Journal of Educational Media, Memory, and Society
Volume 3, Issue 2, Spring 2011, pp. 137-154

Joanne Sayner

Educating Educators of Memory: Reflections on an InSite Teaching Programme

Sayner, Joanne. “Educating Educators of Memory. Reflections on an InSite Teaching Programme.“ *Eckert.Jemms* 2011/2. http://edumeres.net/urn/urn:nbn:de:0220-2014-00127.

Post peer preview precopy edit
Final printversion accessable from publisher Berghahn Journals under bergahn.publisher.ingentaconnect.com/content/berghahn/emms.

Educating Educators of Memory: Reflections on an InSite Teaching Programme

Joanne Sayner, Lecturer in Cultural Theory, Department of Modern Languages, University of Birmingham, UK

Abstract • This article reports on a continuing professional development programme run by the Imperial War Museum in London for educators involved in teaching about European memories. On the basis of two sites visited in Hungary which were elements of the educational programme, the memorial Shoes on the Danube Promenade and the Memento Statue Park, this article suggests that Alison Landsberg's concept of prosthetic memory can be applied to these sculptural monuments. It explores the political potential of empathy in transmitting diverse European pasts and of mapping individual, performative, responses to less familiar cultural contexts.

Keywords • empathy, Imperial War Museum, InSite, Memento Statue Park Budapest, prosthetic memory, shoes on the Danube promenade

Framing European Empathy: InSite 2009

Between 2004 and 2009 the Imperial War Museum (IWM) in London ran a national lottery-funded education programme called Their Past Your Future (T.P.Y.F.). One component of this was named InSite, comprising a series of three immersive learning projects aimed at the continuing professional development of British educators. This article investigates the last InSite project from the perspective of memory studies. It focuses on three interlinked areas which have particular currency in contemporary debates: first, the possibilities and usefulness of a concept of “European memory”; second, memory transmission from those who experienced an event to those who did not; and, third, the controversial role of empathy and memory in historical education. InSite was especially significant in relation to the latter because it aimed to "increase knowledge of post-1945 European history; to raise awareness of the issues involved in teaching controversial and sensitive subjects and to develop educators’ confidence in leading successful, outcome-led educational visits."[1]

Residential visits involving trips to museums and other sites of memory in Britain, Germany, the Czech Republic and Hungary were designed to "engage educators with the people, places and objects [...] in a way which explored the different approaches taken by different venues in each different country."[2] Informed by Kolb's theories of reflexive educational practice, the programme aimed to place the individual educators at the heart of the process in order to raise issues about "personal and national identity, remembrance and commemoration, global impact of C20th conflict, citizenship, commonwealth, conflict resolution, reconstruction and reconciliation, asylum/refugees, peacekeeping and human rights."[3]

Underpinning this discussion of the project aimed at teaching educators about European memories are several methodological assumptions. “Memory” as used here is not just first-hand experience but also refers more widely to socially constructed patterns of remembering.[4] As Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz point out, "Though it is now widely – though by no means uncontroversially – accepted that memory's purchase extends beyond the bounds of the individual, the question of how the social dimensions of memory are to be theorized continues to provoke debate."[5] This article investigates one such theory. At the same time, and by no means paradoxically, this case study has been chosen because of the assumption of the importance of the role of individuals in memory work. My analysis emphasizes questions of agency and embodiment which are sometimes lacking in contemporary theorization.[6] Linked to this is a belief that memory matters, politically and ethically, which is why it is vital to reflect on the ways in which it informs pedagogical practice and how programmes such as InSite provide opportunities for teachers to experience, and pass on, certain models of memory transmission. This article examines how the InSiters responded to two specific learning situations, whether these experiences were successful according to the learning outcomes of the programme, and why replicating such experiences might be useful in the educators’ own pedagogical practice. As an educator who participated in the InSite programme during 2009, my own positionality inevitably inflects my responses to the project.[7] Taking on the much advocated role of "bricoleur," that is, "someone ready to try out various tools and strategies borrowed from many academic quarters,"[8] I am therefore writing from my own experiences of the programme and as a teacher and researcher of memory who "always puts something of [her]self into it."[9]

A key element of the InSite programme was its emphasis on different local, national, European and global contexts. Contentious histories spanning different geographical contexts currently play an important role in contemporary political and academic debates about the possibilities of creating and transmitting something which might be understood as "transnational" or "European memory."[10] In the following I argue that transcultural openness was facilitated in the InSite programme through in-

teractions between national and cross-European frameworks of memories and bodily experiences of empathy. In order to examine the role and transmission of memory at specific national sites visited by the InSite participants, I consider the usefulness of Alison Landsberg's concept of prosthetic memory.[11] As my analysis will show, this concept explicitly focuses on the ways in which memories may travel across national and generational boundaries and challenge identity politics, while at the same time maintaining a sense of self and other. I maintain that prosthetic memory facilitates transnational "cognitive mapping" which helps individuals to engage with the multivocality of unfamiliar European experiences. Before turning to prosthetic memory, however, I begin with the British national context, with questions of the institutional priorities of InSite, and with the wider educational and political background of the programme.

The Political and Institutional Context. *Their Past Your Future*

In September 2003 Tessa Jowell (UK Secretary of State at the Department of Culture, Media and Sport) announced plans to commemorate the sixtieth anniversary of the D-Day landings.[12] This provided the impetus for a bid submitted by the London-based IWM, solicited by the lottery fund, for a series of events and projects aimed around "the human and regional significance and impact of the Second World War, based on intergenerational and outcome-led learning."[13] There were various aspects to the proposed project, including commemorative study visits for schools to British and international sites of memory, which had as their aim bringing children and young people into contact with issues of "remembering, memory, commemoration and reconciliation."[14] The bid was successful and the resulting impact of the programmes led the then Big Lottery Fund to ask the IWM to bid for money for an extended programme; to continue the T.P.Y.F strand by building on what had been learnt from phase one and by developing models of memory transmission further. It was therefore an explicit aim of subsequent projects to consider how memory is transmitted from those who did experience events to those who did not. Between 2007 and 2009 three types of immersive learning programmes were the result: a programme for schools; a programme for youth groups; and a programme for educators. All projects involved visits to commemorative sites abroad as well as preparatory and concluding residential weekends at the IWM in London.

The InSite group of 2009 comprised teachers, museum educators, those involved in subject development and those from academia, along with educators and historians from the IWM It was the possibility of experiencing these different sites of memory with a group of people approaching with diverse perspectives which had attracted the participants to

the project.[15] The InSite programme was designed to educate the educators of memory with tools for use in their own teaching; it included suggested activities at different sites of memory, risk-assessment workshops and case studies by teachers who had run study abroad trips in the past. As such, the potential impact of the project was undoubtedly important as educators were encouraged to replicate in their teaching what they had found successful on the basis of their own learning experience. The InSite programme therefore placed issues of transmission at the centre of its activities.

While the overarching learning objectives for the second phase of T.P.Y.F. aimed to foster, among many other things, both "an understanding of the impact and legacy of conflict, from the First World War to the present, on national identity and contemporary society" and "knowledge and understanding of the issue of remembrance and commemoration, national identity and global citizenship,"[16] the three educators' projects had an explicit additional focus on "Europe and post-1945 conflict."[17] The site visits were explicitly linked to questions of identity, that is, "national identity and global citizenship" – a term taken from the English national school curriculum.[18] The site or "place-based learning" was a significant element which informed the learning outcomes.[19] These related to "knowledge and understanding," "skills, values, attitudes and feelings," "creativity, inspiration and enjoyment," and "behaviour and progression."[20] In addition there was an explicit intention to confront the participants with "multiple voices" and a "diversity of perspectives."[21] The significance of the InSite programme is found in what it suggests are valuable tools for historical education, education which "is vital in providing the norms with which people identify and which provide the space for their historical narratives."[22] An agenda of "personalised learning" was tied to an aim to increase the participants' knowledge of historical events as well as their contemporary significance.[23] Individual agency thus played a fundamental role within the institutionally organised memory work.

This analysis restricts itself to two case studies from a trip to Budapest in September 2009.[24] These specific case studies have been chosen for examination here because, unlike visits to other sites on the programme, Hungary was a context that few in the group were familiar with. No one could speak Hungarian. At a preparatory weekend at the IWM in London the group listened to a paper by a Hungarian historian and were given several academic journal articles detailing the recent history of Hungary and its competing politics of remembrance.[25] This framework was supplemented by historical overviews from one member of the group and an IWM historian while in Budapest. While participants reported in the feedback sessions that they felt their knowledge of this context had grown, a sense of the complexity of, and unfamiliarity with, the historical narratives persisted. It is within this context of unfamiliarity that the following explores how the group were confronted with memories of two significant events

in Hungarian history: the persecution of Hungarian Jews during the Holocaust and the collapse of the communist regime in 1990. The InSiters participated in a four day trip to Budapest which included visits to Heroes Square, the Holocaust Memorial Centre, the House of Terror, the Shoes on the Danube Promenade, and the Memento Statue Park – sites which represented some of the diverse and contested pasts which shape contemporary Hungary. In analysing the latter of these two sites, my analysis considers the usefulness of the contemporary theory of prosthetic memory which emphasizes how memories from different geographical contexts can signify on a wider level for people from different historical and cultural backgrounds – in this case, how eastern European memories were able to become meaningful for a western European group of memory educators through performative, bodily, empathy.

Transmitting Memories of the Hungarian Past via Prosthetic Memories

Shoes on the Danube promenade

In 2005 a memorial was inaugurated to the Hungarian Jews murdered by the Arrow Cross (fascist party which controlled the Hungarian

Figure 1. Memorial by Gyula Pauer and Can Togay on the Danube promenade, Budapest.

Figure 2. "We discern the contours of experience of another person." Shoes on the Danube Promenade, Budapest.

government from October 1944 to April 1945) in 1944. It was created by Gyula Pauer and Can Togay and comprises of sixty pairs of life-size shoes cast in iron. The visitor's experience of the memorial is initially characterized by a sense of defamiliarization. When walking by the riverside, along a busy road and with a vista of the city, the visitor rather unexpectedly encounters the shoes which represent the Jewish victims who were rounded up by the edge of the river, made to take off their shoes, tied together and then shot so that their bodies fell into the water. The iron sculptures represent the creases in the leather, the wear and tear of daily use, and are positioned in such a way as to suggest their hasty removal. In their individuality, the shoes are markers of gender, class and, most powerfully, age. In the following, I suggest that it is possible to understand both the experience of the shoe memorial, and the subsequent trip to the Memento Statue Park, by using Allison Landsberg's concept of prosthetic memory.

In her book *Prosthetic Memory. The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*, Landsberg builds on theories of film and spectatorship to argue that some forms of commodified mass culture, particularly film, facilitate empathetic positions which are significant for the memories being represented in them. Through interpellation,[26] she claims, consumers are invited to take an active position in relation to the memories being conveyed in such a way that their experience of experiencing these memories becomes part of their own identity. This can happen, she continues, across traditional boundaries of gender, ethnicity, class and nationality if the subject feels sufficiently empathetically involved. When at its most positive, and for her, politically productive, empathy "elicits identification across lines of difference" and the resulting prosthetic memory "creates the conditions for ethical thinking precisely by encouraging people to feel connected, while recognising the alterity of 'the Other'."[27] Commodified mass cultural products can, therefore, positively transcend identity politics. She broadens her analysis to encompass other media which employ similar visual and narrative strategies, including what she calls "experiential museums" in her discussion. Landsberg claims that it is advances in technology that

have enabled these empathetic positions. "Through the technologies of mass culture, it becomes possible," she argues, "for these memories to be acquired by anyone."[28] Astrid Erll concurs with the contemporary significance of technology in this respect, seeing modern media as one of three elements which have facilitated the "transnational actuality" of memory.[29] Landsberg explicitly distances her notion of prosthetic memory "from collective memories [...] which are located entirely in social structures such as laws or records or statues or souvenirs."[30] Nevertheless, as I will now demonstrate, it is my contention that Landsberg's emphasis on bodily memory and performance allows for a wider applicability of her concept to other non-technological sites of memory, including sculptural memorials. Specifically, I argue that it is possible to understand the InSiters' experience of these shoes on the Danube promenade in the same experiential way recounted by Landsberg in the context of the piles of shoes at the Washington Holocaust Museum.[31]

While it is certainly not the case that the visitor to the Danube shoe memorial is confronted by the smell of the shoes or thousands of objects representing the mass murder, as in the Holocaust Museum, the visitor nevertheless stands at the edge of the river and experiences very immediately the steep drop down to the river, the speed of the current, and the elements of the weather. While standing in her or his own shoes, the visitor is standing next to those representing the shoes of the victims. As Landsberg has described, piles of shoes have become particularly powerful in the iconography of the Holocaust due to the links the observer makes to his or her own experiences. "At the same moment that we experience the shoes as their shoes – which could very well be our shoes – we feel our own shoes on our feet. The disinvestment that the objects represent can be traumatic only if we feel all the while ourselves."[32] It is this process, she argues, that makes empathy possible, empathy which relies on or recognises "the alterity of identification."[33] As such, the small section of path on the Danube has the potential to become a space of prosthetic memory. The InSiters experiencing these memories did not live through the events but they nevertheless came to have a relationship to them. However, importantly, Landsberg insists that "although real experience takes place, the experience is not equivalent to or an exact repetition of the original event or relationship: the parameters are artificial. Nonetheless, the experience fosters an otherwise unattainable insight into the original event."[34]

These memorial shoe sculptures were placed as pairs with the haphazard spacing encapsulating the individuality of every victim. Just as powerfully as the piles of shoes contained in the Holocaust museum, which overwhelm through their sheer scale, these sculptural, mnemonic everyday objects elicit a feeling of empathy as we "discern the contours of experience of another person."[35] It is Landsberg's contention that the "experience of vulnerability" that one gains from such experiential sites

is "a form of knowledge about the Holocaust." She continues: "For the event to become meaningful enough to retain as part of our intellectual and emotional archive – the archive on which future actions might be based – it must be significant on a cognitive level and palpable in an individual, affective way."[36] It is my contention that the palpability in this case is not a result of the force of narrative or image so characteristic of commodified mass culture, but of the memory of a habitually performed bodily action – the removal of our shoes. As Paul Connerton has described, individuals learn socially constructed performative acts (like tying and untying shoe laces) which become inscribed in memory even though we can no longer recollect when we first learnt them. As a result, "bodily practices of a culturally specific kind entail a combination of cognitive and habit memory."[37] These "incorporating practices," that is, messages sent by bodily activity, provide a "particularly effective system of mnemonics."[38] Combined with an awareness of the absence signified metaphorically by the shoes, this memory of everyday action provides an empathetic link with the stories of the Jewish victims.

The shoe memorial is not an example of mass-mediated, commodified memory culture as envisaged by Landsberg. Nevertheless the memorial still allowed the InSite participants to experience memory in such a way as it could become part of their own subjectivity through empathy, linked to memories and experiences they already have. Although Landsberg maintains that prosthetic memories are not socially constructed (and therefore unrestricted by frames of nationality, gender and ethnicity), her insistence that such memories are then mediated by all our other experiences means that the impact is ultimately determined by our own socially constructed positionality.[39] The memories we already have and which link to prosthetic memories are still shaped by national contexts and experiences. It matters therefore that the InSite participants had already spent several hours in the Holocaust Memorial Centre in Budapest, had talked to the education manager, Hungarian school teachers and a student about the way in which the past is transmitted in contemporary Hungarian society. Such a visit had provided, to follow Landsberg, a cognitive framing of the later empathetic experience.[40]

Memento Statue Park

Twenty minutes from the centre of Budapest lies the Memento Statue Park museum. It houses a collection of statues from the Communist era. The site opened in 1993 with significant media attention in Hungary and elsewhere, although expected visitor numbers did not materialize and the museum has yet still to be completed. There are no plaques to explain what the visitor sees, but a guidebook gives some information as to the

commissioning and original siting of the statues. A small exhibition also gives a history of the statues and of the park itself. The park is arranged in such a way as to prevent the usual "monumental perspective" on the statues, emphasizing both spatially and temporally their dislocation from their previous contexts.[41] Maya Nadkarni has investigated how the architect of the park, Ákos Eleőd, wanted it to be

Figure 3. A Statue of Lenin, Memento Statue Park, Budapest

"open to its visitors' diverse memories of and relationships to the monuments."[42] Eleőd stated: "I would like this park to be right in the middle: neither a park to honour Communism, nor a sarcastic park that provokes tempers, but a place where everyone can feel whatever they want. […] People can feel nostalgic, or have a good laugh, or mourn a personal tragedy connected with the period."[43] However, as Nadkarni has argued, the park has in fact functioned for Hungarians in such a way as to exclude "the monuments' personal and cultural significance" by providing "a ritual of closure" within a hypostatized model of transition from communism to capitalism.[44] Indeed, the park has increasingly been marketed in such a way as to facilitate its ironic consumption by international visitors, by those who had no first-hand experience of the communist regime; it is possible to be taken to the statue park in a Trabant, to experience a "Molotov-Cocktail Party," and to buy busts of Lenin and "The Last Breath of Communism" in a tin from the onsite shop or from the "Red Star Store" online. Since September 2010 visitors can make make-believe telephone calls to different communist leaders and "speak to Stalin."[45] Such playful mockery in turn influences visitor behavior at the site, with many emulating the poses of the statues, something shown in the "Made in Communism" online newsletter. Rather than promoting a plurality of interpretations, Nadkarni maintains that the site now focuses on a consumerist narrative, one which emphasizes the triumph of capitalism

over communism. She argues that those who find the museum's strategy offensive or painful simply do not visit the site. Rather than opening up dialogue and communication, she perceives it as closing them off.[46]

Unlike the other memory sites visited during the trip to Budapest, a visit to the Statue Park by the InSiters was not initially on the itinerary and had not been included in earlier iterations of the project. It was added by request of the participants following the pre-visit reading. The reasons for this request were, firstly, an interest in a place which gathered such monumental mnemonic objects so intensely in a relatively small amount of space and, secondly, a (transcultural) familiarity with images of dislocated statues similar to those at the park, which have featured in various well-known media representations (from *Goldeneye* to *Goodbye, Lenin!*). Its inclusion in the itinerary thus supported the programme's claims to be responding to the participants' learning demands and to be increasing the multiplicity of voices experienced at the sites. The initial discussions that the educators had while at the statue park about activities one might organize for a group of pupils immediately created space for discussion about appropriate ways to navigate the complex histories represented by the statues. The physical responses of the InSite group to the park subsequently manifested themselves in different ways. First, there was an attraction to measure the scale of the monuments through bodily comparison. As a result, the sheer size and workmanship of many of the statues continued to evoke responses of awe or admiration. Second, for some, a fascination with the statues' gestures led to an emulation of their poses. Third, the discovery among the statues of a plaque commemorating a communist resistance fighter who had been executed by the Nazis led to discussion of the very different forms of remembrance within the park. The responses were therefore diverse – from sober reflection to humour – and thus covered the "democratic" spectrum hoped for by Eleőd in his original conception of the site. The InSiters were able to read the site for its multivocality and recognise the undoubted tension between "memorialisation and commercialisation" at the site.[47] More than any other place visited by the InSite participants, the Statue Park prompted heated discussion and debate amongst the participants.

As Landsberg describes, "as products of a capitalist system, the images and narratives of the past made available by mass culture are themselves commodities."[48] This is made explicit at a site like the Statue Park and it is one of the reasons it has been criticized by reviewers.[49] But, as Landsberg also points out, capitalism is, however, the prevailing system we need to be able to find the progressive possibilities within this system rather than hoping for an alternative to commodity culture.[50] The InSiters' divergent responses to the statues demonstrate that consumption of such sites does not prescribe meaning making (albeit providing a limited number of possible interpretations). Landsberg maintains that during "memory ac-

quisition" memories can be understood by their recipients as being those which either reinforce the status quo or challenge it.[51] Within this specific Hungarian context, it is therefore possible to see the statues as part of a completed Hungarian past (to be forgotten, mocked or commemorated) or as signifiers of a past that still await public confrontation.[52] Within a more general educational context, placing this multiplicity of meaning at the centre of the learning outcomes (as indeed the InSite project aimed to do through its focus on personalised learning) requires the educator to relinquish control of the narrative being produced.

Unlike at the memorial shoes on the Danube Promenade, the visitors to the Statue Park are not interpellated to experience an event through someone else's eyes. They did experience the park bodily, albeit in very different ways based on their own memories and positionality, that is within the framework of their own knowledge and past experiences as well as within the specific learning outcomes of the project. Whether they were able, or willing, to identify with the memories on offer depended on the way they interpreted what they were experiencing. Within the park itself, the participants were not offered one position of empathy. Yet, the Statue Park once again drew on visitors' embodied knowledge of "postural performance," of gestures and what Connerton calls "techniques of the body."[53] It was the very materiality of the statues that "drew [the participants] into a lived relationship with them."[54] On the follow-up weekend in London the InSiters saw pictures and heard personal testimony from a Hungarian national who had stood by the dismantled statues in 1990, while the statues were then still in situ. They were then able to combine these first hand visual and narrative memories with their own bodily experiences and any pre-existing mass-mediated knowledge about the statues. As Landsberg argues in relation to a visitor to an experiential museum who listens to first-hand testimony, the person listening is involved in active meaning making, by selectively connecting his or her world to that of the survivor. "[B]ecause the voice speaks to her personally, she leaves with a more intimate connection to, and perhaps a greater capacity to understand, the traumatic historical event through which she did not live and to which she might not otherwise feel connected."[55] This "intellectual coming-to-terms with another person’s circumstances" was facilitated via the InSite programme, that is, an empathetic positioning.[56]

Immersive Learning, European Memory and Cognitive Mapping

The advantage of an immersive on-site learning programme such as InSite is that it provides a series of iterative experiences which draw on bodily mnemonics. Through these experiences the participants are interpellated in multiple, and often competing, ways. They are offered different subject

positions with which to empathize; positions which then draw on their own socially constructed positionality and pre-existing memories. The InSite educators were invited through the programme to consider which of their experiences they would replicate as "memory intermediaries" in their own teaching and field trips.[57] From my own experience as an InSite participant, the discussion following the visits to the shoe memorial and statue park suggest that many of the educators found these sites provocative and therefore potentially pedagogically valuable. Choosing to use bodily, empathetic pedagogical practices as part of historical education would, however, be controversial. While in recent years there has been increasing emphasis on teaching histories characterized by multiple perspectives as the basis for understanding democracy and citizenship, there has been a simultaneous emphasis on the cognitive and intellectual aspect of empathy when used in this context.[58] An early backlash against pedagogies of empathy in Britain in the 1980s has led to a continued argument against the "misleading idea" that empathy is "about *sharing feelings* of people in the past." [my italics][59] Instead there is an insistence on its "intellectual nature as part of critical history thinking."[60] What my experience of these two InSite case studies suggests, however, is that *performative* mnemonics provide a powerful way into different, less familiar, national pasts because they start from a bodily memory of that which is known, which can then be understood within a wider cognitive framework. Such "processual, sensually immersed knowledge" is arguably acquired more easily this way than "by purely cognitive means."[61]

As is clear from the places visited and the learning outcomes referred to above, the InSite programme had an explicitly European focus.[62] The opportunities for empathy provided by the visits to different European memory sites are therefore instructive within the context of current debates about the possibility, and indeed, desirability of "European memory."[63] While commentators often agree that "the European project has very little to say about a European view of history,"[64] they are divided as to the political and ethical usefulness of finding common transnational narratives. While Claus Leggewie advocates a focus on the "concentric circles" of shared European memories as a basis for European political identity and future political co-operation and Klaus Eder points to the possible narrative "contact points" within a collective European identity, there persists an anxiety about a normative European master narrative which might legitimate a European superstate.[65] At the same time, there are calls to investigate the very real and productive possibilities for contemporary identities based on "different memory communities" in light of a European "patchwork of memory landscapes that are partly isolated and partly in touch with each other."[66] In my opinion, InSite directly responds to such calls. It does so, however, not on the basis only of narratives to be told and shared, but also on the basis of bodily experiences that can be

communicated. If we take up the challenge "to create the greatest possible openness towards the experiences and approaches of the other"[67] and listen to contemporary calls for a form of Europeanization based on stronger understanding of diversity rather than homogenization, then performative empathetic responses to the past can be extremely productive.[68] Critical empathy has long been used by ethnographers trying to understand foreign cultures[69] and travel has long been a practice "constitutive of cultural meaning" and which provides "contact zones" with others.[70] Empathetic responses work by maintaining encountered diversity and an awareness of self and other, placing individual agency at their centre. Empathy allows for "recognising and respecting difference" and the resulting prosthetic memories co-exist in productive tension with other memories in circulation, providing transnational contact points within more local communities of memory.[71] As such, memories circulated preserve the specificity of national contexts, make links to other, different, national narratives, and draw parallels to individual experience. In my experience, programmes such as InSite are ideally structured to elicit productive responses from those conveying historical knowledge within national contexts, to maintain a critical reflexivity about how such histories are being written, and how bodily empathy might be used within a wider cognitive process of "reflexive storytelling."[72] InSite intentionally confronted the participants with previously unfamiliar, multiple, and competing voices and prompted them to consider how they would transmit the diversity of such experiences in their own teaching.

Performative empathy and cognitive framing within a programme such as InSite arguably result in an ethically based European "cognitive mapping," a physical and metaphorical state of mind that Frederic Jameson advocated nearly three decades ago as a prerequisite of progressive politics in contemporary capitalist societies.[73] Following Jameson, I understand cognitive mapping, facilitated by empathy, to involve a response to the aesthetics of contemporary memory sites and which results in a "sense of place and the construction or reconstruction of an articulated ensemble which can be retained in memory and which the individual subject can map and remap along the moments of mobile, alternative trajectories." As such, neither cognitive mapping nor critical empathy produce single narratives or positivist truths but are inherently multivocal. They can, however, inform "a pedagogical culture which seeks to endow the individual subject with some new heightened sense of its place in the global system."[74]

Conclusion

The success of the InSite projects has in many ways yet to be determined. The extent to which educators integrated certain pedagogical practices

into their memory work and their perception of their usefulness has still to be examined. As Judith Keene reminds us, Landsberg's model argues for the productive political potential of prosthetic memories but does not provide a method for judging the impact of this. Keene turns to reception studies to suggest methods for examining whether certain memories have become more widely circulated and, indeed, "any epistemological shifts" exposure to these memories has caused. In her analysis of the role of film in the transmission of memories of the Korean War, Keene advocates the analysis of autobiographical sources by Korean War veterans in order to provide any such longitudinal conclusions.[75] A similar strategy could be pursued in order to analyse the impact of the InSite visits. A large scale series of diachronic, qualitative interviews would be one way in which one could try to measure the pedagogical usefulness of these experiences, whether the educators attempted to replicate them in their own study trips, teaching or museums, and how pupils responded to them. Given the close proximity to the visit it is still too soon to assess this. However, the *potential* impact of the programmes and any resulting prosthetic memories is great, as the projects involved educators whose explicit aim is to transmit their knowledge as framed by their own experiences to successively large numbers of people. From my own experience of the InSite project, and of these two case studies in particular, I would argue that it is possible and productive to facilitate situations in which learners are confronted with previously unfamiliar memories which provoke empathy on the basis of bodily mnemonics. Whether these experiences then become significant parts of the recipients' own subjectivity depends on their own backgrounds and pre-existing memories. On-site activities seem particularly suited to elicit this, however, and, given their continuing presence in school curricula, still warrant further investigation as part of future pedagogical practice. If memory in general, and prosthetic memory in particular, are understood as being socially constructed, then educational systems of course play vital roles in deciding which memories should be transmitted and how. Programmes such as InSite provide an important space for discussing whether eliciting cross-cultural empathy is an appropriate way to approach this. Nevertheless, what the InSite programmes have, in my opinion, already offered is a reminder of the role of the individual educator, and of the performativity and physicality of memory within wider political and institutional structures. If, with Michael Schudson, we agree that "memories are commitments,"[76] then I think it is possible to view such programmes as part of a potentially politically productive "[non-canonical] cultural Europeanisation of memory in which teachers participate."[77]

[1] Thanks to Daniell Phillips and Amy Ryall at the Imperial War Museum, to Rhiannon Mason, Charlotte Ross and Adam Sharr, and to the editor and anonymous reviewers for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Morris Hargreaves McIntyre, "An Evaluation of InSite Educator CPD Programme, Their Past Your Future 2," 2010, http://archive.theirpast-yourfuture.org.uk/server/show/ConWebDoc.6783 (accessed 10 December 2010).

[2] Morris Hargreaves McIntyre, "An Evaluation of InSite Educator CPD Programme."

[3] Ibid.

[4] Terms such as "collective," "cultural," "communicative" or "collected" memory have all been used to describe these. Maurice Halbwachs, *Das kollektive Gedächtnis* (Frankfurt: Fischer, [1950] 1991); Jan Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich: Beck, 1992); Aleida Assmann, *Erinnerungsräume. Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses* (Munich, Beck, 1999); Jeffrey Olick, "Collective Memory. The Two Cultures," *Sociological Theory* 17, no. 3 (1999): 333. Dominick La Capra, *History and Memory after Auschwitz* (Ithica, NY: Cornell UP, 1998). For an overview of all the above theoretical approaches: Astrid Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen* (Stuttgart; Weimar: Metzler, 2005), 97.

[5] Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, "Introduction: Mapping Memory," in *Memory. Histories, Theories, Debates*, Susanna Radstone and Bill Schwarz, eds. (Bronx, NY:Fordham University Press, 2010), 1-14 (6).

[6] Wulf Kansteiner, "Memory, Media and *Menschen*. Where is the Individual in Collective Memory Studies?" *Memory Studies* 3 (2010): 1.

[7] The term positionality is used throughout this article and is explained by Almut Finck: "The constitution, characterization and modification of identity depends on the numerous and very heterogeneous positions that the subject does, or doesn't, adopt both simultaneously and consecutively during the course of her life. Identity is not just determined by the positioning of the subject inside or outside a multiplicity of discursive fields, but also through their subordinate or dominant worth within a whole network of discourses [...] To speak of the positionality of the subject means to make visible the current possibilities of access to different spheres of societal power which the individual has." Almut Finck, *Autobiographisches Schreiben nach dem Ende der Autobiographie* (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1999), 131-132 (my translation).

[8] Iwona Irwin-Zarecka, *Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Cultural Memory* (New Brunswick; London: Transaction, 2009), 19.

[9] Daniel Capper, "Scientific Empathy, American Buddhism, and the Ethnography of Religion," *Culture and Religion* 4, no. 2 (2003): 233 citing Lévi-Strauss.

[10] There is now a considerable amount of literature on the subject, including: Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider, "Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory," *European Journal of Social Theory* 5, no. 1 (2002): 87. Konrad Hugo Jarausch, Thomas Lindenberger and Annelie Ramsbrock, eds, *Conflicted Memories: Europeanizing Contemporary Histories* (New York: Berghahn, 2007); Małgorzata Pakier and Bo Stråth, *A European Memory: Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance* (New York: Berghahn, 2010).

[11] Alison Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory. The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004).

[12] Martin Nicholls, "Jowell Sets out Plans for D-Day Anniversary," *The Guardian*, 29 September 2003.

[13] Imperial War Museum, New Opportunities Fund, Veterans Programme – Education Project, Application Form (2004), 9.

[14] Imperial War Museum, New Opportunities Fund Application Form, Stage Two, Their Past Your Future (2004), 1.

[15] "May I present…" emails circulated within the InSite group by way of introductions, 1-16 April 2009.

[16] Imperial War Museum, www.theirpast-yourfuture.org.uk/server/show/nav.00n00s001 (accessed 31 January 2010).

[17] Imperial War Museum, Veterans Programme T.P.Y.F., BIG Lottery Fund (2006), Additional Funding Proposal, 16.

[18] "National Curriculum," http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/ (accessed 5 January 2011).

[19] Imperial War Museum, Veterans Programme T.P.Y.F., Additional Funding Proposal, 10.

[20] Imperial War Museum, www.theirpast-yourfuture.org.uk/server/show/nav.00n00s001 (accessed 31 January 2010). These headings come from the governmental Inspiring Learning for All Framework, a "self-help improvement framework for museums, libraries and archives." Museums, Libraries and Archives Council, "Inspiring Learning," http://www.inspiringlearningforall.gov.uk/ (accessed 5 January 2011).

[21] Imperial War Museum, Veterans Programme T.P.Y.F., Additional Funding Proposal, 10.

[22] Kansteiner, "Memory, Media and *Menschen*," 1.

[23] Imperial War Museum, Veterans Programme T.P.Y.F., Additional Funding Proposal, 16.

[24] For further evaluation of the programmes, see doctoral work currently being undertaken by Greg Tinker at the University of Reading on "The Cultural Memory of the Second World War: D-Day Veterans and Commemoration in Britain", which includes analysis of T.Y.P.F. phase one.

[25] Richard S. Esbenshade, "Remembering to Forget: Memory, History, National Identity in Postwar East-Central Europe," *Representations*, no. 49, Special Issue: Identifying Histories: Eastern Europe Before and After 1989 (1995): 72; Kenneth E. Foote, Attila Toth, Anett Arvay, "Hungary after 1989: Inscribing a New Past on Place," *Geographical Review* 90, no. 3 (2000): 301; Rogers Brubaker and Margit Feischmidt, "1848 in 1998: The Politics of Commemoration in Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 44, no. 4 (2002): 700.

[26] The term comes from Louis Althusser's essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus". According to Althusser, a subject (individual) is interpellated into ideology on an unconscious level through repeated "hailing". Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy*, trans. Ben Brewster (London: New Left Books, 1971).

[27] Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory*, 9.

[28] Ibid., 2.

[29] Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis*, 3.

[30] Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory*, 19.

[31] Ibid., 133.

[32] Ibid., 135.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid., 136.

[35] Capper, "Scientific Empathy," 233.

[36] Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory*, 138.

[37] Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 88.

[38] Ibid., 102.

[39] Capper, "Scientific Empathy," 137.

[40] Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory*, 130.

[41] Maya Nadkarni, "The Death of Socialism and the Afterlife of Its Monuments. Making and Marketing the Past in Budapest's Statue Park Museum," in *Memory, History, Nation: Contested Pasts*, Katharine Hodgkin and Susannah Radstone, eds. (New Brunswick; London: Transaction, 2009), 193-207 (194).

[42] Nadkarni, "The Death of Socialism," 194.

[43] Ibid., citing *New York Times*, 31 October 1993, 3.

[44] Ibid., 202.

[45] "New Spectacle at Memento Park," 14 September 2010 http://www.szoborpark.hu/index.php?Content=Hirarchivum&NewsId=151&Lang=en&ReturnUrl=%2Findex.php%3FLang%3Den (accessed 5 January 2011).

[46] Nadkarni, "The Death of Socialism," 204.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory*, 143.

[49] Nadkarni, "Death of Socialism," 203.

[50] Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory*, 146.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Nadkarni, "Death of Socialism," 202

[53] Connerton, *How Societies Remember*, 74, 78.

[54] Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory*, 132.

[55] Ibid., 145-146.

[56] Ibid., 149.

[57] Iwona Irwin-Zarecka, *Frames of Remembrance*, 176.

[58] Keith C. Barton and Linda S. Levstik, *Teaching History for the Common Good* (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004), 223.

[59] Peter Lee and Rosalyn Ashby, "Empathy, Perspective Taking and Rational Understanding", in *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in Social Studies*, Ozro Luke Davis, Elizabeth Anne Yaeger, Stuart Foster eds. (Oxford: Rowan

and Littlefield, 2001), 21-50 (22).

[60] O.L.Davis Jr., "In Pursuit of Historical Empathy", in *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in Social Studies*, Ozro Luke Davis, Elizabeth Anne Yaeger, Stuart J. Foster, eds. (Oxford: Rowan and Littlefield, 2001), 1-12 (3).

[61] Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory*, 113.

[62] Morris Hargreaves McIntyre, "An Evaluation of InSite Educator CPD Programme."

[63] Jan Werner-Müller, "On 'European Memory': Some Conceptual and Normative Remarks," in Pakier and Stråth, *A European Memory*, 25-37 (26).

[64] Konrad Hugo Jarausch and Thomas Lindenberger, "Contours of a Critical History of Contemporary Europe: A Transnational Agenda," in *Conflicted Memories,* Jarausch, Lindenberger and Ramsbrock, eds, 1-22 (2).

[65] Claus Leggewie, "Battlefield Europe. Transnational Memory and European Identity", translated Simon Garnett, www.eurozine.com, 28.4.2009; Klaus Eder, "A Theory of Collective Identity: Making Sense of the Debate on a 'European Identity'", *European Journal of Social Theory 12* (2009): 427; Konrad Jarausch, "Nightmares or Daydreams? A Postscript on the Europeanisation of Memories", in Małgorzata Pakier and Bo Stråth, *A European Memory: Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance* (New York: Berghahn, 2010), 309-320.

[66] Jaraush and Lindenberger, "Contours," 4.

[67] Ibid., 5.

[68] Werner-Müller, "On 'European Memory'".

[69] Capper, "Scientific Empathy".

[70] James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1997), 3, 195.

[71] Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory*, 24.

[72] Eder, "A Theory of Collective Identity": 441.

[73] Frederic Jameson, "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism," *New Left Review* 146 (1984): 53. This term has also been discussed within work on "cosmopolitan memory": Diane Barthel-Bouchier and Ming Min Hui, "Places of Cosmopolitan Memory," *Globality Studies* 5 (2007): 1.

[74] Jameson, "Postmodernism," 16.

[75] Judith Keene, "War, Cinema, Prosthetic Memory and Popular Understanding: A Case Study of the Korean War," *PORTAL Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies*, Special Issue Fields of Remembrance 7, no.1 (2010): 1 (14).

[76] Michael Schudson, "Lives, Laws and Language: Commemorative versus Non-Commemorative Forms of Effective Public Memory", *The Communication Review* 2 (1997): 7.

[77] Werner-Müller, "On 'European Memory'," 44.