ABSTRACTS

PANEL: " Centre & Periphery"

Kerstin Poehls (DE): *Europe, blurred: Migration, Margins and the Museum*

More and more museums all over (EU-)Europe discover migration as a topic for temporary exhibitions, and a number of museums solely on migration have been founded since the end of the 20th century. In how far does "migration" as a formerly peripheral topic question some traditional principles of museal work? By exploring the role that maps play in the context of exhibitions of migration, I will argue that the meaning of geopolitical boundaries is literally undercut here. National and European boundaries are as instead displayed as "socially performed conceptual entities". Furthermore, exhibitions on migration challenge museal self-perception, as I will argue, precisely because the traditional role of objects is at stake. Finally, I will show how migration exhibition make visible the interaction of various public spheres and discourses. This allows for a more central role of museums in the ongoing self-reflection of European societies, which implies a negotiation of where "centre" and "periphery" are socially, culturally, and politically located.

Ljiljana Radonic (AT): *Croatia – Exhibiting memory and history at the "shores of Europe"*

Even though the self-critical dealing with the past has not been an official criteria for joining the European union, the founding of the *Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research* and the Holocaust-conference in Stockholm at the beginning of 2000 seem to have generated informal standards of confronting and exhibiting the Holocaust during the process called "Europeanization of the Holocaust". This is for example indicated by the fact that the *Holocaust Memorial Center* in Budapest opened almost empty only weeks before Hungary joined the European Union although the permanent exhibition had not been ready yet. On the other hand, after 1989 conflicting memories emerged: the Holocaust as Europe's negative founding myth vs. the parallelizing of National Socialism and communist crimes.

The Croatian case, especially the new exhibition that opened at the KZ-memorial Jasenovac in 2006, will serve in order to examine how the "Europeanization of the Holocaust" impacts on a candidate state. The memorial museum resembles Holocaust Memorial Museums in Washington, Budapest etc., but, although it is *in situ*, at the site of the former KZ, the focus clearly lies on individual victim stories and their belongings, while the perpetrators and the daily "routine" at the KZ are hardly mentioned. Another problem influenced by the international trend to focus on (Jewish) individuals and moral lessons rather than on the historical circumstances is that the focus on the Shoa blanks the fact that Serbs had been the foremost largest victim group. The third field, where the influence of "European standards" on the Croatian politics of the past will be examined, is the equalization of "red and black totalitarianism" at the annual commemorations in Jasenovac. While this was already done during the revisions era of President Franjo Tudman during the 1990, today it perfectly matches EU-politics, as the introduction of the 23rd of August, the anniversary of the Hitler-Stalin-pact, as a Memorial day for both victims of Nazism and Stalinism shows.

Waltraud Bayer (AT): *Europe – Russia – Europe*

The title of the jubilee exhibition at Moscow's State Tretiakov Gallery, 2007, was telling; its timing was significant: "Europe – Russia – Europe" marked the 10th anniversary of the EU representation in the Russian Federation as well as the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, the founding year of the EU. It also opened just in time for the EU-Russian summit in Samara, in May 2007. At the same time the host, the prestigious Tretiakov Gallery, in the rank of a national museum, was celebrating its 150th anniversary.

To adequately celebrate the three important milestones, the chief curator of the Tretiakov Gallery, Ekaterina Seleznyova, and the Delegation of the European Commission in Russia, jointly invited the 27 EU member states to participate in the exhibit: 48 museums followed the invitation. For the first time, curators from the EU and Russia have worked together to create "a truly ground-breaking exhibition which celebrates some of the great achievements in Russian and European art over the past 500 years" (press release).

A major goal was to highlight Russia's relations with Europe which have always been one of the major issues of Russia's self awareness. As the prominent historian Klyuchevsky stated: "Obviously, historically Russia is not Asia, though geographically it is not completely Europe either ... It is an intermediate country, a mediator between the two worlds. In cultural terms it is inseparable from Europe".

The result was officially much praised. The public, however, uttered some criticism: The fact that each member country was allowed to select only two or three, maximum four works, highlighting its national art history and at the same time illustrating its special contribution to the European unification process, was a main criticism: the exhibition was politically correct, it was said, shallow, avoiding any historical and national disputes. Thus, masterpieces were mainly not included. There was no Rafael, no Leonardo, no Michelangelo, no Rubens, and no trace of Velazquez' "The Surrender of Breda" (ca. 1635), which depicts the Dutch defeat over the Spanish army in the Netherlands. In the same politically correct vein, the Russian selection was decided.

This contribution is conceived for the topical group "<u>Objects and collections</u>". It will analyze the overall exhibition concept as well as some of the 'national' contributions. It will also discuss which <u>narrative of Europe can be told with particular reference to the Russian context.</u> As Europe is definitely more than the EU, the exhibition showed that to define Europe in cultural terms much conceptual work remains to be done.

Torgeir Rinke Bangstad (NO): *A future in ruins: Post-industrial landscapes as deterritorialized heritage*

In this paper I will introduce the topic of how the orchestration of single industrial heritage sites into larger routes of industrial heritage can be read as a sort of deterritorialized approach to the interpretation of industrial heritage - whilst also reflecting a more comprehensive way to think cultural heritage beyond isolated monuments and clearly demarcated historical zones. This approach, I will argue, is a result of the need to think cultural heritage beyond an exclusive locality or essentialized 'hereness' and instead examine a more extensive, contextual understanding of history, heritage and place. Whereas the development of cultural heritage is generally believed to reinforce a distinct sense of place and identity and thus works as a device for local self-affirmation, the question is how cultural heritage is applied vis-à-vis more complex patterns of cultural interaction. Venturing beyond the local and the local sites of memory, cultural routes highlight and map narratives of travelling, interaction, and exchange rather than insisting on what Arjun Appadurai calls

the "production of locality" (Appadurai 1996). Does this challenge the view of cultural heritage as a form of retraction from the complex flows of globalization or as a way to compensate from the burdensome experience of identity diffusion in the modern world (cfr. Lübbe 1989)? With the European Route of Industrial Heritage as a starting point, I will investigate some features of the route, the reasons for its development and, finally, give an account of how these attempts of 'routing' may change our understanding of a specific industrial heritage site.