialist standpoints, a discourse developed mainly in Latin America in critical engagement with the post-structuralist foundations of postcolonial critique (Castro-Gómez/Grosfoguel 2007; Grosfoguel 2008). The "second decolonization" they call for (Castro-Gómez/Grosfoguel 2007, 17) necessitates accessing those systems of knowledge and epistemologies which are discarded through continued coloniality. Unlearning here would mean to undo the very epistemological foundations of what is considered knowledge contained in distinctions such as: Europe has philosophy, others have culture; Europe has technologies, others have tradition. The task of unlearning would be to reverse these hierarchies and draw on neglected traditions of thought to decentre European epistemologies (for a proposal in the context of higher education, see Suárez-Krabbe, 2012).

Combining the deconstructive take on post-colonial unlearning with the need to draw on 'Other knowledge', educator Vanessa Andreotti concludes:

> *If we have been over-exposed to and over-socialized in specific European Enlightenment ideals, and if we need to amplify our constellations of meaning, this starts with an acknowledgement of our own inadequacy to even recognize other possibilities – our epistemic blindness (see Souza Santo,s 2007; Andreotti 2011; Andreotti and Souza, 2011). This blindness prevents us from listening to possibilities that, for example, are not framed by Cartesian, teleological, universal, dialectical or anthropocentric reasoning, the essential categories we have learned and used to define reality if we were educated through Western-style schooling. Therefore, in order to learn to listen to, learn from and/or work with other peoples and knowledges, we would first need to learn to unlearn and to work without the guarantees promised by the ideals of social engineering. In this sense the education of those who have been previously schooled should aim to support unlearning, learning to learn and learning to work without guarantees (Souza and Andreotti, 2009).* (Andreotti 2013, o)

3_2_Unlearning in Holocaust Education

The idea that Nazi atrocities were disconnected from "normal life" in Austria or Germany, that SS guards were feared by everyone and not viewed as a respected elite; and that all these events have nothing to do with us – forms part of the common knowledge of post-Nazi societies. The Mauthausen education department (under then head of the educational department Yariv Lapid) developed a process of challenging these basic assumptions by changing the educational approach of this memorial site. They worked out the main points of their educational objectives as part of an EU project between 2012-2014. In the final report for this project and in several research papers, they published their main educational goals and methods. As it seems (with respect to WP3's current research status) that this is one of the most sophisticated methodological proposals for initiating profound processes of unlearning in education at commemoration sites, we take their work as a foundation of WP3's empirical research

The education department set out from the question: "How was it possible for 100,000 people to be murdered amidst a civilian society?" (Lapid, Angerer and Schmutz, 27). The ultimate aim was to connect Holocaust education with civic society education. This approach makes it possible to connect the history education about the Holocaust with other problematic histories (the history of colonialism, for instance) and to bridge it with the current issues of racism and new forms of anti-Semitism. The educational approach of the Mauthausen team under Yariv Lapid is built on two main pillars:

1) An open discussion approach

A key concept of the approach is to keep the interpretation of historical events open, to allow a discussion about their meaning, and not to give in to the inclination to draw premature conclusions.

In this perspective it is necessary that the educators learn to pose genuinely open questions. This means opposing the classical teacher's dialogue. An open question is one for which there are several answers, at best one that challenges the educators themselves. The guides need to put their "own assumptions up for negotiation, abandon the role of 'expert' as much as possible, and not restrict the discussion through their own ideas". As such, the guide needs to deal with silence and take into consideration that a question can fail, and that the discussion can become diffuse. To enable the guides to work with this open discussion approach, they need to establish a learning process in the team and to jointly reflect on their difficulties in dealing with openness.

2) A civil society approach

The second pillar is to understand the concentration camp as embedded in the broader context of Austrian civil society as opposed to the common idea of crimes that happened without the knowledge of civil society, as something that happened 'behind the wall'.

To achieve this goal, the educators use statements from survivors of how they remembered the treatment issuing from the public while marching from the main train station to the camp; photographs of SS guards relaxing in front of the camp or testimonials of eye witnesses asking the guards not to torture the prisoners within their line of sight. The educational tours start not in the concentration camp but outside, looking at the landscape to understand how close the farmers' houses stood, and how many interconnections existed between the prisoners and the local population. Again, these connections served to initiate debate on the main questions: why, given the close intertwinement of the camp and civil society, could the crimes happen? How do we want to understand this civil society today?

"Sanctioned ignorance" is also at play when it comes to Holocaust education, but in a more contradictory way. On the one hand, the acknowledgment of the crimes of the Nazis is part of hegemonic knowledge. On the other hand, the participation of civil society in these crimes, and the benefits these societies gained from their participation, are often ignored in Holocaust education. Understanding 'the Nazis' as the utterly evil, absolutely different from 'us', means to ignore the fact that descendants of this history are themselves a part of this history. To alienate the present time and the educators' own (family) history from the subject which is being taught (the Holocaust) also implies an alienation from the stories and feelings of the survivors' descendants and their (often traumatic) experience of "postmemory": In her concept of "postmemory", theorist Marianne Hirsch describes the

> *relationship that the 'generation after' bears to the personal, collective, and cultural trauma of those who came before-to experiences they 'remember' only by means of the stories, images, and behaviours among which they grew up. But these experiences were transmitted to them so deeply and affectively as to seem to constitute memories in their own right.*

Postmemory's connection to the past is thus actually mediated not by recall but by imaginative investment, projection, and creation.[10]

This relationship between the past and the present has often been shaping the family narratives of survivors for generations, and influences the way they perceive our present time. These dynamics are often ignored in the families of perpetrators or bystanders.

Conclusion of the unlearning process in Holocaust education

To adhere to the concept of 'unlearning' in the context of Holocaust education means to challenge the 'secure' narrator position of the educators themselves.

Looking at this suggestion again with Sternfeld, we need to ask if an approach such as the one the Mauthausen education team developed allows the opening of an "agonistic contact zone". Does it really take different narratives from different backgrounds into consideration? And if so, where are the boundaries of this "open discussion"? What can still be said, and where does the educator need to intervene in, or stop a discussion? Sternfeld points out clearly that far-right opinions, racism or anti-Semitism fundamentally oppose the idea of equality and are therefore not to be tolerated in a contact zone. Taking a cue from the Austrian educator Heribert Schiedel (Schiedel, 2007) and German educator Micha Brumlik (Brumlik, 2009), anti-Semitic or racist statements have to be opposed actively, but the individual behind the statements must be acknowledged. In the pedagogical concept of the "agonistic contact zone", all "openness" requires some "closure", but this is based on negotiation and not on exclusion (Sternfeld, 2013, p. 210f.).

Interestingly enough, the concept of the Mauthausen education team does not directly refer to the necessity of closures. As one of the authors of the study and a former educator at Mauthausen commemoration site, Wolfgang Schmutz pointed out in an interview in the context of WP3 research, educators at commemoration sites that deal with the Nazi era and the Holocaust first and foremost need to be encouraged to create open spaces of debate. This builds on a well-established awareness that not everything can be said, and that there need to be boundaries of debate.

At this point we have to ask: how is the dialectic between 'openness' and 'closure' translated into the concrete practice of communication and education?

[10] http://www.postmemory.net/, accessed 20.02.2017

How, for example, can we understand an openness that leads to closures, and closures which encourage openness? How can we deal with, and gain an understanding of, situations in the education process that are neither 'open' nor 'closed', neither conflict nor agreement, but both at the same time?

Conclusion and Moving Forward

Departing from our critical reading of the suggestions made by educational teams and projects such as the Mauthausen educational team or the blog DecolonizeHU and the observations from our initial fieldwork,[11] we are in the process of conducting our own empirical and theory-based study on commemoration sites, museums and educational centres that deal with the Holocaust and the legacy of colonialism. In this research process, we need to understand both differences and connections between history education (for example about the Holocaust and colonialism) and civic education (for example learning about racism and anti-Semitism) and between the different fields of education on conflictual histories. Our objective is to learn about several methodological approaches, and to ascertain whether and how they draw connections between different memories, current events and conflictual narratives of the past and the present. We aim to provide new insights and more empirical, data-based suggestions to both the theoretical discourse on learning through and with conflicts, and to the practical development of new methodologies in this field. Parallel to this, we will use this study to embed the development of stakeholder involvement and educational programs with the CCPS and their critical evaluation.

Annotated Reading List

Adorno, Theodor W (1966). "Erziehung nach Auschwitz" in: Gerd Kadelbach (Ed.), "Theodor W. Adorno, Erziehung zur Mündigkeit, Vorträge und Gespräche mit Hellmuth Becker 1959 – 1969", Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

[11] Weltkulturen Museum Frankfurt, Museum of Folk Live and Folk Art Vienna, Gedenk- und Bildungsstätte Haus der Wannseekonferenz, educational program of the Documentation Centre of Austrian Resistance, Deutsches Historische Museum Berlin, Bildungsstätte Anne Frank Frankfurt, Verein Frankfurt Postkolonial

One of the classical texts on Holocaust education, based on Psychonalyses and Marxist approaches Adorno focuses on the capacities of self-reflection and autonomy as an antidote against totalitarism.

Andreotti, Vanessa (2005). "The Other Worlds Educational Project and the Challenges and Possibilities of 'Open Spaces'", in: Ephemera, Vol. 5(2), 102–115, Retrieved from: http://www.ephemeraweb.org/journal/5-2/5-2andreotti.pdf (1.10.2016)
This paperby Vanessa Andreotti, Canada Research Chair in Race, Inequalities and Global Change, explores an educator's hands-on experience of working with the 'Open Space' methodology in the context of the 'Other Worlds' Project, a reflexive educational programme addressing development education and uncritical discourses of global citizenship.

Andreotti, Vanessa (2007). "An Ethical Engagement with the Other: Spivak's Ideas on Education", in: Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, Vol. 1(1), 69–79, Retrieved from: http://www.criticalliteracyjournal.org/cljournalissue2volume1.pdf (1.10.2016)
Andreotti summarizes key concept of post-colonial theorist Gayatri Spivak for education, pointing to the difficulties of drawing methodology from a framework based on deconstruction.

Andreotti, Vanessa (2013). "Renegotiating epistemic privilege and enchantments with modernity: the gain in the loss of the entitlement to control and define everything". Dartmouth. Centre for Policy Analyses /UMass Dartmouth; Social Policy, Education and Curriculum Research Unit, Retrieved from: http://www.umassd.edu/media/umassdartmouth/seppce/edleadership/Vanessa_Oliveira_Andreotti_Paper.pdf (1.10.2016)
In this paper, Andreotti connects her previous research and practice in post-colonial approaches to learning with the theoretical framework of modernity/coloniality from a Latin American context, emphasizing the need to learn from other epistemologies.

Autor*innenKollektiv Rassismuskritischer Leitfaden (2015). Rassismuskritischer Leitfaden zur Reflexion bestehender und Erstellung neuer didaktischer Lehr- und Lernmaterialien für die schulische und

außerschulische Bildungsarbeit zu Schwarzsein, Afrika und afrikanischer Diaspora Marmer, Elina/Projekt Lern- und Erinnerungsort Afrikanisches Viertel (LEO) beim Amt für Weiterbildung und Kultur des Bezirksamtes Mitte von Berlin (Eds.):, Hamburg/Berlin, Retrieved from: http://www.elina-marmer.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/IMAFREDU-Rassismuskritischer-Leiftaden_Web_barrierefrei-NEU.pdf (16.12.2016)
Comprehensive, yet abstract guidelines for teaching on Blackness, Africa and African Diaspora in german schools based on a postcolonial framework and current theories of racism.

Berliner Entwicklungspolitischer Ratschlag/Golly, Nadine/Kiesel, Timo (2016). Bon voyage! Rassismuskritische Wege in der entwicklungspolitischen Bildungs- und Projektarbeit, Berlin: Berliner Entwicklungspolitischer Ratschlag e.V.
Practice oriented publication attempting to foster unlearning in the context of development cooperation and related educational projects. The critiques and methodological hints can be transferred in many cases also to museum and heritage education dealing with difference and north-south relationships.

Brumlik, Micha (2009). Pädagogische Reaktionenauf Antisemitismus. In: Braun Stephan/Geisler, Alexander/Gerster, Martin (Ed.): Strategien der extremen Rechten. Hintergründe – Analysen – Antworten. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften
See text

Castro-Gómez, Santiago/Grosfoguel, Ramón (Eds.) (2007). El giro decolonial. Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global, Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre: Universidad Central, Instituto de Estudios Sociales Contemporáneos y Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Instituto Pensar
Reader that gives a comprehensive overview of the theory production of the mainly Latin American discourse on modernity/coloniality.

Grosfoguel, Ramon (2008). "Transmodernity, border thinking, and global coloniality. Decolonizing political economy and postcolonial studies", in: Eurozine, Retrieved from: http://www.eurozine.com/pdf/2008-07-04-grosfoguel-en.pdf (1.10.2016)

Grosfoguels essay gives an introduction to the modernity/coloniality discourse, developing a nuanced critique of the canon of post-colonial theory.

Georgi, Viola B (2003). "Jugendliche aus Einwandererfamilien und die Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus", in: Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte B 40 – 41/2003, retrieved from: http://www.bpb.de/apuz/27374/deutsche-geschichte (20.2.2017)
One of the main authors dealing with Holocaust education in the context of migration society based on empirical studies

Castro Varela, María do Mar/Dhawan, Nikita (2009). "Breaking the Rules: Bildung und Postkolonialismus", in: Mörsch, Carmen/Forschungsteam der documenta 12 Vermittlung (Eds.): Kunstvermittlung 2. Zwischen kritischer Praxis und Dienstleistung auf der Documenta 12. Ergebnisse eines Forschungsprojekts, Kunstvermittlung ; Bd. 2. Zürich [u.a.]: Diaphanes
Castro Varela and Dhawan give an outline of a post-colonial pedagogy for gallery educators in the contemporary art field.

Danielzik, Chandra-Milena/Kiesel, Timo/Bendix, Daniel (2013). Bildung für nachhaltige Ungleichheit glokal e.V. (Ed.):, glokal e.V., Retrieved from: http://www.glokal.org/?edmc=826 (4.8.2016)
Brief and precise study of how global inequality is upheld through the way European students learn about global relations and difference in education for sustainable development. Many of their detailed critiques can be applied also to museum and heritage education programmes.

Heyn, Susanne/Krieg, Deborah/Mendel, Meron (2015). Deutscher Kolonialismus - Ein vergessenes Erbe? Postkolonialität in der rassismuskritischen Bildungsarbeit, Frankfurt a.M.: Bildungsstätte Anne Frank, Retrieved from: http://www.bs-anne-frank.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Slider/Publikationen/Deutscher_Kolonialismus.pdf (1.4.2016)
The Bildungsstätte Anne Frank in Frankfurt a. M. is singular in their connection of critical history learning on National Socialism, and on Colonial History. The publication reflects on their programme on German colonial history, providing also an interesting methodological framework.

TR-
ACE
S—

Heyl, Matthias (1999) "'Holocaust Education' Internationale Tendenzen im pädagogischen Umgang mit der Geschichte des Holocaust", retrieved from: http://fasena.de/download/heyl/Heyl%20(1999).pdf (20.02.2017)
Useful overview on the development of the term holocaust education.

Kuria [Kessé], Emily Ngubia (2015). eingeschrieben. Zeichen setzen gegen Rassismus an deutschen Hochschulen, Berlin: w_orten & meer
Kessé has worked with students of colour to analyse the mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion in Universities in Germany, as well as strategies of action.

Lapid, Yariv (2013). "Strassler Presentation: Combining Education at Memorial Sites and Civic Education: Experiences from the Mauthausen Memorial". Conference paper presented at Policy and Practice: Pedagogy about the Holocaust and Genocide, Clark University Strassler Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies, Worcester, 11-13 April 2013.
Main paper on the Mauthausen educational approach in English.

Lapid, Yariv, Christian Angerer and Wolfgang Schmutz (2013). "Die pädagogische Vermittlungsarbeit an der Gedenkstätte Mauthausen (The pedagogical work at Mauthausen Memorial)." Erinnern.at Annual Report 2012. Bregenz: Erinnern.at, 2013.
See text

Messerschmidt, Astrid (2010): "Gegenwartsbeziehungen – Erinnerungsbildung auf der Suche nach zeitgemäßen Perspektiven", in: Einsicht. Bulletin des Fritz Bauer Instituts zur Geschichte und Wirkung des Holocaust, 2. Jg., Nr. 4/2010, S. 16–21
Astrid Messerschmidt is one of the most important Authors in the context of Holocaust education and migration society.

Ortner, Rosemarie (2010). "Between learning and unlearning difference: using concepts of difference in pedagogical practice", in: Practice and Theory in Systems of Education, Vol. 5(4), 331–338, Retrieved from: http://epa.niif.hu/01400/01428/00014/pdf/EPA01428_ptse_1404 RosemarieOrtner.pdf (1.10.2016)
See text

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1990). "The Making of Americans, the Teaching of English, and the Future of Culture Studies", in: New Literary History,

TR-
ACE
S—

Vol. 21(4), 781–798, Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org/stable/469185S (17.11.2016)
See text

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1990b). The post-colonial critic : interviews, strategies, dialogues Harasym, Sarah (Ed.):, New York [etc.] : Routledge
See text

Sternfeld, Nora (2014). Verlernen vermitteln, Hamburg, Retrieved from: http://kunst.uni-koeln.de/kpp/hefte/heft-30/ (23.2.2017)
Exploration of the concept of unlearning in the field of museum and gallery education.

Suárez-Krabbe, Julia (2012). "'Epistemic Coyotismo' and Transnational Collaboration: Decolonizing the Danish University", in: Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge, Vol. 10(1), 31–44, Retrieved from: http://scholarworks.umb.edu/humanarchitecture/vol10/iss1/5 (21.7.2014)
The author describes the mechanisms of value-coding that reproduce a Eurocentric canon in Danish Universities, and proposes to lecturers to act as epistemic "smugglers" of texts and contents from the south into the curriculum.

Vermot, Ruth G. (1979). "Ethnologie und Schule", in: Geographica Helvetica, Vol. 34(2), 73–77
The text is cited here as an example for the focus on questioning stereotypes in education when it comes to difference and north-south relationships.