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I. INTRODUCTION

It has become a truism ever since the renewed debates about nationalism, nation-building and state formation from the 1980s on\(^1\) that history and historiography played a crucial role in forging and forming national communities and identities and thus «constructing» or «engineering» the national fabric as the scientific terminology goes. Within post-structuralist and post-modern debates about history and historical writing it has also become a commonality that reconstructing, reading and interpreting the past in a text or as a text\(^2\) can differ from what «actually happened» in the past. Historiography is informed by these events, it recreates it to a certain extent, however, it also creates it as a new textual reality and commemorative practice\(^3\). Nineteenth century objectivism and factitiousness was said to be dead with this paradigmatic shift to a new understanding of writing history. This shift generated as a lasting effect the ongoing debate about history and memory, history and oblivion, memory and commemorative practices and the intricacies of their interrelations\(^4\). Thus, the questions, which historical actors, events and groups are represented and how this representation takes place, became more and more important. Research about the function of (collective) memory, the means and contents of commemoration for the construction of collective identities, and the cultural forms of keeping and trading memory became central\(^5\).

2 Geoff Eley, Is all the World a Text? From Social History to the History of Societies Two Decades Later, Ann Arbor 1990.
3 Lucian Boia, Istoria si mit in conștiinta românească [History and Myth in the Romanian Consciousness], Bucharest 1997, p. 9.
4 The topic generated strong interest in the last two decades, so that in the meantime the separate journal History & Memory was founded. Important books for the debate about the interrelations of history and memory were, for instance, John R. Gillis (ed.), Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity, Princeton 1994 and more recently Paul Ricoeur, La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli, Paris 2000.
5 One booming branch of this research stream was the historical research on monuments, festivities or other cultural practices and their commemorative function. See for instance for France and Germany as examples: Charlotte Tacke, Denkmal im sozialen Raum. Nationale Symbole in Deutschland und
These observations open up the question of how historiography and historical representation of the twenty-first century will look like? Will it stick to its accustomed and inherited, but controversial standard of trying to be »objective« and recreating an »objective« and factual past? Or will a more subjective, and a more »constructed«, though also more fragmented, attitude towards writing history dominate? If the latter prevails, it means that categories of choice, difference, diversity, and plurality might gain a stronger influence and eventually exercise hegemony over traditional and often clearly bound national narratives. Hence, the future paradigm might shift towards a more eclectic and more controversial understanding of the past. It might even imply a more normative approach rather asking what history and historiography should and can be about, not only what it is and was about. This paradigm could be open to more ambivalent (and twisted) historical narratives emphasising in-betweenness of groups, populations, and nations, thus recognising the fact that national communities are and have been under constant transformation. In such a view, marginalised populations such as immigrants and minorities could become central. They would offer the possibility of researching history from what was for a long time the periphery, narrating it from these margins, partly against the telos of the centre. Historical imagination would be opened up to much larger, but also more conflictual interpretations. Thus, the current debate about history, memory and practices of commemorations is inherently linked to the debates about making historical representation work under the conditions of increasingly diverse societies, namely societies shaped by immigration.

II. MODES OF IMMIGRANT REPRESENTATION

Modern Europe – Europe in the times of modernity has always been a continent on the move. Emigration and immigration, migration within the continent, as well as in its nation-states, have shaped Europe’s social, political and cultural face. The same is true for European colonial expansion and decolonisation. Large-scale migration had wide-reaching repercussions in Europe. Nation-state populations as well as Europe’s economic and social fabric were shaped by the dynamic of migration movements. This


6 This perspective of ethnocentric and nation-centred history is, however, under attack from various sides. A first step towards overcoming this perspective was comparative historical research, usually along the borderlines of comparing nation-states, often informed by social scientific approaches. See for instance the journal Comparative Studies in Society and History. More recently, the history of interrelations (Beziehungsgeschichte) and transnational history, are emerging as a productive field of scholarship. See Jürgen Osterhammel, Geschichtswissenschaft jenseits des Nationalstaats. Studien zu Beziehungsgeschichte und Zivilisationsvergleich, Göttingen 2001. On transnational history see for instance the forum <http://geschichte-transnational.clio-online.net> within the H-Net system (H-Soz-u-Kult) or for German history Sebastian Conrad, Doppelte Marginalisierung. Plädoyer für eine transnationale Perspektive auf die deutsche Geschichte, in: Geschichte und Gesellschaft 28 (2002) pp. 145–169.
dynamic began unfolding on a larger scale in early modern times, accelerated within the establishment of modern industrial societies, and has yet to come to an end. Thus, migration has been a continuum of European history and not only a phenomenon of the immediate modernity.

Within European nation-states, national cultures and national public spheres, the plurality of the past and present is often not or insufficiently represented and commemorated. The image of Europe's Self is, despite historically different experiences, still mostly determined by national paradigms and modes of interpretation that cherish linear and static national narratives. Border transcending phenomena such as migration or movements or intercultural exchanges are still often neglected. If at all considered, migrants are usually written into national memories and mnemoscapes of European nations as Others. They are seldom portrayed as part of the Self. This is true for public debates and discourses. It is particularly true for national discourses about immigration and integration of immigrants. These debates are usually not dominated by broad discussions emphasising plurality and co-existence of different people and cultures, but by arguments revolving around closing societies along national lines.

Despite increasing Europeanisation, institutions shaping the European historical consciousness and memory (museums, media, schools, universities, historiography, curricula) are usually still conceptualised along national or nation-state borders. Border transcending and border destroying all-European (pan-European) or transnational developments and processes do not yet find adequate room in these concepts. The representation of European migration history within a national as well as a pan-European context provides an opportunity to intellectually challenge centralistic images of the past created by nation-states. Migration history and its representation can thus serve to decentralise historical memory. As it transcends politically and historiographically imagined and implemented borders of nation-state orders, it provides an opportunity to create an image of the past that breaks through national concepts and limitations.

Europe inherited a rich history of various forms of migrations. However, this history is generally not yet part of the general narrative in Europe, but still rather a domain of specialists. Thus, there is room for extending Europe's historical imagery by way of incorporating immigrants and their histories. Such a view and interpretation matches the historical and contemporary European reality, which is shaped by worlds

---

7 See for example Dirk Hoerder, Cultures in Contact. World Migration in the Second Millennium, Durham 2002 (Comparative and international working-class history); Klaus J. Bade, Migration in European History, Oxford 2003.

8 However, in the area of scholarship and public history this is gradually changing with growing scholarly interest in the topic and museums discovering it. Gérard Noiriel, État, nation et immigration. Vers une histoire du pouvoir, Paris 2001; Leo Lucasen, The Threat: The Integration of Old and New Migrants in Western Europe since 1850, Urbana 2004. See also the literature about the diverse national projects to open up migration museums or migration centres, for France and its •Centre d'histoire de l'immigration• see the special edition of the journal Hommes & migrations 1247 (2004); for Germany see Aytaş Eryılmaz, Deutschland braucht ein Migrationsmuseum. Plädoyer für einen Paradigmenwechsel in der Kulturpolitik, in: Jan Motte, Rainer Öhlinger (eds), Geschichte und Gedächtnis in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft: Migration zwischen historischer Rekonstruktion und Erinnerung, Essen 2004, pp. 305–319.
and spaces of in-between, much more than by an interpretation and representation determined predominantly by national centres and national elites. On the other hand such a representation from the periphery serves an important goal going beyond the limited purpose of representing immigrant history. In the age of globalisation it could help to broaden and transcend a still Eurocentric picture of the past which is no longer appropriate for the present nor for the future. Historical representation of migration in and to Europe necessarily has a strong extra or trans-European element. The history of colonialism and decolonisation and the migrations caused by it are the best, though not the only example for this argument.

The question of how this rich immigrant (and ethnic) history can be written into national, as well as into transnational and nation transcending history is one key issue to be debated and decided by the historical profession and practitioners of historical commemoration. One could argue that there are basically five ideal type approaches to representing migrant (and ethnic minorities) historiographically. They could be labelled as ethnification, assimilation, »distinctive« integration, non-representation and multiculturalisation.

These five models were and are (at least partly) mirrored in current or past societies and their historical and commemorative approaches towards (migrant) minorities. Ethnification of migration history is probably best epitomised by the US American approach which developed in the aftermath of the »ethnic revival« (from the 1960s to the 1980s) and was reinforced by debates about political correctness and recognition of minorities. It stands for separate histories of immigrant groups and ethnic minorities. These are seen rather as a separate part of national history (or better histories) than as an essential part of it. For each group its own history, its own museum and its own collective memory would be the motto of such an approach. The nature of this approach opens the way for fragmentation of national history as such. In the extreme form national history remains only a loosely connected patchwork of group histories or is even dissolved as an autonomous entity. Critics would even argue that it endangers the coherence of a society itself and leads to tribalisation.

The opposing model is the approach of active assimilation. It is best mirrored by (historical) France with its republican model. It sees immigrants (and minorities) as a constitutive and essential, though not separate or distinctive part of the politically defined nation and national history. Making ethnically blind nationals (Frenchmen) with an (often invented) commonly shared past out of them is the primary goal within this model. This approach would neither pay any attention to ethnic, regional or historical roots and difference of migrants, nor would it give any room for special group rights, or recognition of particular interests. A group-specific historical narrative may

11 In the extreme and caricatured form this approach is best shown in French textbooks of colonial times teaching indigenous students in French colonies about »Nos ancêtres les Gaules« (Our ancestors the Gauls)
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evolve on an independent local level, but it would not be initiated or supported by state institutions. Conforming to the republican values on which the model is based is the first rule for state educational institutions within this model.

The third alternative would be the model of «distinctive» integration and representation of privileged migrants such as co-ethnic or colonial repatriates. This approach is characterised by smooth integration of immigrants into the national narrative, without assimilating the group and its history completely but rather making it an integrative and essential part of national history, whilst still keeping it visible or distinctive. Germany and its co-ethnic migrants (post-war expellees and refugees but also ethnic German migrants who have come as Aussiedler from Central and Eastern Europe since 1950) could represent such a model. Dutch-Indonesians who went to the Netherlands after decolonisation or French Pieds-Noirs from Algeria immigrating to France could be seen as two other groups epitomising such an approach. Or one could make the same argument for Jews who migrated away from discrimination in Eastern Europe, the (former) Soviet Union, Iraq or Ethiopia to Israel. This mode of representation is often based on narratives of suffering and victim status identity prior to immigration. The real or ascribed status of victim then provides a rather easy possibility for the receiving society to fit the group history into its own national narrative. The state is usually much more inclined to tolerate and support an independent historical narrative of privileged immigrant groups (for instance by state supported research and research institutions).

The fourth model is a non-model, i.e., one of ignoring (migrant) minorities completely within national historiography and public commemoration, just seeing them as not belonging to one's own history and thus overlooking, not representing them. This approach is different from active assimilation, though the outcome of exclusion might be similar. It is probably the most widely spread approach to immigrants in most countries that do not explicitly consider themselves as being countries of exclusion, though they might have a large element of immigrant population in their societies. The long-term attitude of Western European societies to labour migrants that were recruited until the early 1970s is one good example of such an attitude, though it has been slowly changing within the last one or two decades. However, one could also argue that the approach of Central and Eastern European nation-states towards the history of indigenous minorities matches this model. In these cases the structure of excluding minority history from (ethno-)national history is very similar to the exclusion of labour migrants in Western Europe.

The fifth model of immigrant representation, the multicultural one, is probably best represented by Canada12, and in a very different, territorial way by Switzerland13. In contrast to the ethnification of history the multicultural option provides (at least in theory) for an overall idea of society, holding it together and providing a coherent picture of the past. Majority and minority groups play an equally important role in the construction of a national past and in commemorative practices. The national past is ac-

13 For Switzerland this is rather true for the four nation-building ethnic groups, less so for migrant minorities.
tually seen and portrayed as the very outcome of social and ethnic diversity; the state would fairly and equally support majority population and (migrant) minorities being represented historically and historiographically. However, the danger of this model, critics would argue, is its potential for turning into an ethnification or tribalisation of societies and their past. Recognition of differences, the argument would run, has the inherent tendency of establishing and consolidating these differences at the expense of national coherence.

III. QUESTIONS AND CHALLENGES

The intersection of migration and memory, history, commemorative practices, representation and identity, culture and social hierarchy during different historical periods in its complex characteristics is rather an emerging than an established field of study. As a step in this direction, we raised the issue of representing migration and migration history in various national contexts as well as in the European public sphere in our conference held in November 2004 in Paris. Scholars met who work on various subjects in the area of migration history. Topics of interest were e.g. migrant incorporation or exclusion and historical representation in both sending and receiving countries. The focus was also on writing national and/or European history versus migration history. Social and cultural practices of immigrants as well as strategies for representation by migrant groups or museums were under consideration. Exhibitions and the role of the media in representing migrants and migration history were discussed as well as methodological and theoretical contributions.

Discussing the contributions presented at the conference several questions and spheres of problems proved to be important and sometimes controversial. First, there was the question of actors or agency on the one hand, and the question of the target group on the other. If memory is a product of battle and conflict, the question arises as to who legitimately takes part in it and gets a voice. Who is the »audience«? Or to put it more provocatively: what is the content and impact of commemoration? And do immigrants want to be commemorated? Moreover, who wants and needs it? Why and on what terms? Closely linked was the question as to which agency of immigrants unfolds in nationally structured societies and largely national public spheres.

As there are different voices and interests involved, plural memories and commemoration practices seem to be the adequate form for representing the respective past. However, if this holds true, it also raises the question of discrepancy between individual interpretation of lived experiences and official commemoration providing collective meaning. Which psychological and social processes take place when individual memory is confronted with (a different) collective memory? What is the influence of families and generations in this regard?

The question of competition among groups is closely linked to this issue. Who exercises dominance or even hegemony over the interpretation and representation of the past? How and why have previously marginalised memories entered into mainstream conceptions of the past at different moments in time? To what extent have they been
modified by or assimilated into dominant collective memories? In what ways and in what circumstances have formerly excluded or clandestine memories become the sites of rival power centres, subverting or surmounting dominant notions of the past? In this regard, however, function and impact of memory are central. Memory is generally seen as a means of constructing and maintaining a collective (national) identity. Thus, memory and commemorative practices have to be seen as political statements, subject to the dialectic process of remembering and forgetting. The inherent danger of commemoration as only a selective representation of the past has to be taken into consideration. Commemoration can be the effect of memory but not the reflection of it. Thus, commemoration is likely to become a «staging» of discontinuous images, mixing past and present, focusing on image and representation instead of reflection and discussion. As a result, the appropriation of the past rather concentrates on itself instead of writing a new narrative of the past.

IV. CONTENT

The articles in this book discuss different aspects of the topics mentioned above. They give an idea of ongoing research in this sector. A complete overview was not and cannot be intended in a field of research as complex and open as this. In the first part of the book, «Narrating and Theorising Memories of Migration», Dirk Hoerder gives an overview about «Europe's Many Worlds and Their Global Interconnections» from late medieval Europe to the late 19th and 20th century. Among other topics, he discusses the poverty of histories of the nation state and uses the Dutch and Swedish example of reconceptualising national history into a many-cultured history as a resource to reshape societies from mono-cultural historical memory to multi-cultural everyday practise in the present.

«Commemorating Migrations since Early Modern Times» is the title of the second part of the book. Alexander Schunka traces the commemorative practices and historiographical traditions concerning the Bohemian Exiles in the German state of Saxony from the 17th century until today. Due to their social, cultural and linguistic heterogeneity, and contrary to the Huguenots in Brandenburg-Prussia, they failed to achieve a distinctive place in their host society's memory. However, they are a striking example of the multifaceted efforts to invent and select certain migratory traditions and to neglect others.

Through the example of the Swiss in 18th century Strasbourg Hanna Sonkarjävi shows that it does not make much sense to try and define an all-embracing category of the foreigner in Old Regime France. Studying the various means of inclusion and exclusion from a micro-historical perspective and examining in a bottom-up approach who, in what context, would have been defined as a stranger, by whom and to which purpose, provides a counterbalance to the picture created by historians who have tended to take the nation state as their primary point of departure. Focusing on the social processes of defining boundaries between different individuals or groups allows a more thorough and differentiated understanding of the «foreigner» in Early Modern France.

Huguenot migration has been largely seen against a background of religious persecution. As a contrast, Klaus Weber in his article picks the example of 18th century Hamburg, a town with a small, but economically extremely powerful Huguenot community that chose its destination for primarily economic reasons. The paper traces the community’s efforts at integration through the increasingly nationalist 19th and 20th centuries, and assesses the poor commemorative practice of this particular aspect of Huguenot history.

The contribution of Mareike König deals with the changes German migration to Paris underwent after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870/71. The hostile atmosphere affected not only the size and composition of the community, but also the behaviour, identity, and (self)representation of the migrants. In public, they were hiding their national identity. At the same time strong efforts occurred to unite and organise the Germans through associations or festivals like celebrating the Kaiser’s birthday.

In the third part of the book, »Troubled and Contested Memories« of different migration groups are analysed. Although millions of refugees were categorised as DPs (Displaced Persons) after 1945, the experience of displacement was quickly forgotten during the Cold War era. Yet since 1989, DPs have been the focus of scholarly writing and commemorative practices. In his article, Daniel Cohen elucidates the reasons accounting for their post-war absence and recent reappearance. Which image of the past is likely to insure the cohesion and the integration of the Transylvanian Saxons after their emigration to West Germany? Pierre de Trégomain reckons that the »celebration of 800 years«, organised in 1950, did not only intend to celebrate the Saxon history. It also shows the symbolical domination of a group of these migrants in representing the past. The commemoration of a constructed authenticity turned out to be a political act of strength.

In her contribution, Lavinia Stan presents and analyses media discourses on Romanian exiles as they were constructed before and after the fall of communism, emphasising the continuities and discontinuities that can be found in the competing narrative linking or dividing these two periods of Romanian history.

Dovile Budrytė outlines changes in the uses of traumatic memory for collective identity building. Her article about remembering the Stalinist deportations and repressions in the Baltic states explores public debates and analyses struggles about memory in the realm of 20th century forced migration. Her focus is on political discourse and action instead of images of victimhood.
The fourth and last part of the book is entitled »Making Migrants Visible«. In their article, Rainer Ohliger and Jan Motte search possible lieux de mémoire in Germany's immigration society. They analyse the representation of post-war labour immigrants in media of historical representation and commemoration such as monuments, street names, exhibitions, museums and film.

Wladimir Fischer examines the research on migrants from Southeastern Europe to Vienna around 1900 and develops a strategy to overcome the specific problems in writing such a history. He pleads for an open approach to a history that has so far been written from the perspective of the migrant elites and by the administrators of migration.

The Ellis Island Immigration Museum and the Lower East Side Tenement Museum in the United States are the subject of Joachim Baur's research. These two museums are usually thought of as telling fairly different stories about migration to the United States. Without neglecting the differences, the study at hand, in reading the presentations, identifies considerable common ground. Both museums basically produce narratives of transformation, they tell immigration history in terms of »Becoming American«, not so much as »Being in America«.

An oral history approach is used by Myriam Cherti. In her contribution, she deals with the Moroccan migration to England from the 1960s on, a movement so far rather unexplored by scientific research. In capturing the living memory of the first generation migrants, their respective personal experiences are pointed out.

These articles bring together a wide range of scholarship on migration history and its commemoration. They should be seen as a starting point, rather than a conclusion, as the topic is only nascent.