Introduction

The Enemy on Display

> We are all held together in a fabric of stories; we are enriched by the possibilities
> of interpretation; and we are made strong by acts of helping each other to listen.
> —David Carr, *A Place Not A Place*

It is an exciting time to research historical museums in Central and Eastern Europe. In the changing political and social order over the last twenty-five years, many new exhibitions have opened and most of the museum projects have been accompanied by heated public debates on the meanings of history and the transformations of cultural identity. This book originated from this fascination. Our main aim was to compare the ways in which the history of the Second World War was being narrated in the historical museums of three cities: Dresden, Warsaw and St Petersburg. While analysing the exhibitions we focused on the form and content that was being used to present the 'war enemy', and we tried to interpret the role that this plays in museum stories. Although there were different common themes that we could treat as a basis for such a comparative analysis – such as death, resistance, ordinary life experience – from the beginning we wanted the project to play a reflexive role in contemporary European intercultural communication, so we decided to pay special attention to the stereotypical images of 'enemy' from the past, which may still influence the present.

Our approach locates this project within so-called 'memory studies', and concerns the way in which communities remember and reinterpret their past (Urry 1996: 45–68). We assume that history is socially constructed and that its transmission can take various memory forms, one of which is the public historical narrative represented in a museum. While focusing on this theme, we deliberately chose museums in those European cities which represent national symbols of suffering experienced under the cruelties of the Second World War.

The Siege of Leningrad (St Petersburg) that took place between 1941 and 1944 was unique in the Soviet Union in terms of the length of the

blockade and the number of civilian victims, as well as what the fate of the city came to mean after the war was over. While Stalingrad was the setting for an enormous battle between the Red Army and the Wehrmacht, and is remembered as a place of military glory, Leningrad is perceived as the scene of heroic defence by city dwellers against the cruel belligerence of Nazis who were prepared to conquer and annihilate the city by any means, including mass starvation and bombardment. In contemporary Russia, this Soviet myth of heroic defence is at the same time strengthened and revisited.

Warsaw's history too is without any doubt a significant story of the Second World War. The Polish capital was not only conquered by Nazi Germany, but also experienced two uprisings and the destruction which followed them. Its people suffered deprivation and death, and the city lost most of its historic architecture. Nevertheless, in Poland the city is not only remembered as a place of suffering, but also as space of unusual heroism. At the time of the People's Republic of Poland there was conflict between government representatives, who contested this heroic narrative, and opposition groups who struggled to have the Warsaw Uprising of 1944 made a national symbol of the Polish will to maintain national independence. At the same time, in the sphere of international historical representations, this event competed with the memory of the 1943 uprising in the Warsaw Ghetto (Young 1993: 155–84).

Finally, Dresden, with its often overestimated death toll and the loss of Baroque architecture in the 'Anglo-American firestorm', has long been remembered as an 'innocent' city, as a city of art and culture; not as a wartime military industrial complex, but as a place symbolic of the destructive forces of modern warfare, and a target for the furious revenge of the Allies for what Germany had brought to Europe. Thus, Dresden has often been perceived as a representation of a kind of better, older, pre-Nazi Germany, a 'land of poets and thinkers', which was unjustly brought to ruin by the Second World War.

Therefore, although the three cities suffered differently – the experiences of bombardment, hunger and cold or two tragic uprisings – the history of the commemoration of these events has some important common elements. Firstly, the war became a key determinant of the identity of local residents; they often organised themselves in groups of memory in order to publicly commemorate their version of past events. Secondly, almost immediately after the war, the city catastrophes were subject to competing discourses of memory and historical policy. The narratives of the cities' catastrophes used to serve as a tool of communist propaganda, but since the Iron Curtain came down they have become subjects of new interpretations.

This is why we decided to look at exhibitions of the Second World War history in St Petersburg, Warsaw and Dresden, taking into account the differing cultural patterns of memory and the differing debates on war history in Russia, Poland and Germany. It should be noted, however, that we did not intend to fully reconstruct the dynamics of the process of remembrance. We treated it rather as the context that allowed us to better understand the war stories in the museums we visited. From the existing literature, we distinguished those elements of memory discourses which – in our opinion – had had the greatest impact on the shape of the exhibitions. Our main focus was the changes that have taken place in these exhibitions since the fall of communism. We noted, however, that they have not been altered by a replacement of the communist stories with new the ones, invented in the political and social contexts of transformation to free market and democracy. On the contrary, we point out that the narratives we have analysed are the effects of overlapping components of different discourses, and one can still find that they possess many elements of interpretations before 1989–1991. Thus, in accordance with some memory studies, we show that representations of the past do not only relate to the actual events and to the contemporary situation, but they are also path dependent – their final shape resonates with earlier ways of commemoration (Olick 1999: 381).

The City Museum Tells a Story

In our analysis, we treat exhibitions as narratives told in particular historical time and space. Along the lines of the new museology studies (Vergo 1989), we understand them as the result of academic knowledge and popular interpretations, and we recognise the museum as a medium in which the society expresses itself (Macdonald 1998: 7–8). The museum is the place where social memory often wins against history as an academic discipline. By collecting the objects, the museum stores memories which are 'the basis of cultural or national identity, of scientific knowledge and aesthetic value' (Crane 2000: 4). Like other cultural artefacts, such as literature, art or monuments, museum exhibitions help to construct and maintain 'imagined communities' (Anderson 1991). This role of the museum in shaping the national identity and promoting national agendas is complex and multilayered. As Tony Bennett (2011: 263) claims: 'From the early modern period, museums have been places in which citizens – however they might have been defined – have met, conversed, been instructed, or otherwise engaged in rituals through which their

rights and duties as citizens have been enacted'. History museums are particularly engaged in this process of 'meaning making', of transforming the history into identity (Knell 2007: 3), or as Didier Maleuvre (1999: 10) says, into a 'myth: that is, an image that gathers people and summons an identity'. The power of museums, and historical museums in particular, lies not only in that they maintain collective memory (Swank 1990: 85), but because they 'constitute part of the morally and emotionally shaped social and ideological landscape' (Edwards 2010: 28). In the museum 'everything belongs to some matrix of memory, even if it is a matrix which is remote from human concerns and interests' (Casey 2000: 311). While all history museums are vulnerable to ideological manipulation and conflicts, the historical exhibitions about the Second World War are particularly good examples of this.[1] This war is still the subject of vivid discussions and silences, dilemmas and oversimplifications, understatements and exaggerations. It is still a living history, made out of 'dreams and wrestling with recollections both cherished and painful' (Yeingst and Bunch 1997: 152).

The fact that we have concentrated on city museums is not accidental. As Max Hebditch (1998: 108) claims, these kinds of museums quite often connect their narrative with national history. This is the case not only in old states such as France and Great Britain but also, as David Fleming (1999: 132–33) has already pointed out, in the former Eastern Bloc countries after the fall of the Berlin Wall, where political change has led to a renewed scrutiny of city histories. The current third wave of Europeanisation also brings new challenges and opportunities in this respect. All over Europe we observe the growing process of nationalisation of history (Karlsson 2010: 39), and 'museums, as repositories of a nation's history, cannot shirk their responsibility for national identity' (McLean 1998: 245). However, at the same time, in Eastern Europe, we observe some attempts to change old canons of public history in order to acknowledge the diversity of ethnic, regional, gender and individual experiences of war, regardless of national divisions. Moreover, contemporary Europe must deal with a reversed intensity of the memory of the Holocaust and the Gulag, in the West and the East (Maier 2002), and, therefore, look for new paradigms of commemoration in the public realm (e.g. Assmann 2009; Leggewie and Lang 2011). Some observers in the case of Polish historical museums argue that nowadays they stand at the crossroads of romanticising and revising of national history (Szczepański 2012, cf. Kaluza 2011). This dynamic situation brings consequences for museums as places which 'have potency to change what people think and to influence attitudes and values' (Cameron 2005: 229; cf. Weil 1990).

This potency was used by some Western museums which, by giving a voice to previously marginalised voices, supported processes of democratisation (Kaplan 1994). A question arises whether the East European city museums have become spaces of social transformation, and what kind of the transformation they favour.

In addition to these changes in the perception of the past, there are outcomes from speeding globalisation and technological progress which challenge many old functions of the museum and dissolve the borders between museums and other institutions. All this makes the examination of Central and East European exhibitions a fascinating endeavour. In our analysis we wanted to pay close attention to three exhibitions by trying to establish what the story is that the city museums of Dresden, Warsaw and St Petersburg display. Given that they can present both the history of the city and national history, we compared how much of each appears in the analysed exhibitions. We also asked whether or not the way the history was presented changed after the collapse of communism. And finally, we posed the most important question: what is the role of the figure of the enemy in the whole museum narrative?

In analysing the exhibitions, we referred to the categories introduced by Duncan Cameron (1971) of the 'temple' and the 'forum' museum.[2] For Cameron, temples are the museums which support the construction of respective nation states by presenting one interpretation of history, which is treated as objective truth. Intensive development of 'temples' took place in the nineteenth century, when museums played a legitimising role for the existing social and political order. As Wolfgang Ernst (2000: 20) put it, museums became a kind of 'patriotic Valhalla', places where national history was constructed. From that moment on, museums became responsible for promoting the public definition of truth and value. Maleuvre (1999: 10) claims that they were a 'countenance of fate' built on the assumption that 'all stages of the past belong to a necessary pattern of reason, triumph, and order; that all is as it should be on the stage of world history'.

The 'forum' museums, on the contrary, are open to diverse interpretations. Cameron (1971) maintains that instead of singular truth claims, there is a plurality of possible and equivalent approaches. For instance, in the case of historical museums the forum will include the story of marginalised groups, or permit them to present their history in the exhibition. Moreover, the forum is open to diverse accounts of the same historical event. In particular, one-sided interpretations, which were so crucial for the temple narratives, become problematised and discussed in the forums, where frames of remembrance are challenged, fragmented and made transparent. This kind of 'post-museum' belongs to 'reflexive societies' which

recognise the right to be different, and which appreciate debates and productive confrontations if they contribute to cooperation among diverse actors (cf. Marstine 2006: 19–21).

The 'temple' and 'forum' are most of all metaphors. Nevertheless, for several years they have also been in use in actual museum work. For instance, the contemporary handbooks on management in museums will stress that good exhibitions should support social interactions by being engaging and participative, include multiple points of view, welcome difference and dialogue, and encourage discovery, empathy and reflection (Black 2005: 269). However, the very latest literature questions not only the idea and practice of the old type of museums, but also draws attention to some difficulties behind the forum type of museum. For instance, Carine A. Durand (2010: 151–52), in her book on ethnographic museums, underlines that it is necessary to further examine whether museums really address the controversial issues or whether their interest is only in showing the successes of indigenous peoples' reinventions of tradition. Fiona Cameron (2003: 39) pointed out that, even if many museums are deeply interested in presenting difficult topics and diverse opinions, they 'act as brokers of perspectives rather than [being] sites for serious dialogue and meaningful engagement with their constituents around contentious topics'. Thus it was also one of the goals of our project to critically examine the very ideas of 'temple' and 'forum' in relation to historical museums.

Both the temples and the forums are embedded in the cultural patterns of the societies in which they exist. Thus, the way of representation and creation of history in the exhibition is not accidental but reflects a certain order and hierarchy. Whether it is temple or forum, it is 'the act of selection' which turns the item into the museum exhibit and which gives it a sense (Pearce 2012: 24). Documents are beyond 'historical notice' until 'historians find something to do with them … Facts do not become historical evidence until someone thinks up something for them to prove or disprove' (Carson, quoted in Knell 2007: 8). Even if museums take items and documents from their original context, and this displacement causes certain objects' features to be forgotten (Radley 1990: 53), museums need them because they 'constitute material "facts" and evidence for stories to be told' (Dudley 2012: XXVII). However, the object's success depends on how the museum fulfils this remnant of the past with meaning (Knell 2007: 26) and, as we will show, temple and forum do it in different ways.

The way the story itself is told is rooted in the current 'episteme', to use Michel Foucault's term from Plato: it reflects the array of rules and

thoughts that permit the society to describe and function in the given cultural moment (Foucault 1970).[3] This array, which later Foucault named as discourse, is unconscious but uncovers the foundation of significances and meanings shared by the society. For Foucault the elements which seem to us incomprehensible and aberrant are carriers of the heart of matter; they are a kind of relic of past thinking, which helps us to understand that the sense is not a simple truth, but a result of a former way of thinking. In fact all, even the most obvious, beliefs about the surrounding reality or the meanings of things have their origins in the past, and can be explained if we take an 'archaeological step back'. If we look at the museums' exhibitions from this perspective we can see that they are not stores of objects or values, but are the result of the way we think, interpret, and make sense of the world. To put it most simply, they are places of human ideas (Boyd 1999).

In the case of the historical exhibition, this array of thoughts is immense and concerns the way we describe and understand culture, society and politics. However, in the case of the exhibitions analysed by us, the most crucial factor influencing the construction of displays seemed to be political memory and existing memory discourses of the event. Following Foucault, we understand the discourse as the array of beliefs about the event existing in the society, which can construct a certain coherent interpretation of the past. There can be a dominant discourse, which is often the official – state – interpretation, but there can also be some minor discourses constructed by particular groups. All these discourses are built of certain elements (beliefs), which are sometimes common for different discourses, but sometimes belong to only one of them. Depending on their configuration and inner relationships, these elements establish different interpretations.

Some elements which try to explain the sense of an event are so strongly rooted in the tradition that they acquire a 'mythic power'. In nation states, ancient myths concerning the gods and heroes are often replaced by stories about national ancestors and their heroic deeds. As Gananath Obeyesekere claims, myth-making is prolific in European thought. Myth models, which 'refer to an underlying set of ideas (a myth structure or cluster of mythemes)' are employed in a variety of narrative forms. These myths are not sacred stories but have the same power to influence. They are not only rooted in the array of beliefs but, what is most important, they appear 'as surface structure' to 'embody a narrative theme and determine the way that the content is constructed' (Obeyesekere 1992: 10). The myth-making process seems to be especially valid in the case of the interpretation of traumatic events which, by virtue of the fact that they concern

borderline experiences, are often perceived as the beginning of a new era. The understanding of these events is not only formed out of historical knowledge, individual experience and personal imagination, but also out of the use of clusters of mythemes, and other stories/legends about ancestors, which have a similar isomorphic form and which, therefore, help to give a sense to the event.

However, it is important to stress that we have not analysed the discourses or myths, but only treated them as the context for the better understanding of the image of the enemy in the exhibition. Thus, on the basis of a literature review, we have distinguished and named the most important elements of these discourses, which can be decoded in the exhibitions, or which had an influence on the construction/reconstruction of displays. Later, while analysing an exhibition, we tried to show which elements came from which discourse, and thus how origin determines interpretation. Knowledge about discourses, as well as being aware that each historical exhibition is rooted in them, helped us to understand that if a museum's exhibition does not manage to show a certain problem, or if it presents it in an aberrant way, it is not only proof that the problem was not 'worked through', but is also a crucial element of the message of the narrative. It is this incomprehensible element which, as Foucault would say, can bring us to the heart of the matter – to the real reason and significance of the museum's interpretation. That is why, while analysing the image of the enemy, we also looked at the general narrative of the exhibition and at how certain historical facts were being presented, or even concealed. This was important for us as the background and reference point for the analysis.

Focusing on the image of 'the enemy' and the presentation of his role in the general narrative meant that the main character/hero of the story also became a very important part of our analysis. We had two more reasons for deciding to concentrate on the story's main character. The first is linked with the nature of historical exhibitions which form a kind of consensus between the past and the present. We believe that the attributes possessed by the main character are still valid for the social groups involved in producing the exhibition. The second reason is related to the fact that the exhibition tells a story about the deeds of ancestors, so the construction of the character can include some of the features which create a mythical hero. Thus, in each exhibition we tried to decode and name the main character as well as show what kind of relationship there was between the main character and the enemy. We suspected that both of them could be strongly contrasted and dichotomic, so that the way the enemy is presented would depend on the presentation of the main character.

'The Enemy'

For the purposes of our analysis, we defined 'the enemy' as the agent who threatens both the identity and the very existence of the main character of an exhibition's story. The exhibitions that we analysed tell the story of European cities between 1939 and 1945, when the continent – as a result of German aggression – was embroiled in the Second World War, with states either fighting to try to impose their supremacy and ideology upon the others, or trying to resist this threat. Both sides made use of an 'image of the enemy'. In contemporary Europe the concept of diversified unity seems more important than the concept of separate nation states. However, as Ulrich Beck (1997: 68) claims, the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War in 1989 meant that both the East and West lost the enemy, the image of which was so fundamental to their postwar identities. Thus, a search for new 'enemies', or new indicators of identity, started. This inclination is particularly visible in Europe which, after the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain in general, has been forced to find a new way of stabilising and legitimising its existence. In Central and Eastern Europe one observes a tendency best characterised as 'national awakening', triggering the search for new national identities. The search for new enemies is not only connected with the new political situation since 1989, but also with the cultural changes that have been provoked by globalisation, which is often said to have caused a loss of 'clarity' of the individual's identity (Fiebig-von Hase 1997: 33). In the search for identity, other cultures serve as a convenient enemy. Even if the concept of 'otherness as such under all circumstances' is widespread, as Ragnhild Fiebig-von Hase notes, the tendency to stereotype relationships in order to make the world less complicated is also noticeable. The existence of these tendencies to search for new cultural enemies, and the creation of new enemies in the framework of a reborn nationalism, makes it necessary to gain a better understanding of how the image of the enemy is constructed by currently powerful institutions which influence society's imagination. Museums are among such institutions. Their influence on people's imaginations seems even greater because they make use of a very important component of the community's identity, its history (Anderson 1991; Knell 2011), and do so by applying 'moralising and reforming discourses' (Cameron 2007: 330).

The fact that the image of the enemy has been historically utilised and instrumentalised in order to call for war and conflicts has been widely analysed and seems quite obvious.[4] However, even if the image of the enemy is important for individuals and groups, its genesis, changing patterns and

functional uses are complex and imprecise. The definition of the enemy depends itself on an academic approach and an applied methodology of research. Looking at the problem from the psychological point of view, one can say that hostility is an immanent feature of the human psyche, characterised by Sigmund Freud as Thanatos, the drive to self-destruction. Fiebig-von Hase (1997: 6) developed this idea, and claims that enemy images can be perceived as the self-destructive energies of the drive to death directed against others. In this situation the enemy appears as the convenient other, legitimising aggressive behaviour. Anthropological and sociological approaches stress the importance of the 'we–other' division as an element of the process of structuring and giving sense to the world. People organise their knowledge and they construct value and belief systems for their orientation. 'Others' are classified as 'enemies' if their appearance is perceived as a threat (Finlay, Holsti and Fagen 1967: 1–3). Any kind of difference – racial, ethnic, religious, ideological or cultural – might give rise to this. The intensity of such antagonism and the form of enemy images depend on 'the composition of a society, its cultural identity and its political structure' (Fiebig-von Hase 1997: 26–27).

This political construction and function of enemy images is related to other images that political actors use to structure the social world, such as barbarian, imperial, rogue, degenerate, ally (Cottam et al. 2004: 52). In its most extreme form 'the diabolical enemy' is seen as 'irrevocably aggressive in motivation, monolithic in decisional structure, and highly rational in decision making' (ibid.: 52–53). Strong and extreme emotions are associated with the enemy, which can either be a real danger or only imagined, individually or collectively. The group starts blaming the enemy for all its misfortunes and failures, and often when the enemy is not a real aggressor but only a product of the imagination, the mechanism of the scapegoat starts to work. A victim is found and becomes the object of aggression. Scapegoating returns lost balance to the group (Girard 1986).

The enemy helps to tighten community relationships. The enemy's world is perceived as the reverse of the community's own culture, and its attributes are contrasted with the community's own features. The stronger the image of the enemy and the more intense the emotion it provokes, the better is group consolidation and self-definition. The feeling of real 'community' helps to overcome periods of crisis and insecurity. The existence of the opposed systems of values (the enemy's values versus our own) enforces internal consensus and discipline upon a society, which can then be used by the government for its own aims. Political agents seek enemies according to their ideological self-definition, although the argument of moral superiority over the evil ideology of the foe is commonly used. All

the purest moral values are embodied in the image of the hero, who is also a powerful figure offering a foundation for government rule, legitimisation and preservation of the status quo which assures the state's monopoly of power.

Given all of the above, we wanted to deal with the concept of the enemy which, by dividing a society into 'us' and 'them', stands in the way of building a diversified world which is not hostile. Even if a lot of work has already been done in order to build common ways of describing and representing European history,[5] many popular representations still support the old stereotypes and national myths. That is why in our analysis we wanted to see whether the exhibitions which deal with traumatic episodes of European history denationalised the enemy or clung to the old ideas. It seemed important to us because, as Andrea Witcomb (2010: 40) claims, museums 'are spaces in which transformative experiences are possible because of the ability of objects to reach out and literally touch someone', and because the exhibition as a 'world of imagination' has a power to evoke such a level of empathy in viewers that they may become 'other, if only momentarily'. However, in the case of the enemy, such an image which 'touches someone' may maintain the vision of a hierarchically arranged social world, and treat the process as equalising the relationships between different cultures (cf. Bennett 2011).

Understanding that the image of the enemy is crucial for the construction of identity, we decided to distinguish and analyse particular features of this image. When analysing historical exhibitions one needs to bear in mind that the image itself is not merely the representation of the enemy as current during that particular period, but is distorted with time, and subjected to a curator's interpretation. Obviously the photographs, posters, advertisements, exhibits and other artefacts of the past are a direct reflection of the enemy of the time, and they set the framework of the visual form presented at the exhibition. By showing the way in which the enemy was described and interpreted then, they reveal a historical aspect of the enemy image. However, the image itself has two other significant features which play an equally important role in the development of a museum's interpretation.

Apart from historical features, the enemy's image also bears some characteristics of the political discourse of the period when the exhibition was prepared. We will show that in the case of the exhibition in St Petersburg it is the Soviet discourse of the 1960s, while in the case of Dresden and Warsaw some elements of current discourses are present. If we agree with Sharon Macdonald (1996) that the exhibition says more about current times than about the past, we must conclude that the enemy's image,

despite the fact that it draws on historical sources and iconography, is constructed in such a way that it reflects 'current' social notions – meaning those from the period when the exhibition was being prepared.

Another factor which can have a strong impact on the enemy's image as presented at an exhibition involves the deeply rooted and culturally shaped notions of individual ethnic groups and their mutual relations, which are rooted in the culture of the exhibition's authors. The latter can make the enemy's image not only reflect what happened and how it is currently talked about, but they can also impart certain features, that could be called 'archetypal', resulting from the thought structures deeply rooted in a given culture. What seems even more important than stereotypes is the very archetypal thought pattern existing in a given culture concerning 'we–other' relations and the role that this pattern plays. Stereotypical conceptions can be found in historical presentations, such as the aforementioned posters, prints or propaganda texts. During the war they had been used to create a negative image of the enemy, and therefore their presence in the museum seems obvious. On the other hand, the archetypal thought pattern about the we–other relation constitutes a much deeper cultural dependency, which not only concerns the presentation of the enemy, but also has an impact on the creation of the tale's hero–enemy relation, and on the whole shape of narrative. It is therefore worthwhile thinking about the role of the 'we–other' dichotomy in Russian, Polish and German culture.

Daniel Rancour-Laferriere (2000) maintains that the we–other juxtaposition is a constituent element of Russian culture and identity. The we–other division existed in traditional Russian culture in many social strata, not only in the ethnic dimension but also reflected in folklore, language and habits.[6] The bonds of community were particularly strong in the face of a threat or of war.[7] Community then became a dominant value, appreciated more than the value of the life of the individual (Rancour-Laferriere 2000: 113–14). At the same time the notion of what Russianness is not forms an integral part of the Russian identity. From this perspective the Russian seal which represents Saint George sitting astride a horse and battling a dragon might be interpreted as proof that Russia cannot live without an enemy persecutor (ibid.: 177). On the other hand, Elene Hellberg-Hirn (1998: 17) maintains that the dragon represents the dehumanised image of Russia's enemies, which in turn is juxtaposed with the image of the perfect Russian who is a sort of 'universal human', with the messianic mission of assimilating other nations.[8] James Wertsch (2002) shows that the enemy, and more precisely, the way the Russian talks about the triumph over him, is a part of Russian 'textual heritage' and forms 'unique national ways of explication'.

The we–other juxtaposition also forms an important element of Polish folk culture. According to Benedyktowicz (2000: 10), 'it results from the bridge-like nature of the Polish folk culture that has been developing between the East and the West of Europe, as well as historical determinants and a frequent need to protect one's own identity'. There are many stereotypes functioning in Polish culture concerning various ethnic groups. Important are images of Jews and Russians, sometimes conflated in the political stereotype of Judeo-Communists (cf. Michlic 2006) with its roots in the interwar period. However according to the Polish sociologist and ethnographer, Jan Stanisław Bystroń ([1935] 1995: 167), one of the best-rooted notions of an 'alien' is the image of a German: 'Germans have always been considered alien in Poland, to such an extent that the term German was used to refer to aliens in general, in particular those stemming from North-Western Europe; in this sense a Dutchman, Swede or Dane, and sometimes even an Englishman or Frenchman, was referred to as German'. One may therefore say that in the popular sense the word 'German' became a synonym for any foreignness. This notion is reflected in a still-popular Polish proverb: 'As long as the ways of the world persist, Poles and Germans will not coexist' (Bystroń 1995: 181–82). This combination of two concepts has resulted in the image of a German being well recognised in Polish culture, and it will not be tamed as long as its meaning is not separated from the concept of an 'alien'.

German notions concerning the we–other relation, as in the case of Russia, were strongly influenced by the Napoleonic Wars. According to David Jacobson (1997), the French army was perceived as a 'real enemy' that posed a threat to people's existence. The sense of real threat influenced the idea of an organic nation, a *Volk*, 'a nation in search of a state and, more than that, a protest against the nationalist and cosmopolitan beliefs of the French Revolution' (ibid.: 23–24). The Romanticism and the Prussian reforms had a decisive influence on the shape of the German notion of a community as an organic cultural and racial entity marked by a common language. According to Bystroń (1995: 25), the racial superiority of the Germans and their special role in the development of European civilisation and culture was supported by Germanic myths and a belief in the German genealogy of Christ, which nationalised God and thus deified the nation. In this sense, the Germans believed they were the embodiment of the greatest values, and they perceived evil as something external that threatened their very existence. Hence, as a threat to their existence, the enemy could not be assimilated. He had to be destroyed. This notion of the we–other division functioned until 1945. German postwar education efforts focused strongly on the deconstruction of this

way of thinking, but its popularity shows that this dichotomous thinking is still present.

Such a brief presentation of the culturally and historically shaped patterns of the we–other relation in Russian, Polish and German culture does not exhaust the topic. It merely accentuates the most characteristic features which seem to influence the picture and function of the enemy's image in the analysed exhibitions. They unveil a deeper level of the we–other relations, and can enrich the historical analysis related to the Second World War by conveying a deeper sense of the cultural background. When analysing the image of the enemy we decided to consider all the three possible sources of the notion – namely, historical, cultural and political. We were aware that all these factors combine and merge in the museum image of the enemy, and so we were not trying to analyse them separately. But by being mindful of their existence, whenever the analysis required this, we tried to say how they influenced the presentations.

Our Approach

When we started our project in 2007, the literature on historical museums in Eastern Europe specifically, and on the methodology of how to study the cultural aspects of historical museums in general, was limited. Only recently has that situation changed (e.g. Ganzer 2005; Knigge and Mählert 2005; Apor and Sarkisova 2008; Łuczewski and Wiedmann 2011; Troebst and Wolf 2011; Ziębińska-Witek 2011; Szczepański 2012). Hence – ironically as East Europeans – in designing our approach we were largely informed by West European literature and the new museology studies which started with the aforementioned anthology by Peter Vergo (1989). One should note that the new museology primarily included authors with previous academic training in art history and ethnography, which of course influenced the type of museums studied (most of the analyses concerned either art or ethnographic museums). The leading publications were written or edited by authors such as Mary Bouquet, Sandra Dudley, Eileen Hooper-Greenhill, Ivan Karp, Simon Knell, Sharon Macdonald, Suzanne MacLeod, Janet Marstine, Susan Pearce and Donald Preziosi.

The key issues raised by those authors about exhibitions concerned the politics and poetics of display, power relations, aesthetics, and the construction of knowledge. The actual subjects of analysis included the investigation of narratives and representations, the studies of agency of various museum makers, museum dilemmas and contradictions, meaning

and status of museum materials such as objects and photos, and the examination of visitors and reception. Most interesting were the holistic approaches, examining the interrelationships between production, content and consumption of exhibitions (Macdonald 1998; Bogumił 2011b).

The critical approach of the new museology did not usually stop at the stage of description and explanation through the deconstruction of underlying assumptions of a given exhibition, but was normally involved in giving some prescriptions as to how a good exhibition should look. As Marstine (2006: 5) argued, 'museums are a "social technology", an "invention" that packages culture; it's our job to deconstruct this packaging so that we can become critical consumers and lobby for change'. In this context, strong influences in the new museology were the already described metaphors of a museum as a temple or as a forum. The new museology stood, obviously, on the side of the forum, and believed that museums were able to support social transformations, and to even have therapeutic or 'healing' potential (Silverman 2002; Janes 2009; Macdonald 2009). Eilean Hooper-Greenhill (2000: 152–53) described the forum as a 'post-museum', and that 'rather than upholding the values of objectivity, rationality, order and distance, the post-museum will negotiate responsiveness, encourage mutually nurturing partnerships, and celebrate diversity'.

The new museology was influenced by the post-structural theories and narratives of the 1970s and 1980s, by post-colonial discourse and problems of multicultural societies, as well as by changes in museums themselves brought on by both technological changes and the demands of the consumer society, which prefers being entertained to being enlightened; it also prefers experience to contemplation (Starn 2005; Marstine 2006; Ziębińska-Witek 2011). Even though it was disputable whether this approach was fully suitable for studying museums in different cultural contexts, it was the only perspective we had at our disposal when we started our research. Nevertheless while pursuing our interpretations we became aware of some limitations in applying theories which had been born in a specific West European cultural context to studying museums in an East European one.

While we were agreed on the general approach from the very beginning of our project, an intense discussion began before we started our field research about the actual methodology that we should apply. The longer we discussed this problem the more we understood that it would be impossible to strictly follow only one methodology. First of all, the analysed material was too complex, and secondly, our academic backgrounds, and the methodologies used in them, differed so much from each other that it would have been unworkable to follow just one method from one

field. Thus, we decided that we would use those elements of which ever method which would help us the most to better understand the collected material. The principle was to understand the exhibition, and to try to establish a common interpretation, rather than to follow one methodology in a dogmatic way. As a consequence our perspective is a mix of different methods from different disciplines (history, sociology and anthropology), which were applied in the individual analyses, and enriched and improved by long discussions during which the final interpretation was constructed.

The central question of our research concerned the role of the image of the enemy in the historical exhibitions presenting the traumatic events of the Second World War. However, in order to get a better understanding of the image of the enemy it was necessary to obtain knowledge about the relevant political and cultural discourses, and to understand what role the image of the enemy plays within these discourses, and how the discourses influence the image presented in the respective historical exhibition. We have not analysed the discourses themselves, but have just treated them as a context for reaching a better understanding of the image of the enemy in the exhibitions. Our awareness of museums as institutions that derive from academic and popular knowledge in order to construct their own interpretation, inclined us to pay special attention to cultural determinants of the enemy's image. The image of the enemy is a significant figure well rooted in our cultures, so we presumed that cultural features would be an important element of the construction of the image of the enemy in the exhibitions.

From the very beginning of the research we had to deal with the problem of the impossibility of maintaining fully objective attitudes to the analysed material. One cannot forget that in our research we did not deal with the image of the enemy in general, but with a very particular image which represents traumatic historical events. In the cases of four of us, these events greatly affected the histories of our own families. It was therefore difficult for some of us to distance ourselves from the exhibitions, especially when confronted with critical arguments from colleagues from less-affected countries.

In order to solve the problems described above, we decided that the main element of our methodology would be a 'conversation', through which we would come to an agreed sense. 'Conversation' is understood, after the Polish cultural anthropologist Joanna Tokarska-Bakir (1995), as openness towards the other and permitting the other to express what he or she wants to tell. She argues: 'Who listens will be open towards claims of truth, claims that can be advanced through otherness. Then, it can happen (but not necessarily!), that the other is right and we are tongue-tied' (ibid.:

14). Sometimes during the research we had the feeling of 'being tongue-tied', especially when we were talking about some elements of national discourses which were obvious for us yet seemed incomprehensible and problematic for the rest of the group, or when we were caught thinking in stereotypical ways by our colleagues. We dealt with these problems practically throughout our common work.

As a first step of our actual research the national subgroups composed short lists of museums worth visiting in each of the three cities. The selection was not accidental. We chose museums on the basis that after visiting them we believed we would have a basic knowledge about the museum's commemoration of the respective event in a particular city. The members of the group selecting the museums were familiar with the national discourses of their country, so, in fact, we approved a selection of institutions, which, in our opinion, show important elements of the dominant discourse. The fact that we live in discourses and that they dominate our understanding of things was also visible in the subsequent steps of the research.

In July 2007 we spent one week in each city. We started with a quite complex but rapid visit to the different museums,[9] and after this brief reconnaissance we decided which museum in each city would be the subject of deeper analysis. At the beginning it was not obvious that we would analyse the city museums, but there was an idea to choose museums of the respective events (bombardment, uprising and blockade). However, in Dresden there is no museum of the bombardment, so the city museum was the only option. In Warsaw, we initially planned to analyse the Warsaw Rising Museum, but understood that to ensure comparability of the analysis it is important to select similar types of museum. The city museum looked appealing, especially given that the exhibition in the Warsaw Historical Museum was being modernised at the time. When we arrived in St Petersburg there was no doubt about which museum we would analyse – the State Museum of the History of St Petersburg, which is equivalent to the city museums in Dresden and Warsaw.

In the museums, during our detailed exhibition mapping, we used a kind of 'museal game' – to use a term introduced by Polish anthropologist Anna Wieczorkiewicz (2000: 18–20) – which enabled each of us to visit the exhibition separately and establish the first pre-interpretation. Wieczorkiewicz developed the idea of the museal game on the basis of Hans-Georg Gadamer's ([1975] 2006) concept of the game as the way a work of art comes into existence. Gadamer claimed that a work of art does not result from an artist's will, but through the process of the game, which has its rules, in which the artist and the piece have to play. Wieczorkiewicz

used this concept to explain the contact between the visitor and the exhibition. In our case it could be understood even more literally as a way of behaviour – a way of collecting material on the exhibition – used by each of us. It really looked like a kind of game. Some people sat down and drew maps of each room, while others wandered around like sleepwalkers breathing in the atmosphere in order to record information in their notebooks a minute later. Some spent a lot of time standing in one spot and staring at one object while others passed it by. Nearly everybody made some drawings or took photographs or videos. Thanks to the different approaches we mapped the exhibitions in detail, and later during the conversations there was no problem with reconstructing the exhibition.

However, there was a problematic element of the game. Some of us did not have sufficient knowledge about the historical facts and so tried to learn them from the exhibition. This is quite risky because the selected presentation of the historical events is also a part of the construction of the exhibition, so the interpretation should not only contain information about the presented facts, but also about those not presented. To avoid misunderstanding, we started the 'conversation' not only with the exhibition, through the game, but also with each other, through dialogue. Team members with better historical knowledge helped those who had some problems, while those who were better in cultural explanations helped to decode the relationships between elements. Sometimes there were vivid discussions about the exhibition: the first interpretative thought exchanges.

We also had to solve another problem. When the group started analysing the exhibitions, each of us had some prejudice and expected to find certain elements of certain discourses in the exhibitions. The 'museal game' approach and thought exchange with other participants of the project helped us to realise our own limitations and prejudices, and to establish a kind of distance from ourselves and from the exhibition, which in consequence permitted a real contact with the exhibition narrative.

Furthermore, in order to get a better understanding of the exhibitions, we met with museum staff to obtain more precise information on the given exhibition. We also talked to the curators of the exhibition or people responsible for the exhibition's development.[10] Moreover, in each city we had some meetings with people other than museum staff – people who located the museums in the existing local context of Dresden, Warsaw or St Petersburg.[11] Subsequently we have also collected published sources on the museums. In such a way we could pay attention to the wider context and the history of each exhibition, because we did not want to assume that museums are straightforward reflections of political and

ideological interests; this has been a fair point of criticism of some of the museum studies (Macdonald 1996: 4–5). Thus, we tried to reconstruct the dynamics and contexts that formed the exhibitions by looking into various published sources, and collecting information on the changes in the exhibitions since their establishment. Nevertheless, the present shape of the exhibitions and our readings of them are the main focus of our study.

Each evening after visiting the museums, we brainstormed and noted some interpretative triggers for further development. The meetings were recorded and the recordings distributed amongst participants. At the end of the field research in each city we spent an evening summarising the interpretative clues from the selected exhibition. The whole field research ended with an evening workshop at the Memorial Society in St Petersburg, during which we tried to establish the outline of the report and noted down the most important elements of the case studies. We also divided ourselves into three subgroups (pairs), which were required to write the case studies. We decided that in each subgroup there would be one national of that country and one foreigner. Such a division of labour was intended to help us avoid stereotypical ways of thinking and to compensate for gaps in historical knowledge, enabling us to deal with discourse and in consequence guarantee the possibility of a common interpretation rather than a one-sided approach. At the same time, we agreed that the work of the subgroups would be consulted and supervised by all participants during the workshops held in Warsaw, as well as via emails.

We started avidly reading the literature on the subject and created a basic, common bibliography of the publications which could be reference points for our analysis. Our aim was not to undertake deep research into the historiography of the destruction of each of the cities, but to establish which events the historians investigating the Bombing of Dresden, the Warsaw Uprising and the Leningrad Blockade considered significant for understanding each catastrophe. We recognised that without such a list it would be difficult to constructively discuss which information the exhibitions omit and to which they pay maybe too much attention.

'Museum meanings are dependent on personal and community memory and imagination, and often involve emotions and sensory experiences', as Sheila Watson (2010: 205) summarises the vast research on the role of subjectivity in the perception of exhibitions. Already during the field research and later during our meetings in Warsaw we realised how differently each of us were looking at the exhibitions analysed, and that this dissimilarity was not simply a result of our national origins. Thus, the national groups sometimes tried to cover over some problematic elements of their national

exhibitions, for instance by adding information which was not presented in the display but which was, in their opinion, important for better understanding the story. Nevertheless, discussions with colleagues led to greater awareness and permitted further development of the interpretation. In consequence, dealing with the different national perceptions of the exhibition seemed less difficult than the problems arising from the different academic backgrounds of the participants. Coming with backgrounds in sociology, history and anthropology, we used diverse methods and tended to pay more attention to those elements important within our own respective fields. Moreover, even people coming from the same academic field (e.g. history) had different approaches, which depended on the specifics of local (German, Polish, Russian) historiography. In these cases the national confrontations were much more intense than in cases of simple interpretation of the exhibition elements.

Once the frameworks of our common interpretative language had been determined and we began to speak more or less the same language, the interpretation of the 'poetics' of the exhibitions could commence. It was a 'semiotic analysis of the diversity of ways in which exhibitions create representations of cultures' (McLean 1998: 247). We were interested in the multilevel dependences present in the exhibitions. We tried to understand the structure and meanings of the whole narrative which we treated as a complex text. We wanted to understand its inner construction and dependences, to name and characterise particular elements, and to establish the relationships between them. The 'synthetic' construction of the exhibition was very important: the way objects were presented and the relations between different exhibits, as well as the artefacts and texts or pictures themselves. However, in order to understand the relationships between particular elements of an exhibition, it is necessary to look at each element separately (Edwards 2001). Thus, we wanted to establish to what extent displayed objects propose a 'complex, problematized, and nuanced view of the past' (Lubar 1997: 16). We were interested whether they were displayed in a wider historical and cultural context (Knell 2007) or whether only the basic information about the item could be elicited. It seemed to us very important, because as many researches claim 'objects are dumb' (cf. Crew and Sims 1991: 159; Kavanagh 2004). It means that when we think that they communicate something to us, in fact we talk to them and 'infuse them with our thoughts and desires' (Knell 2012: 324). Therefore, we also looked on 'the codes of presentation through which meaning is created' (Pearce 1992: 196) and on labels, because the way the objects are described determines how they are perceived and understood (Knell 2007).

We paid special attention to photographs, which are tools of 'economy of truth' par excellence (Edwards 2010: 27, after Porter). As Elisabeth Edwards (2001: 186) claims, in museums 'photographs are used in a didactic way, to show how this or that "works", "is used", "made"; they are seen as providing context, they explain, authenticate and, on occasion, substitute for a real object'. Photographs are quite often stripped of their hermeneutic potential (Edwards 2010: 27) in the museum, and are used only as 'functional realist images as a "window on the world"' (Edwards 2001: 184). Summing up, in our analysis of the poetics of exhibitions we tried to understand the significance of each element of the exhibition and then translate its historical and cultural meaning for the narrative in order finally to understand the complex message.

However, the narrative of the story is also constructed through the development of the space of the exhibition. The way in which spaces are arranged and the objects displayed has an influence on the viewer's perception of the exhibition. We applied several methods as drawing plans of the exhibitions to bear in mind 'how culture manifests itself in the layout of space by forming a spatial pattern in which activities are integrated and segregated to different degrees' (Hillier and Tzortzi 2011: 285). These plans were also important for us, because there is a significant difference between an exhibition which forces the visitor to follow the curator's narrative by creating a kind of one-way circulation, and an exhibition which permits the visitors to choose their own way through the exhibition. The first one may be called after Christopher Marshall (2005) as 'projective space', which tries to convey certain massages, the second as 'reflective space', which permits individual contemplation. These space analyses were very important for our case studies, because the museums that we analysed belonged to both 'temple' and 'forum' space constructions.

Our methodology was a multilayer dialogue concentrated on understanding the exhibition. First of all, each of us adopted an informal, even playful, approach to each exhibition during the process of our 'museal game'; then there was a deep 'conversation' between the partners from each subgroup, during which the two individual's different approaches towards the exhibition could be identified; and finally there were meetings of the whole group, where all approaches and interpretational proposals were acknowledged. When the highest conversational level was achieved, we once more made our way down the levels in order to check the veracity of the agreed statements. However, the hierarchical construction of the dialogue is only apparent. Very often during our meetings we discussed the exhibition itself, not only our interpretations. By showing pictures we tried collectively to re-enter the 'museal game' in order to liberate ourselves

from interpretative limitations and to try to establish the factual meaning of a particular element of the exhibition. Our aim was not limited to understanding the claims of the other participants of the project. Through conversations in which different perspectives clashed, we wanted to come to the cultural meaning of the exhibition. Thus, the conversation, even if treated very subjectively, was a means through which the 'thick description' (Geertz 1973: 3–32) of the exhibition was produced. The 'thick description' should be understood as the contextualised and problematised (concentration on the image of enemy) explanation of the exhibition, enriched by the interpretation of a broader context.

The Book's Structure

To make the interpretation comprehensible, we have divided each case study into several parts. For each, we begin with a short introduction, followed by information on the development of the discourse of the event, a brief account of the history of the museum, a short description of the narrative, and finally our interpretation. The structures of the interpretative parts are different, because the exhibitions themselves were diverse and our texts were written by different people. However, the assumptions underlying the interpretation are the same.

We interrogated each exhibition about 'the enemy', the main character, and their common relationships as well as the general structure of the story. We also questioned what the meanings and values attached to the city were before and after the enemy's appearance. These are the frames of the case studies, which only define the general outline, but do not determine the content which is the 'thick description'.

The main core of the book comprises three in-depth qualitative case studies devoted to the images of 'the enemy' in three museums located in three European cities, which tell how these cities coped with the effects of the Second World War.

Chapter 1 interprets the exhibition 'Leningrad during the Great Patriotic War' at the State Museum of the History of St Petersburg. It shows how the exhibition, first created in the 1960s, converges two discourses: the Soviet state discourse of the heroic behaviour of Leningraders as one of many heroic wartime acts, and the local discourse which highlighted the exceptional experience of the city. As a result of this double influence, the image of the enemy takes two different forms: the military enemy related to the conception of morally dehumanised German soldiers (state discourse); and the image of the people's enemy (local discourse), which takes the form

of food and water shortages, lack of heat and other scarcities in everyday life resulting from the Germans' actions during the Leningrad Blockade. Moreover, the image manifests itself in the way the Leningraders thought of the enemy who never entered the city, but who posed a constant threat by their presence and actions. These complexities do not adversely affect either of the discourses. In the conclusions, we refer to Yuriy Lotman's (1990) idea on the perception of the city as an antithesis to the surrounding world understood as nature. The imagery of the city as a symbol of the victory of culture over nature reinforces the museum's tale about the division of the world into good and evil, where the good is associated with the inhabitants of the city, while evil is an inhuman, animal-like enemy. This view on the siege of Leningrad is common to both discourses.

Chapter 2 is on the exhibition about the German occupation of Warsaw (1939–1945), including the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising (1943) and the Warsaw Uprising (1944), in the Historical Museum of Warsaw. We interpret the image of the enemy by referring to the pattern inherent in the Polish culture of martyrdom, particularly its two main narrative threads: struggle and suffering, deeply embedded in Catholic symbolism, and nineteenth-century romantic thought. This pattern explains the idealised qualities of both the main character of the exhibition's narrative, the Polish nation, and the invader, the Nazi. Their features are, above all, presented by various contrasts frequently used by the exhibition's creators, such as attacker–defender, perpetrator–victim, anonymous–distinctive, immoral–moral, guilty–innocent, dishonourable–honourable and evil–good. The cultural pattern for romantic martyrdom also helps us to understand why Warsaw Jews, who constituted one-third of the pre-war population of the city, have been marginalised in the exhibition.

Chapter 3 shows how the exhibition 'Democracies and Dictatorships' in the Dresden City Museum tries to deconstruct some of the myths concerning the Bombing of Dresden (the most important being the myth of the 'innocent city') and proposes a thought-provoking approach to the German past and memory. The exhibition develops an element of the German discourse on common guilt, and shows that the majority of city dwellers were responsible for the city's destruction because they voted for National Socialism in the democratic elections in 1932. The enemy in this exhibition is, therefore, neither external and dehumanised, nor particularised in the Nazi leaders, but comprises a psychological dimension. It is a hostile part of the human personality. While the beauty and prosperity of the 'Florence on the Elbe' in the nineteenth century was a result of cooperation among citizens, the city's destruction in the twentieth century is presented as a consequence of the destruction of the united community.

This mutual relationship between the condition of the community and the beauty of the city, which determines the shape of the museum narrative, is called the 'Dorian Gray effect'. We show that this reference to the beauty of the architecture is problematic because it permits the exhibition to taboo some important dilemmas of collective memory.

In the final chapter we draw general conclusions from these three case studies. We identify the regularities found in constructing images of the enemy in each exhibition, and point out some of the risks involved in musealising[12] (i.e. keeping alive) the historical 'other'. Then, we discuss the potentials and dangers of the 'temple' and the 'forum' metaphors with regard to the research of historical exhibitions. In such a way we recognise that interpreting a museum exhibition is an ongoing, never-ending process. Nonetheless, the very process of seeking to interpret and explain the role of the contemporary historical museum is absolutely essential for intercultural communication in the future. We hope this part will be of special interest to museum curators.

Notes

1. On exhibiting war in museums, see for example Zolberg 1996; Hinz 1997; Gieryn 1998; Thomas 2000; Boursier 2005; Bogumił and Wawrzyniak 2010; Thiemeyer 2010.
2. Duncan Cameron used these terms to analyse art museums. However, both terms were later used by other researchers to analyse ethnographic museums (Ames 1992: 15–24) and historical museums (Cristea and Radu-Bucurenci 2008: 275–305).
3. Foucault's archaeology of knowledge was applied by Eilean Hooper-Greenhill (1992) to analyse the history of the museums.
4. Compare the examples that Ragnhild Fiebig-von Hase (1997: 9) recalls in footnote 18. See also, Senyavskaya 2006; and Jarecka 2008.
5. Good examples of attempts to write a common past are the French–German history textbook *History: Europe and the World After 1945*, and the Polish–German textbook *Understanding History – Shaping the Future: The Polish–German Relationship 1933–1949*.
6. Daniel Rancour-Laferriere (2000: 129–31) shows examples of how this dichotomy functions in language and communication. He also recalls the example of the traditional Russian peasant bridal laments to show how this dichotomy was transferred into everyday life.
7. While describing the history of Russian culture in his book *Natasha's Dance*, Orlando Figes (2002) shows how Napoleon's Invasion in 1812 influenced a total shift in the mentality of the Russian aristocracy and intelligentsia from the Western model of life to concentration on their own, inner-Russian

values, which began to be the most important elements of the Russian identity.

8. According to Rancour-Laferriere (2000: 153), the image of the universal human was first propounded by Dostoyevskiy in his speech at the unveiling of the Pushkin monument in Moscow.

9. See the appendix for the list of all the museums visited, together with a short description of each.

10. In Dresden we talked to Roland Schwarz, the chief curator of the exhibition; in Warsaw we met Joanna Maldis (curator) and Maciej and Marek Mikulski (designers) of a new exhibition. In St Petersburg we talked to the guide who showed us the exhibition, and to Tatiana Mikhaylovna Shmakova, the manager of the branch of the city museum on Naberezhnaya.

11. In Dresden we met Tobias Krohn who showed us interesting movies about celebrations of the Bombing of Dresden and a Nazi demonstration in Dresden. In Warsaw, Dr Dariusz Gawin explained to us the core idea of the Warsaw Rising Museum, and Hanna Nowak-Radziejowska introduced us to the museum's cultural activities. In St Petersburg we talked to Tatiana Voronina, who described to us the project 'Pamyat' blokady' carried out by the European University in St Petersburg.

12. We refer here to the Hermann Lübbe's (1991) concept of 'musealisation', which means that the archival thinking is no longer confined within the museum, but concerns every zone of culture. This growing importance of historicism in contemporary culture has a great impact on sensibility of our times, and perception of time and space changes.