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Session: Historiography I
Report by Kerstin Lange, Global and European Studies Institute i.G., Universität Leipzig

The focus of this session was the interface between historical science, politics and society. Beyond the academic field, history didactics and memorial laws („Geschichtsgesetze“) were discussed by a group of international scholars.

A critical analysis of the state of history lessons in secondary schools and the approaches to Global History in textbooks formed the focus of the first panel of the session (Thinking the World - Approaches to World History and Global History). CHRISTOPH KÜHBERGER (Salzburg) presented an analysis of Austrian history textbooks; he criticized the fact that the ‘world as a whole’ is still not represented. Only very few adequate learning and teaching models exist which provide an insight into globality. Increasing the quantitative number of case studies does not enough to explain complexity. Kühberger presented selected examples of media and teaching material. While criticizing existing didactic concepts, he also explained approaches, which will enable pupils to discover locality and heterogeneity. These topics were also picked up by URTE KOCKA (Berlin), who emphasized the necessity of media skills for pupils. Education has to teach these basic skills in order to facilitate pupils’ understanding of contemporary global questions. Kocka mentioned that, on a positive note, discussions have moved forward as in 2005 the First European Conference was still discussing the ‘why’ of developing Global History didactics, whereas in 2008 discussions about the ‘how’ are taking place, i.e. the discussion of a concrete transformation of theory into practice and of adequate materials to support this. A very different approach was chosen by RAINER JANSEN (Münster), who connected global history to prehistory and pointed at its inherent pedagogical potential. In a long-term study, from 1870 to present day he has examined how explanatory models construct common or separated narratives of the development of mankind.

Concrete implementations of those theoretical concepts which try to overcome the nation-state perspective on history were described in the second panel (Jenseits nationaler Meistererzählungen. Zur Multiperspektivität und Transnationalisierung von Schulgeschichtsbüchern). During the presentations given by SUSANNE GRINDEL (Braunschweig) and RAINER RIEMENSCHNEIDER (Montpellier). At the center of the discussion was the Franco-German history textbook “Histoire/Geschichte” published by Ernst Klett; it was created by a bi-national cooperation of French and German authors. Currently it contains the Franco-German history from 1815 to present. Susanne Grindel referred to the proposal for a European history textbook that has been brought to a meeting of EU Secretaries of Education by the German minister Annette Schavan. Grindel analyzed current German history textbooks and the Franco-German history textbook to ask if it is possible to comprehend Colonialism as a common European theme. According to her results, there are presently two main representations of this period: either national narratives occur in parallel, but separated, or, in search of a common denominator of a shared European history, discrepancies are smoothed over. Reiner Riemenschneider, who was part of the commission for the Franco-German textbook, reported on the controversies that emerged because of the national conflicting contexts. As he pointed out, different perspectives and orientations should all be represented in the textbook. Discrepancies should remain transparent and be seen as a productive constructive
criteria. Multiperspectivity would then be a fundamental part of the text. In the discussion following the lectures the inadequate considera-
tion of incompatible opposed positions was criticized sharply. Moreover, the problems of the theoretical frame of reference Europe and its political genesis were criticized for remaining too fragmentary. A eurocentric narrow-
wing could compromise an education which should open to a wider historical frame. As long as the emphasis does not change from parallel national histories towards entangled histories, a generally accepted curriculum can not be created.

A second strand of the session (addressed within the third panel „Geschichtsgesetze und neue Weltdis-“) was a discussion about memorial laws conducted by LUIGI CAJANI (Rome). During this debate about the competing interests of historical science and politics, European and non-
European perspectives enriched the discus-
sion. In his introduction Luigi Cajani presented the framework decision “on combating racism and xenophobia”, proposed by German Justice Secretary Brigitte Zypris and ad-
opted by the Council of EU justice ministers, on 20 April 2007. He underlined the warning against a definition of historical truth by par-
liament or judicial authorities and emphasized the consequences for historical research. On these grounds he pleaded for internatio-
nal cooperation and a wide public debate be-
tween scholars of this topic. Therefore he re-
ferral to the conference of the ”International Committee of Historical Science (CISH)” 2010 in Amsterdam. MATTHIAS MIDDELL (Leip-
zig) pointed out the different dimensions of the discussion in the EU countries and illus-
trated this with reference to the “Lois mémorialles” in France. The debates in France in 2005 and 2006 actualized fundamental ideas about history and memory. The specific role of historians in politics of remembrance shows the difficult separation of judiciary, politics and history. During these debates public pro-
test of scholars showed the close relations-
ship between French society and historians. A sphere where actors are striving for influence and the power of interpretation is constantly created. A generation of historians in France, whose position in social debates has always been highly acknowledged, was thrown in-
to doubt about their self-understanding. But within this process doors were also opened to a new self-confidence and to more space for maneuvers. The cooperation with teachers was also part of the process.

From a Non-European perspective, STEFFI RICHTER (Leipzig) expanded the focus of the session, demonstrating the close rela-
tionship between politics and history in Japan. The recent textbook controversy there was in her reading an example for political control over education and history. Moreover, Richter pointed out the close entanglement of histo-
riography with international relationships to neighbouring countries. This connection has also been pointed out by BJÖRN GOLDSTEIN (Münster), who related Chinese Global Histo-
ry from the 19th century onwards to national-
ization and political instrumentalisation and China’s positioning towards the West. KAZI-
MIERZ WOYCICKI (Warsaw) brought the fo-
cus of the session full circle and discussed the present situation, referring to memorial laws in Poland and politics of remembrance in Eastern Europe. Dealing with a commu-
nist past and the resulting consequences of self-critical analysis produces a sensitive area which is hesitantly opening towards alterna-
tive narratives.

The following discussion focused on different national characteristics and their effect on the interface between politics, society and histo-
ry. To sum up, this panel revealed very diver-
gent conceptions of the privilege of inter-
pretation and the eloquence of historians in different national contexts. As Middell and Woycicki emphasized, there is still a denial of the idea, that there are at least two histo-
rical meta-narratives in Europe. There cannot be an enforced consensus between basically different memories. The tendency to legal reg-
ulations could be interpreted as a reflex to an uncertainty which states attempt to con-
trol through legislation. During the discussion of memorial laws specific conflicts in the EU countries were pointed out, so that a forthco-
mimg law throughout the EU, based on that framework was analyzed very critically. Fur-
thermore, the social spheres that Global Histo-
ry is involved in and its connectivity to social debates were established.
Program of the Session:

Panel: Thinking the World - Approaches to World History and Global History, chairs: Jens Naumann, Universität Münster, DE / Christoph Kühberger, Universität Salzburg, AT
Christoph Kühberger: „Die Welt denken – Zugänge im Geschichtsunterricht“
Rainer Jansen: „Ursprungsmythen, Entwicklungsparadigmen und Weltbewusstsein in Schulbüchern“

Susanne Grindel: „Perspektiven eines europäischen Geschichtsbuches“
Rainer Riemenschneider: „Das deutsch-französische Schulbuch“
Urte Kocka: „Die ’Welt’ im Schulgeschichtsbuch - Befund und Perspektiven - Die Welt im Geschichtslehrbuch - das Geschichtslehrbuch in der Welt“

Panel: Geschichtsgesetze und neue Weltordnung, chair: Luigi Cajani, University of Rome, IT
Luigi Cajani: „Europe moves to censor historians“
Matthias Middell: „Frankreichs Historiker und die Geschichtsgesetze“
Steffi Richter: „Vergangenheitspolitik und Geschichtsdebatten in Ostasien/Japan seit den 1980ern“
Björn Goldstein: „Weltgeschichtsschreibung in der Volksrepublik China“