



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Mycock, Andrew and Ward, Paul

Education, identity and empire: history teaching in multi-national post-imperial Britain

Original Citation

Mycock, Andrew and Ward, Paul (2011) Education, identity and empire: history teaching in multi-national post-imperial Britain. In: Teaching The Nation-State After Empire In Europe: National Historiography And History, 10-12th June 2011, University of Huddersfield, UK. (Unpublished)

This version is available at <https://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/10220/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

Standing Committee for the
European Medical Research
Councils (EMRC)

Standing Committee for Life, Earth
and Environmental Sciences (LESC)

Standing Committee for Physical
and Engineering Sciences (PESC)

Standing Committee for the
Humanities (SCH)

Standing Committee for Social
Sciences (SCSS)

ESF Exploratory Workshop on

**Teaching the Post-Empire State in Europe:
National Historiography and History
Education**

Huddersfield (UK), 9-11 June 2011

Convened by:
Prof Paul Ward and Dr Andrew Mycock

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

1. Executive summary (approx. 2 pages)

From 10th to 12th June 2011, the University of Huddersfield (UK) held an Exploratory Workshop with the support of the European Science Foundation. It was organised by Professor Paul Ward (Department of History) and Dr Andrew Mycock (Department of Politics) based at the University of Huddersfield. Both work within the Academy for the Study of Britishness, which seeks to explore the making and unmaking of national identities in the British World. The workshop brought together thirteen scholars from eleven countries across Europe representing a range of disciplines and scholarly focus to consider the implications of empire and its legacy in how European states articulate post-empire citizenship and national identity through the teaching of school history.¹

The workshop was staged across the University, including the School of Business and Music, Humanities and Media, and at Huddersfield's famous Town Hall to provide a range of stimulating environments to promote formal and informal dialogue. There was also a visit to the Royal Armouries based in Leeds, hosted by the Museum's academic director, Professor Graeme Rimer. Delegates also visited the main auditorium of Huddersfield Town Hall, world famous for the annual performance of Handel's Messiah by the Huddersfield Choral Society, and were given a brief historic tour of the town.

Such activities allowed for an open meeting, whose atmosphere can be best described as friendly productiveness. Participants described the meeting variously as 'an inspiring experience', a 'superb intellectual meeting', 'one of the best conferences i have attended', and 'one of the best workshops I've ever participated in'.



(Some of the workshop delegates visiting Huddersfield Town Hall)

¹ Three proposed participants were unable to attend due to unforeseen circumstances. They each submitted a paper for the workshop which will be reviewed and included in subsequent plans. One participant withdrew from the project but has kindly helped in identifying a replacement for future workshops and publications.

In examining the legacy of Empire on historiography and history teaching, we were seeking to compare a range of post-empire states not usually brought together including Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal, Italy, Germany, Turkey, Russia, France, Denmark and the UK. As the impact of the end of empire has not proven uniform across the formerly colonial states of Europe, the workshop explored how the experience of imperial withdrawal has influenced national historiography and what the implications have been for how post-empire identity is promoted through school history.

The outcomes of the workshop were at least twofold:

1. The workshop explored how the experience of imperial withdrawal has influenced national historiography in post-colonising European states. The workshop examined the extent to which the nature of the experience of imperial withdrawal has influenced the national historiography in post-colonising states. It explored how the relationship and interplay between post-imperial and post-colonial constructions of the national past interact in plural societies. It considered the extent to which orthodox approaches to national-imperial historiography persist or whether revisionist approaches to national history writing have emerged in the post-empire period.
2. The workshop assessed the influence of national historiography after empire on debates about citizenship and identity. In particular, it explored how empire and its demise have impacted on constructions of post-empire identity promoted by government through state-sponsored school history. It focused on the extent to which the politicized debates - the so-called 'history wars' or 'history politics' - concerning national historiography and school history link to broader narratives framing citizenship and identity in post-empire European states.

The workshop developed the foundations for further exploration of the relationship between national historiography, school history and the politicisation of debates about the national past, national identity and citizenship across Europe. It elaborated on the complex legacies of empire and the challenges that post-empire states face in articulating and inculcating common frameworks of citizenship and national identity amongst citizenries who have markedly different views on the imperial past. The convergence of national history and history education on a Europe-wide basis of post-empire states had not been proposed before and there was, prior to the workshop, no research active community on the subject.

By bringing together scholars of national and imperial historiography and specialists on the teaching of school history, the workshop encouraged a more sophisticated appreciation of how the tensions and challenges in post-empire European states are to be understood. Its focus on the comparative analysis of national historiography encouraged the workshop to explore the extent to which the dilemmas of empire have influenced approaches to national history writing and school history. The workshop identified ways of developing common methodologies to comparatively evaluate common and distinct challenges amongst the colonising states of Europe after empire. The workshop successfully outlined plans for further conventions for workshop participants, the development of research agendas and academic publications and the identification of other engagement and knowledge sharing activities with politicians, policy-makers, scholars, educational practitioners and the general public.

2. Scientific content of the event

The workshop took place over three days. We encouraged contributors to develop country-specific approaches that reflect the diversity of post-empire experiences. The link between debates about national-imperial historiography and the content of national school history curricula and textbooks is an area in which we were keen to develop some comparative analysis. Authors were also permitted to explore other issues linked with debates about empire and the national past and how states seek to utilise educational provision to inculcate a common sense of national identity and citizenship. For optimum productivity, participants' papers were circulated in advance and participants were given about 25 minutes to summarise at the workshop, allowing maximum time for discussion.

Friday 10th June 2011

The workshop began with an introduction and welcome by Professor Andrew Ball, Pro-Vice Chancellor for Research and Enterprise at University of Huddersfield, who emphasised the importance the university attaches to inter-disciplinary research and its desire to see the impact of rigorous and original research extend into areas of public debate. Professor Ball was followed by Dr. José María Faraldo Jarillo, who represented the ESF as its Rapporteur. He provided a detail overview of the role of the ESF, clearly outlining how and in what ways it could provide guidance and assistance in a period of transition in research funding.

The first substantive speaker was Professor Stefan Berger, who explored 'the historiography of Empire in Europe' in the wake of his five-year European Science Foundation-funded project, 'Representations of the Past: The Writing of National Histories in Europe' (<http://www.uni-leipzig.de/zhsesf/>). Berger considered varieties of European empires, establishing practical typologies that encouraged comparative understanding and analysis. He related these to specific examples, seeking commonalities and differences in the construction of political, economic and cultural ideas such as 'Greater Britain' and 'Greater Russia'. He also considered divergence in how the legacies of empire are understood, exploring the tensions between post-imperialism and post-colonialism in shaping national historiography and divergence in post-empire 'politics of apology' across Europe. He raised the important themes of the workshop by asking what difference and similarity meant for historiographical debate and the teaching of history in schools.

Professor Hercules Millas then presented a paper on the Ottoman experience of empire and subsequent discourse in Turkey over its legacy since the beginning of the twentieth century. The dominant historiographical narrative of the Ottoman Empire is clearly fixed as expansion, stagnation and decline, but its legacy for subsequent Turkish history is disputed, mainly along the dividing line between 'Islamists' and 'secularists'. Millas's paper was the first to raise the equivocal position of minority groups within hegemonic narratives as it drew attention to the place of the Kurds as an inviolable people in Turkish education. Some commentators have sought to restore the political idea of the Ottoman Empire as a place in which diversity was given expression. Millas considered this pursuit of neo-Ottomanisation and its impact upon discussion on education policy, including for example disputes over the use of history, religion and language in schools.

Dr Susanne Grindel then discussed the place of colonialism in German historiography and history education. Her paper explored how discussions of the past were profoundly shaped by the division of the country after 1945, with East German historians dismissing imperialism from 'their' historiography while West German historians focused on social history of colonialism. She noted that the comparatively short period of colonial expansion of thirty years (from 1884 until 1914) has seen Germany's colonial legacy appear largely forgotten, particularly in contemporary questions of post-reunification citizenship and national identity.

This situation is however changing due to a range of challenges from historiography, public debate, memory culture and history teaching, drawing attention to the recurrence of the concept of *Sonderweg* in shaping the German national past.

These three stimulating papers allowed for a comparative framework and discussion of the particularities of the experience of imperialism across Europe. The two main themes were carried forward from the discussion were, first, the need to think carefully about contestations over the legacy of empire and its impact in education. Participants explored the appropriateness of the phrases such as 'history wars' and 'history politics', highlighting that the 'politics of memory' is distinctive from 'historical politics'. Stuart Ward noted that debates about memory culture and victimhood were porous and contagion was a key dynamic across Europe. Second, the place of minority ethnic and immigrant groups both in the past and present discussions of empire history and its deployment in education. In many cases minority groups were directly linked to the period of colonialism. However in some instances, such as Turks in Germany, there is no direct colonial link.

Saturday 11th June 2011

The first of these themes emerged again strongly in the first paper of Saturday morning, in which Professor Alexei Miller explored the 'historical politics' of empire in Russia and parts of the former Soviet bloc. The relationship between history and politics in Russia has changed radically over the past 25 years since the beginning of perestroika. One change that began in 2009-2010 and affected the principles of the Russian version of 'historical policy' was the use of specially selected elements of the past for political purposes. There has been a focus on nationalisation of history, ethnic exclusivity, xenophobia, and the construction of victimisation in Russia, with many disputes proving bitter. Miller provided examples such as the changing pantheon of national heroes. Miller also pointed out the investment placed in history, with the Institute of National Remembrance in Poland employing 3000 people.

Mycock and Ward presented a paper exploring the historical context of discussions about the legacy of empire in the United Kingdom, including discussion of the historiographical debate over impact of the empire on the one hand and the apparent unravelling of the United Kingdom on the other. This latter development has raised the potential for devolved parliaments to consider how empire (and other national history) is taught in schools. The paper also explored tensions between projecting a shared national identity and encouraging young people to adopt critical perspectives of the national-imperial past.

Dr Maria Grever considered the case of the Netherlands, analysing the experience of the 'small nation' and the impact of imperial expansion. She did so through discussion of, for example, the Colonial World Fair in Amsterdam 1883 which displayed commodities and people from the colonies and the National Exhibition of Women's Labour in 1898, which included women from the Dutch East Indies and Surinam, and which provided a key moment in the feminist movement. She discussed the teaching of imperialism in Protestant schools as the extension of religion and responses to acts of violence in the empire but a subsequent distancing of national from imperial histories after decolonisation. Grever then discussed 'canons' and their role in transmitting different variants of Dutch history. Again, this drew attention to the place of minorities and immigrants in public histories.

Dr Marta Araujo examined the construction of Eurocentrism in textbooks in Portugal, particularly among those aimed at 12-15 year olds. Through systemic analysis of history textbooks, she considered the depiction of African struggles for National Liberation in contemporary Portuguese history textbooks and on their relation to the 1974 Revolution.

The paper identified the idea of Europe as an ideological construct and that knowledge was used for the production of power. Araujo considered the way in which language was used to describe non-European peoples has changed but retains the notion of backwardness. She developed the notion of abyssal line between metropolitan society and colonial territories which made 'the other' invisible. She concluded that Eurocentrism was reproduced within narratives of decolonisation.

The discussion relating to these papers drew attention to the need to consider the relative roles and connections between those who make policy, those who write 'history' and those who then teach young people themes from the past. There are a number of processes occurring in how different 'agents' formulated their knowledge and then transfer this towards education for citizenship. The relationship between internal colonialism and imperialism within post-empire states was identified as fundamental in shaping approaches to citizenship, identity and the national-imperial past.

In the afternoon session, Dr. Antoon De Baets' paper considered whether post-empire states in Europe censored views on colonialism. Drawing a broad range of case-studies, he provided a comparative typology of the censorship of views on colonialism exploring why some states sought to control and censor knowledge about the imperial past while others did not. He considered varieties of censorship, ranging from the failure to pass a PhD thesis to the full coercive power of the state. There was some discussion about the difference between lack of knowledge of and indifference towards imperial events, as well as some desire to secure a clear definition of what constitutes censorship. The paper concluded that the nature of the imperial past and its resonance in contemporary post-empire societies would appear to have some influence in shaping approaches to censorship.

Professor Luigi Cajani then explored the Italian experience of colonialism. He continued the theme of lack of knowledge as he explained how the widespread ignorance of the Italian colonial history rather sanitized the past through the popular myth of the 'good Italian'. He considered that by the analysis of history textbooks, which are the most important mediator between historical scholarship and mass culture, it was possible to discern the development of such a myth. He suggested that history textbooks agreed that Italian experience of empire was a largely negative one due to the late arrival of Italy in the 'race for colonies' and the relative inability to efficiently exploit them.

Professor Uffe Østergaard outlined the Danish experience of empire, drawing attention to the significance of lesser known imperialisms, as well as the way in which the decline of an empire could be seen as constructive of identity if the memories could be made positive (and sometimes humorous). He identified the various parts of the Danish 'empire' and examined forms of devolution and autonomy. He noted that the legacy of the colonial empire has not been analysed in post-colonial terms as yet and or in terms of the Danish Commonwealth which still comprises the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

These papers further developed the scope of discussion, underlining the diversity of imperial experiences in Europe and the suggestion of a potential classification of imperialism as a European enterprise. The issues of censorship and the prominence of post-empire debates about issues of the migration of people from different empires were clearly evident. Consideration was given to how this might impact upon the reception of history education, particularly when the national-imperial past under discussion was seen to 'belong' to others. This raised issues of integration and belonging allied to the connective link between development of historiographies and the teaching of history. In particular, it was considered

that thought should be given to 'national' approaches of teaching history and whether this impacted upon the place of empire in education.

Sunday 12th June 2011

The session on Sunday morning was used for drawing together themes and considering future directions of the project and publication plans.

Jean-Pierre Titz, Head of the History Education Division of the Council of Europe, provided an overview of the 'Shared Histories for a Europe without Dividing Lines' project. He discussed the Council's desire to ensure that 'history teaching must not be an instrument of ideological manipulation'. He outlined the project's aims to reveal the chief interactions and convergences which have characterised Europe as a spatial entity. Crucial in this was the delineation between the history of Europe is a collage of national histories and the rejection of national histories in favour of a singular European history. He noted that the Council have encouraged multi-perspectivity not as an objective but as a tool to allow students to understand the complexities of history and to adopt critically-analytical approaches. His key point was that European nations did not have a common history but did indeed share historical experiences. Exploration of this conceptual approach forms a major part of his division's work.

Professor Stuart Ward, acting as workshop commentator, highlighted commonalities relating to the previous discussions including renewed emphasis across Europe on the imperial past after periods of 'amnesia'. He suggested that the controversial and potentially confrontational transnational reappearance of empire was symbolised by the phrases 'historical politics' and 'history wars'. Ward argued that the reasons for this resurgence cannot be understood within internal dynamics of any particular country. He suggested a need to look at the global unravelling of European empire states in order to understand this latest memory boom, in relation to European as well as imperial events. This would necessitate the simultaneous analysis of the dilemmas of post-imperial and post-colonial states to encourage greater appreciation and understanding of the complexities of the end of empire.

3. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field, outcome

The workshop sought to explore the commonalities and divergences of how empire influenced national historiography, school history and broader debates about the imperial past in post-empire states. It successfully initiated a process whereby a common analytical framework could begin to be established that allowed for comparative research to understand the complexities faced in teaching the post-empire state. It was agreed by all participants that empire and colonialism has the potential to become one of the key themes whereby Europeans understand their past and explain contemporary societies. Imperialism is a crucial part of a European shared history and historiography and the workshop confirmed that there were positive benefits to be accrued through comparative research of the imperial past and post-imperial present.

Several conclusions were drawn from the workshop. It is clear from the papers produced for the workshop that the experience of imperialism in Europe was varied. This is reflected in the rich and diverse historiography of empires and imperialism in the academy of each case study. The porosity and contagion of debates about the legacy of empire and its implications for teaching the post-empire nation-state was identified. The discussion of the impact of

empire on metropolitan societies, both during the imperial moment and the period of decolonisation, varies however in its resonance from country to country. The ways in which empire and imperialism have been 'forgotten' and 'remembered' have also been varied but do share certain commonalities. In many cases across Europe there have been episodes of 'history wars' or 'historical politics' that have frequently had an impact on the way in which empire has been used in education. This has been shared across Europe but is affected by particular national circumstances.

The workshop identified areas for further development. It was recognised that the scholarly focus of the workshop was predominantly on Western Europe with interesting and important contributions on Russia and the Ottoman empires. The loss of a contributor focusing on Austro-Hungarian Empire was acknowledged and delegates agreed to ensure this would be quickly redressed.

The workshop identified a number of emergent research areas of considerable potential for future development. It was agreed that consideration should be given the experiences of other states in Europe whose interconnections with the imperial/colonial binary were more complex. These included states or their national peoples who had experience as colonisers, as colonised or, at different periods in their past, as both. This includes examples such as Romania, the Baltic states, Poland, Bulgaria, the Republic of Ireland, Serbia, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary. The workshop agreed that an exploration of the common and distinctive dynamics internal and external colonialism in debates about national historiography and history education across Europe was of significant research potential and should be explored.

It was also recognised that the experience of empire for those *in colonised countries* outside of Europe was of profound importance and that discussion of historiography and history teaching solely inside Europe would provide only a partial analysis. The future plans for the work of the project must seek to consider other non-European empires on the one hand and scholars exploring the impact of imperialism on historiography and history teaching in former colonies on the other.

The workshop also succeeded in outlining an initial research framework to analyse the complexities of teaching the post-empire state. These included the following:

- The identification of political, economic, social and cultural influences on the writing of the history of empire
- The development of national historiography and its relationship with the teaching of school history and empire
- The role and importance of actors such as academic historians, educators, politicians and policy-makers, institutions, textbook writers and producers, popular culture and the media, and communities and diasporas.
- The framing of debates about the past with reference to ideology and politics, pedagogy, conceptions of the post-empire nation-state (positive or critical), and the purpose of school history

It was agreed that the workshop had been highly productive and should form the start of subsequent joint work, expanding from the participants to others working in history, education, sociology and politics. The following research objectives and plans were identified:

Sustaining and developing the Teach the Post-empire State in Europe network

- To produce a summary report highlighting the research themes and outcomes of the workshop. This will be distributed to policy-making bodies, scholars and other selected individuals and institutions across Europe. Workshop participants will undertake
- To design and host a web resource this provides information about the ESF-funded exploratory workshop, participants and future project developments. A closed section of the site will be established for participants to review and comment on all papers submitted at the workshop and subsequent contributions were appropriate. This will contribute to the development of coherent themes and the sharing of research ideas and expertise. The web resource will also host an electronic copy of the summary report.
- To peer review the papers and develop an edited academic volume for publication.
- To secure funding and host further workshops. Participants agreed to explore the potential for further conventions with possible hosts being the Centre for Historical Culture at the Erasmus University, Rotterdam and the Georg-Eckert-Institut für Internationale Schulbuchforschung, Braunschweig .
- To develop the group further, identifying new participants were appropriate, and also further building links with other research networks and organisations in Europe and elsewhere.
- To liaise with the ESF Standing Committees for Humanities and Social Sciences and other groups to develop a proposal for funding to establish a pan-European Research Network.

4. Final programme

Friday, 10th June 2011

Arrival at Huddersfield Central Lodge Hotel

Location – University of Huddersfield Business School, Room BSG/25/6

13.30-14.30: Registration, refreshments and Welcome by Professor Andrew Ball (Pro-Vice Chancellor, University of Huddersfield)

Introduction by Dr. José María Faraldo Jarillo (ESF Rapporteur)

Introduction by Workshop Organisers – Professor Paul Ward and Dr. Andrew Mycock

14.30-18.00: *Session One: Land-based Empire-States*

Stefan Berger – The Historiography of Empire in Europe

Hercules Millas - From the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic: Vacillating between heritage and prospects

Alexei Miller – Russia: History and Politics

Susanne Grindel - Imperial legacies – the place of colonialism in German historiography and history education

Discussion

19.00: Historical walk through Huddersfield and Dinner
Saturday, 11th June 2011

Location: Huddersfield Town Hall

9.30 – 13.00: Session Two

Andrew Mycock/Paul Ward - Education, identity and empire: History teaching in multi-national post-imperial Britain

Jacques Frémeaux - France

Abby Waldman - The influence of government policy on the teaching of imperial history in the English and French national curricula 1990-2007

Maria Grever - Uncontrollable colonial legacy: Historiography, history education and contested heritage in the Netherlands

Marta Araujo – The (Re)Production of an Abyssal Line: The African Struggles for National Liberation in Democratic Portugal's textbooks.

Discussion: The discussion at the end of this session will aim at establishing a first understanding of possible first contact points between the two subject areas; a first appreciation of how post-empire national historiography can influence school history education.

13.00 – 14.00: Lunch

Location: University of Huddersfield, West Building WG/27

14.00 – 16.30: *Session Three: 'Forgotten Empires'*

The participants will discuss national historiography, history education and the idea of the 'forgotten empire'. It will focus on case studies such as Italy, Denmark, and Spain where the legacy of the colonial past has proven less prominent.

Antoon De Baets – Censorship of Views on Colonialism in formerly Colonizing States of Europe (1945-2011)

Uffe Ostergaard - Legacies of Empire in the present Danish nation state

Luigi Cajani - The Memory of Italian Colonialism: from the "Good Italian" to the Ferocious "Poor People's Imperialism"

16.30-20.30: Guided visit to Leeds Royal Armouries and Dinner

Sunday, 12th June 2011

Location: University of Huddersfield West, Building WG/27

10.00 – 13.00: Session Four

'Shared Histories for a Europe without dividing lines' - Jean-Pierre Titz (Council of Europe)

Formal feedback from Professor Stuart Ward and Dr. José María Faraldo Jarillo

Final Workshop Discussions and Conclusions

Future Project Development and Publication Plans

5. Final list of participants (name and affiliation is sufficient; the detailed list should be updated on-line directly)

List of Participants

1. Dr Marta Araujo, Universidade de Coimbra.
2. Professor Stefan Berger, University of Manchester.
3. Professor Luigi Cajani, Università La Sapienza, Rome.
4. Professor Mario Carrereto, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. Unable to attend due to ash cloud in South America
5. Professor Antoon De Baets, University of Groningen.
6. Professor Jacques Frémeaux, Université de Paris-Sorbonne. Unable to attend due to urgent commitments in France.
7. Professor Maria Grever, Erasmus University Rotterdam.
8. Dr Susanne Grindel, Georg-Eckert-Institut für internationale Schulbuchforschung.
9. Dr José María Faraldo Jarillo Universidad Complutense de Madrid. ESF rapporteur
10. Dr Jodie Matthews, University of Huddersfield
11. Professor Hercules Millas, University of the Aegean.
12. Professor Alexei Miller, Russian Academy of Sciences.
13. Dr Andy Mycock, University of Huddersfield.
14. Professor Uffe Ostergaard, Copenhagen Business School.
15. Jean-Pierre Titz, Head of Division, History Education, Council of Europe.
16. Dr Abby Waldman, University of Cambridge. Unable to attend due to urgent commitment.
17. Professor Paul Ward, University of Huddersfield.
18. Professor Stuart Ward, University of Copenhagen.

Prof. Jacques Frémeaux, Dr. Abby Waldman, Prof. Mario Carrereto were unable to attend the workshop due to last minute events. Their papers were circulated and discussed informally.

6. Statistical information on participants (age bracket, countries of origin, M/F repartition, etc.) The statistics to be provided under section 6 can also include repartition by scientific specialty if relevant.

Over 50/Under 50 8/7

Male/Female 11/4

Breakdown of countries:

Belgium

Portugal

Italy

Netherlands

Germany

Spain

Greece

Russia

France (Council of Europe)

UK (2 covenors, 2 participants)

Denmark (2 participants)