



Historical memory and the practice of commemoration in public space – mapping moral sentiments of opinion leaders

Basak Akkan & Jing Hiah

This Report was written within the framework of Work Package 4 “Political Advocacy & Media Discourses of Justice & Fairness



Funded by the Horizon 2020
Framework Programme of the European Union

Acknowledgements

The guidelines for the WP4.5 is developed by Dorota Lepianka and Jing Hiah. Dorota Lepianka has also contributed to the methodology section. We would like to express our thanks to Ayşe Buğra who has worked on the outline of the report. We would like to express our thanks to Trudie Knijn and Sara Araujo for the in-depth review of the first draft of this report.



Want to learn more about what we are working on?

Visit us at:

Website: <https://ethos-europe.eu>

Facebook: www.facebook.com/ethosjustice/

Blog: www.ethosjustice.wordpress.com

Twitter: www.twitter.com/ethosjustice

Hashtag: #ETHOSjustice

Youtube: www.youtube.com/ethosjustice

European Landscapes of Justice (web) app: <http://myjustice.eu/>

This publication has been produced with the financial support of the Horizon 2020 Framework Programme of the European Union. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Commission.

Copyright © 2019, ETHOS consortium – All rights reserved ETHOS project

The ETHOS project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 727112

About ETHOS

ETHOS - Towards a European Theory Of Justice and fairness, is a European Commission Horizon 2020 research project that seeks to provide building blocks for the development of an empirically informed European theory of justice and fairness. The project seeks to do so by:

- a) refining and deepening the knowledge on the European foundations of justice - both historically based and contemporary envisaged;
- b) enhancing awareness of mechanisms that impede the realisation of justice ideals as they are lived in contemporary Europe;
- c) advancing the understanding of the process of drawing and re-drawing of the boundaries of justice (fault lines); and
- d) providing guidance to politicians, policy makers, advocacies and other stakeholders on how to design and implement policies to reserve inequalities and prevent injustice.

ETHOS does not merely understand justice as an abstract moral ideal, that is universal and worth striving for. Rather, it is understood as a re-enacted and re-constructed "lived" experience. The experience is embedded in firm legal, political, moral, social, economic and cultural institutions that are geared to giving members of society what is their due.

In the ETHOS project, justice is studied as an interdependent relationship between the ideal of justice, and its real manifestation – as set in the highly complex institutions of modern European societies. The relationship between the normative and practical, the formal and informal, is acknowledged and critically assessed through a multi-disciplinary approach.

To enhance the formulation of an empirically-based theory of justice and fairness, ETHOS will explore the normative (ideal) underpinnings of justice and its practical realisation in four heuristically defined domains of justice - social justice, economic justice, political justice, and civil and symbolic justice. These domains are revealed in several spheres:

- a) philosophical and political tradition,
- b) legal framework,
- c) daily (bureaucratic) practice,
- d) current public debates, and
- e) the accounts of the vulnerable populations in six European countries (the Netherlands, the UK, Hungary, Austria, Portugal and Turkey).

The question of drawing boundaries and redrawing the fault-lines of justice permeates the entire investigation.

Alongside Utrecht University in the Netherlands who coordinate the project, five further research institutions cooperate. They are based in Austria (European Training and Research Centre for Human Rights and Democracy), Hungary (Central European University), Portugal (Centre for Social Studies), Turkey (Boğaziçi University), and the UK (University of Bristol). The research project lasts from January 2017 to December 2019

Executive Summary

This deliverable 4.5 explores moral dilemmas pertaining to justice and fairness in the context of historical memory and the practice of commemoration in Europe. The study provides knowledge on the moral justice views of stakeholders and opinion leaders from diverse political wings, backgrounds and identities in different country contexts by means of a cross-country vignette study. The study draws on the moral psychology of Kohlberg as a framework to analyse the moral dilemmas of opinion leaders with respect to recognitive and representative justice primarily. Historical memory and public commemoration are chosen as the focus of analysis to contemplate the moral justice views of opinion leaders.

The public commemoration practices could generate a narrative of a glorified past in the name of collective identity; consequently it could exclude the narrative of the ‘other’ whose ‘minoritised’ position in the society is a result of historical injustices that is part of that glorified past. Yet, historical memory generates debates on what actually is commemorated; whose narrative is included/excluded. Since accepting one historical narrative over another is likely to have profound consequences for a variety of justice-related claims; historical memory transpires not only as an important *context* of contemporary debates but also as one of the significant *battlefields* of justice. In this respect drawing on the diverse moral justice views of the opinion leaders in different country contexts as they elaborated in the country studies, the study explores the moral dilemmas with respect to historical memory and commemoration. By using an analytical frame of moral psychology, the aim here is to uncover how different moral views are justified within the contested politics of public commemoration practices.

The research in this study is designed as a vignette study where an evolving scenario is presented to a diverse group of opinion leaders with different/contrasting views in different country contexts. The study reflects on the following themes: ‘meaning of commemoration and selective historical memory’, ‘historical injustices and identity/political positions’, ‘historical responsibility in dealing with historical injustices’, ‘public space and inclusionary and exclusionary aspects of commemoration’, ‘representation and social consensus’; and discusses the moral dilemmas uncovered in the vignette study and their relevance for the current struggles for justice framed as recognition and representation within the politics of commemoration.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| <i>Executive Summary</i> | <i>iii</i> |
| <i>1. Introduction</i> | <i>5</i> |
| <i>2. Overview of national contexts that the vignettes are plotted</i> | <i>9</i> |
| <i>3. Analytical Frame</i> | <i>12</i> |
| <i>4. Methodology</i> | <i>15</i> |
| <i>5. Politics of commemoration and justice: What the vignette study tells us</i> | <i>19</i> |
| 5.1 Meaning of commemoration and selective historical memory..... | <i>21</i> |
| 5.2 Public commemoration and recognition of identities and political positions in society..... | <i>26</i> |
| 5.3 Historical Responsibility and Restorative Justice | <i>30</i> |
| 5.4 The Inclusionary/Exclusionary Aspects of Public Commemoration and Representation in the Public Space | <i>32</i> |
| 5.5 Representation in the debates over commemoration: Is social consensus possible? | <i>34</i> |
| <i>6. Conclusion: Reflections on moral dilemmas</i> | <i>37</i> |
| <i>Bibliography</i> | <i>41</i> |

1. Introduction

This deliverable 4.5 explores moral dilemmas pertaining to justice and fairness in the context of historical memory and the practice of commemoration in Europe. The study provides knowledge on the moral justice views of stakeholders and opinion leaders from diverse political wings, backgrounds and identities in different country contexts by means of a cross-country vignette study. The study draws on the moral psychology of Kohlberg as a framework to analyse the moral dilemmas of opinion leaders with respect to recognitive and representative justices predominantly. Historical memory and public commemoration are chosen as the focus of analysis to contemplate the moral justice views of opinion leaders. As it will be elaborated throughout the report, diverse views on historical memory and the practices of public commemoration reflect moral dilemmas on how the reflections of history define today's identity and ideological conflicts. The talk on commemoration and historical knowledge in different country context vividly demonstrate that selective representation of historical memory could be instrumentalized to justify moral justice views that pertain to the majority/minority positions and acts of belonging to the society. The ways and means of dealing with the colonial and imperial histories and historical injustices of the second world war provide insights to understand the diverse moral justice views in societies as the "imagined communities" of nations (See Benedict Anderson, 1983) is the major challenge for the construction of representative and recognitive justice for a cosmopolitan living in Europe.

In this respect, the study aims to explore the diverse moral dilemmas that pertain to selective historical memory and the politics of commemoration. As it has been demonstrated in previous empirical studies of ETHOS, injustices of recognition and representation vis-à-vis the majority/minority positions could be understood through the lens of history, especially a selective memory of history applied in the process of nation-building. Here, we take minority as a contested social category; since the historical minoritisation of different groups comes about within the national history of state formation (See: Anderson, Araújo, Brito, Ertan, Hiah, Knijn, Meier and Vivona 2018). It is often the 'politics' that reinforces the majority/minority positions and incites the anxieties and tensions generated by the selective memory of historical events and complex historical figures.

Certain historical events and episodes are selectively remembered by social and political actors thus giving priority to various versions of historical knowledge (Irwin-Zarecka, 2009). The

selective historical memory as such has drawn the inclusionary and exclusionary boundaries of commemoration in the European public spaces. A commemoration practice could generate a narrative of a glorified past in the name of collective identity; consequently it could exclude the narrative of the 'other' whose 'minoritised' position in the society is a result of historical injustices that is part of that glorified past. Thus, historical memory generates debates on what actually is commemorated; whose narrative is included/excluded. It is in the dilemmas of glorification and remembrance that moral justice comes to the fore. In our modern societies, where conflicts and tensions with respect to ethnic and religious/non-religious identities, or belief systems, are built on the historical injustices, historical memory is instrumental in constructing today's identities.

As the country cases in this study profoundly demonstrate; through a portrayal of a particular historical narrative, the practices of commemoration in the public space could shadow/silence other's narrative, often as a result of prevailing power relations inherent in the majority/minority positions in the society. Consolidation of a collective identity grounded in a 'hegemonic' national narrative that has recognition in the public space is predominantly achieved by silencing the 'other' (minoritized, victim of a war crime, colonized, etc.). Hence, the acknowledged compliance in the name of creating a collective identity indicates an 'otherization' process through silencing and denial of the perspective of the 'other' in the public space. Yet, the diverse practices of commemoration could also manifest a narrative of remembrance of historical injustices; in this case, remembrance of past traumas render a historical memory that belongs to the 'other'/minoritized; a memory that challenges the consolidated collective identity. Since accepting one historical narrative over another is likely to have profound consequences for a variety of justice-related claims; historical memory transpires not only as an important *context* of contemporary debates but also as one of the significant *battlefields* of justice (see Lepianka, 2018). In this respect that the selective memory of history and its relevance to identity and political positions in society are significant in understanding the moral sentiments and dilemmas around ideas of justices. The commemoration practice is a political endeavour undertaken in the name of creating a 'national' narrative for a collective identity; overcoming the traumas of the past crimes; or bringing back a glorified past. The way that the opinion leaders provide diverse moral reasoning for the purpose and configuration of commemoration manifests the dilemmas around the moral justice views.

By using an analytical frame of moral psychology, the aim here is to uncover the how different moral justice views are justified within the contested politics of public commemoration practices at several levels: 1) How do we commemorate?: Historical memory as glorified past in contrast to remembrance; 2) How do we remember?: Contentious historical figures/episodes presented as perpetrator /victim?; 3) How do we represent?: Commemoration in the public space: whose narrative is visible/invisible, voiced/silenced through the presence/non-presence in commemoration; 4) How do we deal with past? Historical responsibility for the historical injustices; 5) How do we reach to a consensus on commemoration? Dilemmas around social consensus: is consensus over commemoration even possible?

In the country studies, the historical memory of the colonial/ imperial past and the second world war have provided the historical contextualization of the majority/minority tensions and anxieties around recognition and representation in the public spaces within the countries as well as in ‘cosmopolitan’ Europe space. Although every country tells a distinct story of the politics of commemoration in the public space, the phenomenon of ‘Europeanization of memory and remembrance’ (see McDonald, 2013) offers a wider context to contemplate the contextualization of the historical injustices within European politics. While several writers refer to our times as ‘age of commemoration’, ‘age of memory’ (see Judt 2008; Kattago 2015), the question to be pursued: In Europe, is there a shared knowledge of dealing with history with its good and bad qualities? The selective historical memory in an age of commemoration is a strong means to serve the aims of political narratives that do not necessarily seek justice in the societies.

The country cases illustrate how selective historical memory is used to legitimize the current political narratives. In the United Kingdom, debates around commemoration have always focused on the second world war, relations with Europe and the British empire. Currently, the narrative of the country’s liberation from Europe and gaining back its imperial prominence, that recalls a particular historical memory, have dominated the Brexit talks. In the Netherlands, the dilemmas around the ambiguities of identity politics and social categorization in commemoration debates are discussed vis-à-vis the polarizing political climate where the incentives for dialogue to reach for solutions are losing their political appeal. The Austrian study refers to the emergence of a ‘collective remembrance culture’ that creates its commemorative symbols in surmounting the traumas of the second world war. The battles over ‘creating forms of remembrance’ (understood as remembrance of the victims of the war crimes) and ‘forgetting remembrance’ (which refers to leaving the past in the past) reflect tensions

inherent in overcoming the historical injustices of the second world war. The Hungarian study contemplates how a complex and contentious historical figure like Horthy's political imaginary that elicits the victimhood and perpetrator position of Hungary in second world war informs the political frictions in the current polarized political climate between the governing party of Fides and the far-right Jobbik on the one hand, and the liberal left, on the other. As the country study elaborates, the ruling party's attempts to create a collective identity around a historical memory of Hungarians' 'sufferings under German-Soviet occupation' are supported by symbolic commemoration practices. When selected historical injustices become a political tool to create collective memory; this paves the way to shadowing and silencing of justice claims of the 'other' (in the Hungarian case is the cosmopolitan opposition). Similar rhetoric is evident in the Turkish study, as the polarized politics between the secularists and Islamists (these categories are also contested) are reflected in the battles over commemoration in the public space. Hence, commemorating a controversial Ottoman Sultan like Yavuz Sultan Selim by naming the Third Bridge of Istanbul after him has resonances on today's majority/and minority positions and tensions with respect to 'fragmented' collective memory of a divided society along the lines of not just identities of the victims but also political positions of Republican-Secular and Neo-Ottoman-Islamist. The Portuguese study explores how an imaginary of an imperial past is utilized to define a national collective identity. The elements of an imperial imaginary of such collective identity of being Portuguese are of a multi-racial country with diversity that has brought progress to the colonized world. Such imaginary of a glorified imperial past is relevant in the context of the assumed absence of racism in the Portuguese society, or rather lack of acknowledgement that racism is a continued source of injustice.

The research in this study is designed as a vignette study where an evolving scenario is presented to a diverse group of opinion leaders with different/contrasting views in different country contexts. Along with the scenario, a series of questions were posed to the research participants so that the respondents could reflect on the scenario. Although the vignette is designed as a fictive scenario, it is based on real-life historical events, episodes or figures that the respondent could recall in their interviews. The country studies provide compelling debates on relevant themes that manifest moral dilemmas with respect to the role of selective historical memory and the commemorations practices in building the link between historical injustices and today's recognitive and representative justice claims. Firstly, we will provide an overview of the country contexts, and then elaborate on the analytical frame of politics of commemoration and its relevance to justice talk. In the fourth section the methodological framework of the study

will be presented and in the fifth sections, the analysis of the vignette study will be provided. The report reflects on the following themes ‘meaning of commemoration and selective historical memory’, ‘historical injustices and identity/political positions’, ‘historical responsibility in dealing with historical injustices’, ‘public space and inclusionary and exclusionary aspects of commemoration’, ‘representation and social consensus’. Finally, in relation to those themes, the report will discuss the moral dilemmas uncovered in the vignette study and their relevance for the current struggles for justice framed as recognition and representation within the politics of commemoration in the European public spaces. The deliverable study draws on the country reports:

- Anderson Bridget and Dupont Pier-Luc (2019). Imperial Reminders: Philosophies of commemoration among opinion leaders in Oxford.
- Hiah Jing and Lepianka Dorota (2019) Dutch Country Report for WP4.5
- Veres Judit (2019) Hungary Country Report for WP4.5
- Gomes Margarida, Biac Mara, Brito Laura, Meneses Maria Paula (2019) Portuguese Country Report-Recontextualizing History
- Meir Isabella, Tiefenbacher Wanda and Vivona Maddalena (2019) Commemoration in the Public Space: Mapping Moral Sentiments with a Historical Vignette in Austria
- Akkan Başak, Ruben Duygun, Serim Simla and Hışıl Oğuzhan (2019) Turkey Country Report for WP4.5

2. Overview of national contexts that the vignettes are plotted

The vignettes in the country studies are plotted in national contexts where the colonial and imperial pasts and second world war contextualize the tensions around majority/minority positions and ideological battles. The controversies around the perpetrator/victim myth are central in Austria and Hungary commemoration debates. The evolvement of ‘culture of remembrance’ with respect to the overcoming of the historical injustices of the second world war is a dominant theme in the context of Austria. In Hungary, the perpetrator/victim myth with regard to Hungary’s role in the Holocaust and the reflections of contrasting narratives on the public commemoration in a polarized political climate played a central role in commemoration debates. In Austria, the victim/hero narrative and “culture of commemorating the fallen” aftermath of the second world war have gradually paved their way to a narrative of perpetrators (alliances in Nazi crimes) and remembrance of the victims and then to a more toned form of

collective remembrance culture after the 1980s and 90s. Dealing with Hungary's role in the second world war crimes, the era is known as Horthy era (1920-1944) where Vice-Admiral Miklós Horthy was the regent of the restored Kingdom of Hungary was the focus in the Hungarian study. Horthy as a complex historical figure plays an important role in the political imaginary that also informs the existing political divisions. Orbán-government pays lip-service to antisemitism and remembrance of the Holocaust that is positioned in the context of Hungary's own sufferings under German and Soviet occupation as shown by a variety of symbolic, political acts and choice of advisors and historians in reinforcing the views propagated by the government. In Austria, the remembrance of the victims of the Third Reich (Jews, Roma and Sinti, LGBTI persons, persons with disabilities, and other 'deviants') who were silenced in the public commemoration have increased their presence in the commemoration activities. The visibility of commemoration for remembrance of the victims of the war crimes in the public sphere is an ongoing process. The 'stumbling blocks' (*Stöplersteine*) that were installed in Austrian cities, marking significant buildings or street names associated with victims of the war in the form of plaques inserted in the sidewalk is a good example of remembrance culture. Whereas, in Hungary, the victimhood of Hungary in the second world war is still a prevailing theme along with remembrance. The statue (crushing of Archangel Gabriel, symbolising Hungary, by Germany's imperial eagle) that was erected in Szabadság Square, Budapest is a monument that commemorates the memory of all the victims of the German occupation including the Hungarian Jews killed in the gas chambers, the soldiers who died on the battlefield, and the civilians who were killed by enemy fire as the victims of the Germans, thus relativizing, erasing and denying the responsibility and complicity of the Hungarian state and society in the extermination of its Jewish population.

In the UK, the Netherlands and Portugal the colonial empire and historical injustices that define today's majority-minority positions in the society are central themes. They have commonalities as well as differences in coming to terms with a colonial background but also second world war in the public commemoration practices. The Netherlands' involvement as a colonial power with the transatlantic slave trade and the second world war are central to commemoration practices and debates in the Netherlands. In the UK, debates around commemoration revolve around the British Empire and second world war with a particular focus on the relations with Europe. It is interesting to see that the melancholia of global empire and anxious politics of relations with Europe resonates in the politics of Brexit; since the Brexit context is instrumentalising the commemoration practices for a nationalistic discourse where anti-

migrant, racist and xenophobic sentiments are solidified. The Dutch case represents the debate on the need to confront “the truth” of the Dutch history of colonialism and slavery, demands for the re-interpretation of historical and cultural heritage, and necessity to re-evaluate some historical figures, and in particular the (state) actors whose heroism seems intertwined with perpetration of war crimes and/or acts of brutal violence. In the Dutch context, as a good example the debates that revolve around the (indirect) support of the figure of Michiel de Ruyter (a national and much beloved maritime hero considered one of the greatest admirals in his time) for slavery and war-fame won in fights over control of ‘trade routes’ to America and Surinam reflect the dilemma of commemorating the contentious historical figures.

In the UK study, the city of Oxford that the vignette is spotted has significance pertaining to imaginary of British Empire. Oxford as a city is intertwined with the colonial past as the city played a critical role in shaping the nature of the empire; it is also the site of a national campaign calling for decolonisation of education that again surfaces a moral dilemma of dealing with a contentious historical figure. Cecil Rhodes was a British imperialist and businessman who believed in the Anglo-Saxon ‘master race’ and Black Africans as a ‘subject race’. In 2015, the Rhodes Must Fall campaign has gathered more than 3,000 signatures demanding the removal of this statue; yet rejected as it meant also a loss of an estimated £100 million in donations to the University.

In Portugal, the representation and teaching of the colonial past have a predominant role in debates around commemoration. The political imaginary of the colonial past as the ‘golden era of prosperity’ emerges as the pride of a nation and as the main determinant of the features of the Portuguese collective identity. The representation of a heroic past is being reflected in the political intentions behind the Portugal of the Little Ones (Portugal Dos Pequenos) in Coimbra that is opened as a pedagogical and a recreational park; yet reference object for the great national empire. In such commemoration objects, the nation was conceived as a *multicontinent and multiracial* country (see Meneses et al, 2017). However, the relationship with the ‘other’ living in the colonies was always represented in a paternalistic way, accentuating the importance of the presence of the Portuguese in those colonies. The imperial imaginary in Portugal informs the contested Euro-centric politics of today. In Turkey, historical memory and commemoration have always been a contested area that has represented the identity and ideological conflicts in the society. The contrasted commemoration practices of a Republican era and an Ottoman past in the public sphere reflect how the two opposing groups in society

take political positions with references to selective historical memory. The acts of commemorations, in this respect, reflect several tensions with respect to today's identity and ideological conflicts; it is a political act in relation to the way it glorifies historical knowledge. The glorification of the Republican history and the founding fathers of Republic have been at the heart of the nation-building process of Turkey after collapse of an empire. Contesting the historical memory of the Republic, and addressing the injustices that they have lived through in the early years of the Republic; the Islamists are more concerned with the commemoration of the Ottoman past than the Republican history. Naming the third bridge that connects Europe and Anatolian sides after Yavuz Sultan Selim created lots of controversy among the Alevi Community in Turkey as the name reminds the historical sufferings for the Alevi community.

3. Analytical Frame

The politics of commemoration throughout the 19th and 20th century has served two objectives. One is the nation-building efforts that unite individuals around a shared glorified past. Here, the politics of commemoration pertains to the re-situating the historical knowledge that would serve the aims of nation-building through a selective memory of a glorified past; or shared victimhood that would also serve the collective purposes of state formation. Second is the remembrance of the historical injustices through the public recognition of the victims' narratives by putting the individual-witness at the spot of the remembrance objects.

The politics of public commemoration in this respect reflects the moral dilemmas of a glorification/ remembrance; perpetrator/victim; the responsibility for the history; representation and consolidating consensus that this deliverable report elaborates further. In understanding the moral dilemmas, the study explores the relationship between moral justice views and historical memory, and commemoration. Moral justice is about how individuals would justify their actions if placed in similar moral dilemmas. Exploring the moral justice views of the opinion leaders; the study refers to Kohlberg's (1981,1984) study on moral development which distinguishes 6 stages of moral reasoning: Stage 1 and 2 that belong to the Pre-Conventional level refers to a) how to avoid punishment orientation, b) self-interest orientation (what's in it for me?) Stages 3-6 belong to the Conventional Level. Stage 3 addresses interpersonal conformity the social norms and the good boy/girl attitude. Stage 4 addresses authority and

social-order maintaining orientation; law and order morality. Stage 5 addresses social contract orientation and Stage 6 addresses universal ethical principles.

Kohlberg's stages do not refer to specific belief systems, but to the underlying modes of reasoning where moral dilemmas appear. His stages of moral development are stages of 'justice reasoning' and such reasoning is the result of one's cognition (Wendorf et al. 2002); but also of one's ideological position. In this study, Kohlberg's theory provides an analytical framework to understand the moral dilemmas pertaining to history's role in understanding today's recognitive and representative justice views. The conflicting meanings (glorified past, heroic figure, perpetrator, victim, etc.) attributed to remembrance and commemoration is the reflection of diverse moral reasonings at different stages to legitimize moral justice views regarding; dealing with past traumas; silencing the narrative of the other or; giving a voice to justice claims. What is justified as accepted/non-accepted, included/excluded, silenced/heard are results of moral deliberation processes. Understanding moral dilemmas in this respect are important to uncover the recognitive and representative injustices in society.

The public commemoration in the name of state-formation that has selectively captured a historical event or a figure, by "*condensing the moral lessons learned from the past*", "[...] *intended to educate the population about the nation state's past victories, and to create a grand and imposing sense of shared history for a population being consolidated around the idea of the nation*" (Bickford and Sadora, 2016: 70). The public commemoration pursues 'conformity' in the name of nation-building (see Anderson and Dupont, 2019); and historical memory (with its good and evil sides) and complex historical figures (with their good and bad deeds) are purified in order to prevent the tensions and anxieties around the collective identity created as of the nation (Savage 1994 cited in Bickford and Sadora, 2016).

While the pursuits of politics of commemoration for a collective/ national narrative was a dominant theme, growing 'Europeanization of memory' also defined public commemoration practices in Europe (McDonald 2013). McDonald (2013: 4) refers to the idea of Europe as a 'memoryland'. The memory lands (monuments, museums, statues, etc.) dispersed around Europe pursue the thematisation of collective European memory. However, according to McDonald (2013) a plurality of 'memorylands' is required to hear the different voices and understand differences within various ways of performing history and memory. The meaning of commemoration, in this respect, changes with respect to its ability to include the narrative of the 'other'. The other could be a minoritised position that derives from misrecognition of an

ethnic/religious identity or non-representation of a particular interpretation of the history or a political view that contest the commemorated figure or event. What is important in the memorisation of Europe is not only the 'other' within the nation state but also the other in Europe that manifests itself in North-South and East-West divide.

Through time, in Europe and elsewhere, the politics of commemoration has gradually moved from 'state-formation' narratives to the 'individual experiences' narratives in the name of remembrance of the past traumas (Bickford and Sadora, 2016). The focus on the individual rather than the state is being indicated as the 'democratization in the politics of commemoration' as "*everyday individual is recognized as the worthy of commemoration*" (Bickford and Sodaro, 2016: 73). What defines the politics of commemoration in 'the age of memory' (Kattago, 2015) or 'age of commemoration' (Judt, 2008) is overcoming the traumas of the past.

The memory boom of our age according to Kattago (2015) is also related to the growing importance of 'the witness' of the past. Kattago (2015:9) argues that "the importance of the witness as a moral truth caller called into question the delicate relationship between historical truth, justice, aesthetic representation and political commemoration". Remembrance, and non-silencing the past through the testimony of the victim has been a dominant theme in today's commemoration practices. Maintaining a commemorative space for remembering the silenced victim in overcoming the crimes of the second world war or coming to terms with a colonial past emerge as significant aspects of the politics of commemoration in Europe. Thus, recognition of a witness who is speaking for the past is not independent of the power relations with respect to the hierarchical positions among the acclaimed victims and the (dominant) narratives of victimhood. Roma, LGBT and other victims have been excluded from the narratives of the victimhood of the war crimes for so long (see Meier et al. 2019). The Holocaust memorials around Europe that are dedicated to LGBT, Roma and Sinti victims of the war crimes act as platforms of shared victimhood to enact today's struggle for recognition.

The witness-hood intertwined with victimhood define the critical understanding of commemoration as identities and memories of traumas are closely linked. Gillis (1994:3) observes that both memory and identity are subjective phenomena, embedded in complex class, gender and power relations that determine what is remembered (or forgotten) by whom, and for what. Politics of commemoration in relation to a selective understanding of collective memory is a way of imposing a certain identity to other groups in society. Thus, the memorials,

monuments as other historical sites had the power to legitimize hegemonic discourses on what collective identity means (Foote and Azaryahu, 2007); yet it is important to recognize that they could also act as platforms for claims of recognitive and representative justice as it is observed in the victimhood narrative.

Furthermore, Gillis (1994) refers to the inscriptive nature of memory and identity, both of which inform ideological positions. The politics of commemoration reflect such ideological positions with respect to nation building and inclusionary and exclusionary boundaries of society. Public commemoration in this respect is a battlefield in the public space over the representation/visibility of the identities and ideological positions. “Fueling much of the analysis of memory is a recognition that the past—as we commemorate and identify with it—is a selective social and geographic construction. What memories are ultimately made visible (or invisible) on the landscape do not simply emerge out of thin air. Rather, they result directly from people’s commemorative decisions and actions as embedded within and constrained by particular socio-spatial conditions” (Rose-Redwood, Alderman, and Azaryahu, 2008: 161).

In this respect, the historical memory with its selective character has an inherent contradiction; although it belongs to the past, it serves today’s aims (Teski and Climo, 1995). Connecting present to the past through the commemoration practices informs the recognitive and representative injustices with respect to majority/minority positions. This has implications for a justice framework pertaining to the questions of remembrance, memory and commemoration. While the remembrance of the past is important for reconciliation of today’s tensions and conflicts, the legitimization of historical injustice through commemoration is a matter of misrecognition of justice claims of minority/vulnerable groups that have historical roots. In this respect that moral reasoning behind the selective understanding of memory and commemorative practices is important to analyse. The selective historical memory in many cases is utilized to legitimize a majoritarian position in the name of creating belonging to society; yet historical memory is also a matter of remembrance of the historical traumas. The moral sentiments in this respect embody dilemmas that are explored in this study.

4. Methodology

The study aims to uncover the moral justice views and sentiments of opinion leaders and other stakeholders on justice in the context of historical memory and the practice of commemoration in each of the participating countries. Under ‘opinion leaders’ we understand individuals or

organizations that have the ability to influence public opinion by putting forward new information, ideas and opinions, and spreading certain attitudes and moral sentiments; individuals who are trusted and respected in their communities, whose opinions might be considered representative for that group or community and who may also have the ability to bridge groups by having access to different audiences (see also Yu Wang 2017). In each of the participating countries seven to nine interviews were done with politicians, journalists, popular bloggers/vloggers, community leaders, architects, urban planners, policy makers, artists and intellectuals taking a stance on the issue. In each country, the researchers tried to reach a balance between interviewees representing different ideological and political positions. Not everywhere it was possible: whereas in Portugal, the reaching out to right-wing, conservative opinion leaders proved most challenging, in the Netherlands, the opinion leaders on the left-side of the political spectrum appeared difficult to reach. In each country a balance was also sought between respondents from various minority groups vs. majority.

In the Netherlands, research participants are:

- right-wing columnist,
- right-wing columnist of social media platform,
- right-wing historian,
- left wing local politician,
- architect with expertise on cultural/religious heritage projects (centre),
- project leader from an NGO on cultural heritage and commemoration for specific minority group (left);
- local level policy maker (centre),
- right wing journalist of newspaper and author,
- left wing author and phd fellow.

In the UK research participants are:

- theatre activist
- participant works for an arts organisation,
- vicar,
- university professor,
- political campaigner,
- student vlogger and social media activist

- councillor.

In Hungary, the research participants are:

- activist blogger,
- Jewish historian,
- Roma academic,
- artist,
- right-wing historian
- 2 documentary film makers,
- left wing public intellectual.

In Portugal, the research participants are:

- sociologist and art entrepreneur,
- art historian
- journalist,
- architect,
- 2 artists,
- artistic producer,
- rapper and journalist, blogger (amateur musician)

In Austria, the research participants are:

- university professor working on contemporary history and memory cultures in the German-speaking area
- artist who was involved in creating a monument for persecuted minorities in Austria
- sociologist and theatre pedagogue who deals with taboo topics through art in the public sphere
- representative of an organization dealing with commemoration culture in Austria,
- historian involved in a public debate about historically contentious street names in Austria,
- Roma representative,
- a young author who has been living in Austria for several years after fleeing from a war zone

In Turkey, the research participants are:

- Right wing conservative (religious-right) parliamentarian,
- Urban planner, activist,
- Conservative academic,
- Alevi activist, NGO(moderate),
- Representative of Alevi NGO,
- Journalist, founder of online media platform,
- Leader of a right-wing nationalist youth group,
- Book editor, art curator

Opinion leaders' views were collected by means of a fictitious vignette (or scenario) describing some projected developments related to the objects and/or forms of commemoration. The chief purpose of using a vignette during an interview is to provide entry points to explore complex research questions by 'selectively stimul[at]ing] elements of the research topic under study' (Hughes and Huby, 2002:383). Such a design allows to highlight issues 'which may normally be relatively unconsidered or perhaps even highly routinized' (Jenkins et al., 2010:179; Kandemir and Budd 2018). This usually requires constructing a fictive vignette or building into a vignette some hypothetical elements.

For the current study, researchers in each participating country were asked to draft a fictive scenario that would resonate with real-life debates and open up a meaningful discussion on tensions related to the issues of justice in the context of historical memory and commemoration. While researchers in the participating countries were free to adapt the meta-vignette to match the character of local and national debates on commemoration, each vignette was framed by efforts to reflect on the different types of claims related to: (1) recognition of pain/past harm of the ethnic/racial/religious groups and claims touching on restorative justice; (2) claims related to freedom of thought/speech/expression by different 'sides' of the controversy; (3) claims related to present day discrimination/racism faced by the minority members and/or present day consequences of their past oppression; (4) claims related to issues of redistribution and social class; (4) claims related to (ontological) security and/or fear of the Other; (5) attempts to diminish the role of history.

Our interviews followed a semi-structured format, in which readings of the various sections of the vignette altered with general questions designed to elicit views on the events described but

also their general opinions related to the historical memory, practice of commemoration and the social debates surrounding them. The current report constitutes a synthesis of the results obtained in each of the six countries participating in the ETHOS project. Special attention is given to themes, tropes and strands of the debate that recur in various contexts and regardless of the socio-political context of the debates and their historical embeddedness (Second World War in Austria and Hungary, history of colonial domination in the Netherlands, Portugal and the UK, history of Secular Republic and Ottoman Empire in Turkey). This means that the report does not constitute a complete overview of themes, claims and tensions uncovered in various countries, but rather a critical discussion of themes and issues that resonate in various countries despite all their peculiarities.

The study reflects on the country findings and a selection of recurrent themes and sub-themes. Once the themes were selected, relevant passages from the reports were repeatedly re-read to identify the various ideas about justice, its forms, substance as well as tensions it evokes. Attention was paid to similarities, complementarities and contradictions between the countries, discourses and actors involved. At the final stage, we selected quotes that would illustrate the various arguments and moral dilemmas uncovered. Analytical challenges encountered in the course of the analysis resembled those discussed in ETHOS Deliverable 4.2 (Lepianka 2018): the implicitness of justice in the debates analysed and the pitfalls of trying to understand ideas about justice via studying grievances; the entwinement of the various conceptions of justice in the real life debates; overcoming methodological and trying to find common vocabulary that would allow reflecting on the common and distinctive moral dilemmas.

5. Politics of commemoration and justice: What the vignette study tells us

The vignette study conducted in six country contexts provides a rich discussion on the relevance of historical memory and public commemoration in contemplating present claims and struggles for recognitive and representative justice in Europe. As it will be explored, the diverse moral justice views of the opinion leaders depicted in the vignette study reflect moral dilemmas around the ‘justice reasoning’ in the politics of commemoration. Such moral reasoning informs debates that revolve around the recognitive and representative justice in Europe. The contested politics of commemoration with its inclusionary/exclusionary aspects in different country contexts dwells on a selective historical memory of imperial/colonial pasts, and of the second world war. The ways and means of commemoration practices in dealing with historical knowledge have significance in the enactment of majority/ minority positions. The significance

attributed to a particular commemoration practice could be informed by one's religious, ethnic or other identities that are historically constructed. Yet, the tensions with regard to the place of commemoration and remembrance is not solely an identity matter but the political positions/ideological approaches define the debates around the meaning of commemoration as the country studies vividly demonstrate.

Public commemoration in Europe bears different meanings, depending on the socio-political contexts of the commemoration practices and the historical era they relate to. The historical time-period identifies the sentiments around the commemorated era or figure. Practices related to more recent historical events arise different emotions and controversies, partly because the memory of those events is more vivid and more readily available through eye-witnesses and participants. However, as it has been illustrated in the country cases; selective historical memory that belongs to a historical period that lost its witnesses could be recalled to serve the aims of a political establishment/ideology as we see in the talks of Brexit where Britain's global importance as a colonial power has dominated the talks (see Anderson and Dupont 2019). The Portugal of Little Ones that serves as a pedagogical park in Portugal aims to recall a political imaginary of imperial Portugal to construct a modern Portuguese identity (See Gomes et al. 2019) Whereas the memorial museums of Holocaust around Europe are designed in a way that appeals to the emotions of the visitors; the commemoration practice here aims to keep the sentiments about the war crimes alive as the war witnesses are vanishing.

As it is debated in the Dutch report, nobody is suggesting that slave trade is good, and 'Never again' is a publicly acclaimed belief in the European societies to prevent the war crimes happen again. Yet still the injustices as a result of historical minoritization processes with respect to majority/minority positions are evident that identify controversies around commemoration. For instance, in the Dutch context, the movements like 'decolonize our museum' argue for the consequences of the transatlantic slave trade on the racial inequalities in the Dutch society as "due to the history of oppression, until this day benefit the white Dutch population and disadvantaged the black Dutch population" (Hiah and Lepianka, 2019: 9). Whereas in the UK, according to the respondent who is a political campaigner, there is not enough anti-colonial discussion in the UK which would commemorate anti-colonial heroes rather than colonial masters; in this respect "*the celebration of the Empire reinforced by feeding into a broader White supremacist narrative*" (quoted in Anderson and Dupont 2019: 14) Debates around commemoration are shaped by the power position inherent in their majority-minority statuses,

and the perceived meaning of commemoration, often related to ideological or political positioning of those participating in the debates, which shape not only their attitude to history but also the way they perceive the relevance of history and historical knowledge in present-day struggles for justice.

Firstly, we will reflect on the following themes: ‘meaning of commemoration and selective historical memory’, ‘historical injustices and identity/political positions’, ‘historical responsibility in dealing with historical injustices’, ‘public space and inclusionary and exclusionary aspects of commemoration’, ‘representation and social consensus’. Secondly, we will discuss the moral dilemmas uncovered in the vignette study and their relevance to the current struggles for justice, in particular justice understood in terms of recognition and representation.

Each theme, as they are explored in the country studies, reflects on the moral sentiments that pertain to the question of whose story is more worthy to be represented through the politics of commemoration and on a shared narrative of historical injustices that would resonate to today’s claims of justice. As it is explored in the studied cases, the subjective notion of historical knowledge and selective historical memory are defining elements when we refer to collective group identities. The commemoration talk is an identity talk; yet it is a talk that pertains to the ideological positionings in society. While politics of commemoration determines inclusionary and exclusionary processes with respect to the recognition of multiple identities in society, the claims for ‘just’ representation of a historical event and figure or claims for remembrance of victims of the historical injustices, evoke questions of fair representation of different/diverging narratives in the public space.

5.1 Meaning of commemoration and selective historical memory

As it is elaborated in the analytical part, even if we assume that there is ‘objective’ historical knowledge, historical memory is always selective based on different interpretations of the historical knowledge. The prevailing narrative to build a national identity is a particular interpretation of historical knowledge. The respondents Mossora (rapper journalist and Catarina (artistic producer) in the Portuguese study point that the selective historical memory in Portugal creates a Portuguese imperial imaginary of a diverse multiracial country that brings education and civilization to the colonized (Gomes et al. 2019: 22).

A historical figure who is considered heroic for his/her good deeds, according to a particular historical interpretation, could be a symbol of historical injustice, according to another. In the Dutch case, the commemoration of Michiel de Ruyter is contemplated with respect to ‘condemnation for his involvement in colonial conquest’ in contrast to ‘praise for lack of his (direct) involvement in slave trade’, depending on the historical interpretation. As the respondent who is a historian reveals:

“Historians also often disagree. I can name a historian who would say that Michiel de Ruyter statue must go, because it is colonialism. But I can also mention a historian who says: Michiel de Ruyter is a man who has freed slaves, and he is still honoured by Hungarians, because he has freed Hungarian slaves. Michiel de Ruyter is one of the people that you can easily portray as a hero from the Golden Age, because he himself never had any slave ships, et cetera. Where another historian will say: but he has saved the Republic, and that Republic has also caused slavery” (quoted in Hiah and Lepianka 2019:22).

The interpretation mainly gets meaning in the current historical constellation. What one can say here is that the slave trade is nowadays condemned, while its results (the Golden Age) is still celebrated. This ambivalence is represented in the commemoration of de Ruyter. The different perspectives on the commemorated historical figures/events are also an illustration of how one chooses to recall a historical memory in generating a collective narrative. This is being illustrated by how different groups in the society reflect on a selective memory of a historical event to create a narrative of their own. Such symbolic representation of historical memory has different meanings to different collectivities in society. As observed by the university professor in UK study: “[...]What means nothing to one group of people means a lot to another” (quoted in Anderson and Dupont, 2019:20).

How we commemorate selective historical memory? emerges as a question to understand the moral sentiments around the commemorated figure or an episode. In the Austrian case, ‘the heroic remembrance of the second world war soldiers’ aftermath of the war illustrates how a selective memory of history that is glorified through the commemoration practice is being used to generate a collective narrative of history. The meaning attached to the commemoration practices/objects pertains to the sentiments of different groups in society along the lines of perpetrator/victim. In Hungary, for instance, Horthy is regarded by some as a great statesman who re-instituted Great Hungary, while others see him as a Nazi collaborator, responsible for

the death of around half a million Jews, who were deported from Hungary under his administration. As amply illustrated in the Turkish case, Yavuz Sultan Selim could be the ‘glorified ancestor’ for the majority (they could be aware/unaware of the deeds under his reign); yet, a proclaimed perpetrator of violent crimes for the Alevi community. As the Turkish respondent who is an urban planner and liberal-minded activist reveals that

“It depends where you look from. Glorified ancestry (Ecdad) discourse does not mean the same for many people. There is a group of people who tremble from excitement when they talk about the Ottoman ancestry. These are all related to one’s political view and religious identity” (quoted in Akkan et al. 2019:10).

The different/ contrasting sentiments and views towards commemoration contest the shared historical memory and the collective remembrance of a society. Thus, such controversy around the contentious historical figures (the glorified historical figure for some; yet a perpetrator for the other) represents the moral dilemma of how the present connects to the past. A strong narrative of a glorified past could shadow the remembrance of the victim. In this respect, ‘how we commemorate’ emerges as a moral question concerning the tensions between glorification/remembrance of past with good and bad deeds. Austrian case demonstrates remembrance and commemoration depends on how people re-tell ‘the story’: *“Deciding on what to commemorate and in which form becomes difficult when considering different stories nested in historical events”* (Meier et al., 2019: 13). In this respect, a deliberation process is needed to address different stories nested in historical events.

Historical knowledge has both negative and positive aspects. Therefore, the ways (glorification/remembrance) that the ‘good/evil’ and ‘victim/perpetrator’ are represented in public commemoration pertains to the question of normativity. The respondents in the UK study agree on *“the difficulties of drawing normative conclusions on complex personal and historical trajectories, including those intertwined with colonialism”* (Anderson and Dupont, 2019: 17). The respondent who is a councillor suggests: *“you can commemorate the good things for celebration and the bad ones for not repeating them”* (quoted in Anderson and Dupont, 2019: 17). Pointing out the notion of glory that floats around the concept of commemoration, the vicar in the UK study proposed to replace it with the idea of ‘reminders’ of the past which would include *“things that have not been very nice and you ought to think about them”* (quoted in Anderson and Dupont, 2019: 17). History with its negative and positive aspects could be present as reminders in commemoration practices. Thus, the way that the commemoration

practices ties past to present has relevance on the normative core of society. The local politician in the Dutch study points: *“For example when I look at the commemoration of the Soah and the death of 6 million people, it is not just that we commemorate those 6 million people; but dehumanization system, that it should never happen again. So in that sense you should remember principles. [...] So commemorating is not just about people, it is about principles”* (quoted in Hiah and Lepianka, 2019: 24). Such moral reasoning behind practices of commemoration needs an inclusive space where the narrative of the ‘other’, the narrative of the ‘dehumanized’ is included. While the commemoration of contentious historical figures could be justified as remembering the history with its good and bad sides; it embodies a moral dilemma as such figures are also symbols of cultural hegemony (see Hiah and Lepianka, 2019:37); or hegemony of post-colonialism (see Gomes et al. 2019).

Hence, the politics of commemoration built on a selective historical memory has a pitfall of excluding the narrative of the “other”, isolate certain voices along the lines of glorification/remembrance. A demand for re-telling the story from the perspective of the victim as a way of remembrance is a claim for justice, a claim for recognition of the silenced ‘other’ lost in the hegemonic politics of commemoration as it is observed in cases of Portugal and Netherlands. Important here is not only the need to recognize the suffering of specific groups through commemoration understood as remembrance, but also to acknowledge the credibility of their testimony and/or legitimacy of their claims to knowledge. Such claims can be properly understood only through the lens of epistemic justice or cognitive justice.

Epistemic injustice is usually evoked to describe “those forms of unfair treatment that relate to issues of knowledge, understanding and participation in communicative practices” (Kidd et al., 2017: 1). According to Fricker (2007; 2013; 2017), epistemic injustice may take the form of ‘testimonial injustice’, for example, when someone's knowledge and/or credibility is ignored, rejected as false, treated as less relevant, or deflated because that person is a member of a particular social group; or ‘hermeneutical injustice’, when someone's experience cannot be rendered intelligible (by them or by others) because of the unavailability of sufficiently shared concepts that could adequately identify or explain that experience or because of the style of communication. Regardless of the specific definition or form, epistemic injustice is believed to be generated by stereotypes and prejudices about marginalised groups and a derivate of unequal power relations. As such it is closely related to ‘cognitive injustice’ that touched on the non-

recognition of “*those others form of knowing and experience of the world, especially knowledge that have been marginalized and subalternized*” (Meneses, 2009 quoted in Gomes et al 2019).

The re-telling of the story from the perspective of the unacknowledged victim is a way to respond to the tensions on the prevalence of one history over the other. Commemorating the victims of the Nazi crimes, including the unacknowledged victims like Roma, LGBT and disabled people emerges as a form of remembrance to come to terms with the war crimes in Austria. The war experience of a respondent in Austria manifests that “historical events should not be covered in silence” (Meier et al, 2019:18). Remembering the victim is very relevant for taking the responsibility of the past injustices and preventing them to happen again. “Never again” is a strong theme in the evolving culture of remembrance in Austria as elsewhere in Europe. The Portuguese study refers to commemorating the “silenced” in a celebrative manner, that could be a way to resist/ overcome the hegemony of (post-)colonialism. As the respondent (rapper, journalist) in the Portuguese study reveals:

"I think we have to celebrate the resistance icons. Celebrate Zumbi dos Palmares [legendary Brazilian black hero and freedom fighter. He fought for the independent kingdom of Palmares, a kingdom founded in the seventeenth century by slaves' insurgents in the north-eastern Brazil] the day of the black conscience, Rosa Luxemburg, etc. Celebrate who fought against the perpetuation of these forms of oppression. Here in Coimbra, we should celebrate the struggles to end the fascist regime and also the struggle to end the colonization. For example, the 'House of Students of the Empire' could be the stage to debate joint strategies. (...) The celebration should be done with debates, marches, artistic events that bring a new perspective but a perspective that takes into account the ancestral knowledge that was decimated (...) which is a huge wealth. So, I think we should celebrate much of what is silenced" (Gomes et al. 2019: 20).

The politics of commemoration based on a selective historical memory could emerge as a battleground for the recognition of the silenced historical narratives that pertains to majority /minority positions in a particular context. The historical memory of colonialism and the moral justice views around it, in this respect, are convincing narratives to problematize the fault lines of public commemoration.

5.2 Public commemoration and recognition of identities and political positions in society

In our modern societies, where conflicts and tensions with respect to ethnic and religious/non-religious identities, or belief systems are results of historical injustices; historical memory becomes instrumental in constructing today's identities. If commemoration is a battleground for recognitive justice, how are the identities, majority/minority positions, political ideas/positions manifested in the politics of commemoration? According to many of the opinion leaders interviewed, the selectivity of historical memory and persistent attempts to construct an ambivalent, usually one-sided, narrative can only be understood in the light of processes of (collective) identity formation and identity struggles. Just like the attempts of the (ethnic/religious) majority to delimit the scope of collective memory by framing it around some collectively important historical events is a part of the construction of a coherent, uniform 'national' identity, the historical grievances of specific minorities serve the purpose of constructing their own group identity, often in opposition to the majority. A close relationship between one's identity and the experiences of their ancestors is stressed by a respondent (representative of an organization dealing with commemoration culture) in Austria study:

“I believe that it is very relevant, also if you have not experienced this time personally, you are shaped by the experiences of your family, or even if you don't have any direct experience in your family, you are shaped from what happened in your own community. (...) yes, I believe that one is not really free to decide: you are directly or indirectly shaped, whether you want it or not” (quoted in Meier et al., 2019:22)

The case of Turkey demonstrates how in a polarized society historical memory can become fragmented along the lines of ethnicity or religion, depending on the subjective positioning of individuals and groups. As the respondent (representative of Alevi organization) reveals:

“Everything that is lived in this land, is experienced through an ethnicity or belief, all the good things and the bad things. We do not have collective memory that binds together as a nation. In order to have collective memory, we need to confront the historical events. If we cannot confront our past, we cannot have a collective memory. In country like Turkey where 4-5 belief systems exist, it is not easy to have a collective memory. Only if we discuss these together we could have a collective memory. Alevi

have their own collective memory, Sunni have their own, Armenian, Greeks have their own. Therefore to make our memories collective, we need to think of other ways” (quoted in Akkan et al., 2019:10).

In Hungary, the fragmented memory of the second world war is interpreted not only as a derivative of a fragmented society, but also, or predominantly, in terms of an absence of a shared narrative: *With respect to the Holocaust, there is no clear recognition yet of who the perpetrators were in the first place and what varying roles they played, and who the various victims were”* (Veres, 2019: 8). This is a major issue for moral justice as the victim position is justified to make the perpetrator position irrelevant.

In contexts where specific commemoration practices revolve around remembrance of (past) victimhood, the recognition of the identity of the victim has an effect on the nature of commemoration. In Austria, *“Commemoration is related to the identities of victims and their recognition and representation. Identity plays also a strong role, when it comes to the design of commemorative practices”* (Meier et al, 2019: 22). Building a link between the identity of the victim and the victim’s collective experiences of historical injustices creates a narrative of victimhood that might be transferred from one generation to another. In the Netherlands, the example of the Dutch famine in the final years of the second world war (1944-45) was discussed by one of the respondents to explain the continuity of Dutch food sharing habits and, at the same time, to illustrate how the trauma of victimhood is passed from one generation to the other (Hiah and Lepianka, 2019: 28). On one hand, victimhood based on a shared experience of injustices creates a collective identity that defines the claims for public recognition like in the case of the victims of Holocaust with different identities; yet a shared experience of a war crime. On the other hand, the narrative of victimhood could be exclusionary/ disempowering for individual members of the victimized group. Remembrance of the historical justices is important for non-silencing the narrative of the ‘minoritized yet enfolded’ into victimhood story and envisioning restorative justice through a story of victimhood also evokes a moral dilemma. Including the heroes of the ‘colonized’ in public commemoration in a glorified/celebrated way is revealed both in Portuguese (see the discussion in the previous section) and Dutch cases to overcome the disempowering position of victimhood. According to the Dutch respondent (author), the disempowerment of victim, narrated within a victimhood story, could be overcome by the glorified public commemoration of the heroes of the oppressed:

“But if the masses acknowledge that the wealth of the Netherlands has certainly been at the expense of something, then you can also proceed to celebrating the power and resilience of the oppressed peoples. And then there is much more space for heroes who really should get that place, people like Anton de Kom, a black resistance hero who died for the Netherlands. He has everything in his biography that can make him one of our national heroes” (quoted in Hiah and Lepianka, 2019: 31).

Whose story is worthy of commemorating is a matter of recognitive and representative justices to the extent that politics commemoration is inclusive of the stories of the ‘minoritized’. As it is being reflected in the studies, the role of identities pertaining to the victim position in commemoration choices are important to build the links between selective historical memory and today’s identity-based justice claims for recognition. The collective identities are entangled not only with ethnic, religious, majority/minority positions and/or identities of past heroism vs. victimhood, but also with political positions (see also previous Ethos reports D4.1, D4.2 and D 5.2).

The country studies on Turkey and Hungary address the instrumentalisation of a selective historical memory with respect to the interests of current ideological tensions. This is manifested in the secular/Islamist polarization of Turkey, or nationalist/cosmopolitan divides in Hungary. In the Turkish case the, selective historical memory of the glorified Ottoman past in contrast to Republic values, and in the Hungarian case, the selective historical memory of Hungary as the victim of the German occupation are used as ideological instruments by the political powers for maintaining a divided politics of commemoration. The mythos of historical memory created by such politics is a strong ideological tool along the lines of conflicting values and political positions in today’s divided societies. This concern is also present in the Netherlands, where most respondents drew attention to the manner in which debates around commemoration have become politicized along the lines of identity and where the perceived victimisation of the “silent majority”, may eventually undermine the minority claims to historical memory and commemoration. As argued by the columnist interviewed:

“Well, that [identity and Dutch culture] is made important. I think nobody concerns themselves about [Dutch identity] in everyday life. But it has become an argument in a discussion and so it exists. You can say very little about it based on this case. But the fact is that in the imagination of people policymakers listen less to minority groups than to majority, native Dutch, is I believe a big problem. People do not feel seen and

are misunderstood and have the impression that a great deal is being given to people from other minority groups. That pinches, that pinches. So, I think you should give all those people the idea that they also count. And I think these people have the idea that they do not count (quoted in Hiah and Lepianka, 2019: 16).

The temporality of the historical episodes and their relevance to today's identity positions and justice struggles is another matter where conflicting moral justice views are deliberated in the country studies. The irrelevance/relevance of the episodes of history to today's conflicts and tensions embodies moral dilemmas of how we selectively make the history relevant to today's politics of commemoration. In the UK study, as the respondent's comment is being elaborated, "the university professor noted that the loss of meaning that comes with temporal distance may actually make painful events easier to remember as the emotions that they evoke become attenuated" (Anderson and Dupont, 2019: 21) On the other hand, the artistic and social media activists "warned against the use of chronological time as a measure of relevance" (Anderson and Dupont, 2019: 21) Some respondents in the Dutch study emphasized the temporality of claims to problematize the historical responsibility of the government. The respondent (columnist of the rightist social media platform) argues that "we cannot put responsibility on the current generation for something caused by previous generations and especially not because contemporary Dutch people do not normatively agree with what has happened in the past" (Hiah and Lepianka, 2019: 28) Hence, as the Dutch report points out, not many respondents draw a link with the colonial past with today's injustices/structural inequalities. Whereas in the Austrian case, none of the respondents argued that the past should stay in the past; there is a strong belief for historical responsibility the present is connected strongly to the past (Meier et al 2019: 17)

In the Turkish case, leaving the past behind, and embracing the historical figures both of the Ottoman and Republic past is an approach that is defended mostly by the right-wing groups, as the "Turkishness" and being member of a Turkish nationality without the expression of different identities is perceived as a melting pot for such ideology. Hence, the moral dilemma of such approach is that embracing of history emerges as a way of misrecognition of different identities that could have conflicting justice claims in the society. As the respondent reveal (leader of right -wing youth group):

“ These[historical conflicts] are not their [depicted figured in the vignette] problems, these were the problems of their ancestors. Because their ancestors had a fight, does not mean that we will fight today. As our leader says, Yavuz Sultan Selim belongs to us, Şah İsmail belongs to us. Both of them were Turks with their good and bad parts.(hatası sevabıyla) Can we say that? Today, there are two views in Turkey, one starts the history by 1299, says we are the Ottomans (without any reference to earlier empires) One view says I am the continuation of Ottoman Empire, Fatih is my ancestor, I do not recognize Republic and Atatürk, secularism is ateism. Furkan [the character in the vignette] represents such political view. Cem [the character in the vignette] and other people who think like him say that I do not recognize Ottomans that represent monarchy, slavery, religiosity, we are the children of the Republic, we take 1923 as our historical starting point. They do not have any ties with the Ottoman Empire for 90-95 years. What we are saying is that all those Turkish emperors, states till today, they all belong to us. Atatürk belongs to us, Albulhamit belongs to us...” (quoted in Akkan et al. 2019:12)

Therefore, as the country cases demonstrate making history irrelevant/relevant is a major dilemma in building the connection of present to past. Historical episodes in today’s injustices are justified/reasoned by the temporal distance with the past and it should be kept as it is. The moral dilemma here is the misrecognition of the relevance of historical episodes in today’s struggles for justice.

5.3 Historical responsibility and restorative justice

The normative understanding of good/adequate commemoration of the past as a practice of remembrance evokes the question of historical responsibility: Should we as individuals feel responsible for the historical injustices? What is the role of collective responsibility for the harms of the past? Such questions evolved in the country studies regarding the role of commemoration in remembering the past; but also, pertaining to the limitations the restoration in responding to the historical injustices.

The idea that individuals are not responsible or should not feel guilty of the harms inflicted in the past by members of the collectivity (nation) they belong to prevails among the opinion leaders in all countries studied. At the same time, the idea of historical responsibility emerges as an important component of restorative justice, given that the continued relevance of the

historical injustices, present for example in contemporary practices of “othering” and discrimination as the Portuguese report stresses: *“The idea of “guilt” and accountability doesn’t make sense if all has ended. It’s the past. And we are not guilty for what happened in the past. The problem is that it’s not really a question of “guilt” or “past”, but rather how it continues to “reinforce” a Eurocentric and racist view of the “other”* (quoted in Gomes et al., 2019: 25).

Accepting historical responsibility can thus take a form of rejecting the idea of shared historical memory and the reopening of the history to those who are currently excluded from such shared historical memory. As the Portuguese respondent (rapper and journalist) reveals:

“[...]Only if we open up we can understand its deep knowledge. And historical responsibility is the responsibility to tell the history of what really happened so that we can build identities, self-conscious people of themselves and of all the damage they have done” (quoted in Gomes et al, 2019: 18).

Here, historical responsibility is understood as a call for more inclusive writing of history that accommodates the voice and narrative of the denied from the historical memory. While such an inclusive approach is maintained on the grounds of historical responsibility towards the ‘other’, it is also endorsed as a way of “learning from the past, coming to terms with the past”, not only for here and now, but only for the future as the Austrian report stresses *“taking responsibility for what has happened in the past, at least for those generations that were not directly involved, means to remember and learn from the past”* (Meier et al., 2019: 17).

In the Netherlands, the idea of redressing/ restoration is deliberated in the context of financial compensation. While the idea of financial compensation is not unanimously rejected - some respondents discuss, for example, the possibility of financial compensation for the now independent ex-colonies and/or the need of some form of affirmative action for the Dutch citizens who suffer racial discrimination as continuation of a colonial past -, recognition seems to be valued more as restoration than any form of financial redress.

In this sense, recognition of narratives of those who are otherized/minoritized; and re-telling the history from the perspective of the ‘other’ are presented as ways of handling historical responsibility and restoration in the country studies.

5.4 The inclusionary/exclusionary aspects of public commemoration and representation in the public space

What does public commemoration tell us about the representation of majority/minority positions; multiple identities; divergent political position in the public space, and what does it say about moral justice? The performances of commemoration like monuments, statues, the remembrance museums, the naming of streets pave the way to an idea and arrangement of urban space that includes certain kind of historical memory and denies the other. If we consider public commemoration in the urban space as a way of storytelling about the historical events or figures; the perspective of storytelling, and the selective representation of historical figures in public commemoration are important for the inclusive/exclusive aspects of commemoration.

The boundaries of inclusion/exclusion pertaining to the collective memory of the urban space manifest the injustices of representation of the historical memory of the ‘other’ in the public space. As it is revealed in the Turkish study, Alevi’s non-representation in the city memory reflects such exclusion according to the Alevi activist: *“The old part of Istanbul preserves the history. The Muslim, the Jews, the Christians have a historical presence there, only Alevi do not have any historical presence in the old town. This is a problem. Alevi society has been part of that history for 1400 years, but do not have any representation”* (quoted in Akkan et al.,2019:18).

Even seemingly non-discriminatory forms of commemoration could become a symbol of cultural hegemony in the public space and transpire exclusionary processes. This is well illustrated by a quote of Dutch study (Hiah and Lepianka: 2019: 37): *“racism is not so much about intent, but it is about cultural hegemony, and can therefore be very unintentional. Within this latter perspective, the statue of de Ruyter, while it is not intended to harm others, be considered a symbol of this cultural hegemony”*. The Austrian report also points to the hegemonic character of the public space that is governed by power relations. Whose story is worth of commemoration is a political decision that would either includes or excludes claims and societal demands. This emerges as a moral dilemma to be solved as it contemplates the diversity of moral views on the commemorated figures.

Inclusive politics of commemoration, that is sensitive to different perspectives and the multiplicity of historical knowledge, is often suggested to overcome the recognitive and representative injustices. Then, what does it entail to include the other perspective/ historical

memory of the ‘other’ in the practice of commemoration in the urban space? The deliberation in the public space is suggested as one way of including different voices on the commemorated historical figure or event. Artists’ role in the deliberation of different views and positions is being brought up in the Netherlands, Austria and UK studies:

“Refurbishing the park in such a way that it is a nice place for residents to play with their children and contextualize the statue. And not so much with a placard, or a change in the text of the placard. But by setting up an equally impressive statue that would illuminate the matter from a different perspective. That would also be wonderfully interesting from an artistic perspective. If you ask a contemporary artist to reflect on the statue of Michiel de Ruyter, and thereby reflect on history, and give him as much space as Michiel de Ruyter now has. Then you get a combination of art, contemporary art and somewhat older art. But you also get a combination of perspectives on history. [...] You know, art is the reason why Michiel de Ruyter was once founded, the statue, to ‘lift you up’, to excite you, to paint you a kind of image that you want to believe in” (quoted in Hiah and Lepianka, 2019:21)

The different views of the participants in the UK provide a vivid depiction of contestation of representing different views through different means in the public space like “the possibility and desirability of altering the meaning of Mountbatten’s statue by modifying or adding to the accompanying inscription”: Conveying competing views through different means are proposed by the respondents like theatre activist, university professor and the councillor. For the theatre activist, *“the original inscription should be maintained as it conveyed the reasons why it was originally designed, but additional information could be made available elsewhere (e.g. mobile apps). For instance, videos could feature a number of people discussing the meaning Mountbatten takes on for them”*. The councillor proposed that *“the diversity of views, especially most diametrically opposed ones, could be captured through a diversity of plaques”*, yet the professor thought that *“this could trigger a proliferation of competing statements”* (quoted in Anderson and Dupont, 2019: 22).

As the Austrian country report highlights the public space has a controversial character that is shaped by the political decisions and choices of who should be commemorated or not. Here, again the deliberation in the public space is crucial to include all voices in the representation of historical memory through commemoration objects: *“Interviewee thus highlight the importance*

of voicing one's discontent: public space thus becomes also an arena to which those who feel underrepresented can turn to voice their claims” (Maier et al, 2019: 26).

Although there is agreement among the respondents that different views should be represented to overcome the moral dilemmas of ‘whose story is worth telling in the public space’, the way that the diverse views are represented around a practice of commemoration still is a contentious issue. What are the limits of diversity and the means of expressing the diverse views on historical memory? Are the suggested plaques or artistic expressions enough to re-tell a story? Such questions lead one to ask is social consensus over commemoration possible?

5.5 Representation in the debates over commemoration: Is social consensus possible?

The channel of representation in the debates over commemoration is an important aspect to understand the consensus-building processes in society. The acceptable/nonacceptable ways of representation in dealing with the tensions and controversies in the commemorative practices are elaborated in the country reports. In the Austrian report, controversies around voting as an acceptable way of representation. Here the majority/minority positions and power struggles are discussed with regard to the injustices of representation when voting is used as a way of solving moral dilemmas as the respondent (a young author who has been living in Austria for several years after fleeing from a war zone) reveals “*No, I would not let them vote, (...) because it is always the majority who wins and for me this is also not just, it is not necessarily just what the majority says, it should not have to be. Therefore voting, although it is seen as a democratic choice, to me does not voice justice” (Meier et al, 2019:27)*

The Turkish study points to the exclusionary character of representation channels with regard to the majority/minority positions. Although the Alevi NGOs have protested against the naming of the third bridge after Yavuz Sultan Selim (YSS), it has not found a listening ear in the political circles. Civil disobedience in the form of not using the YSS bridge that commemorates the perpetrator of crimes against Alevi is suggested as a way of protesting the decisions, when channels of political representation are exhausted.

“There is the third bridge YSS, despite Alevi's rejection it was named after the Ottoman reign. I have used it once because I had to use, not my preference to use it. We have

the right to protest and not use them. There could be demonstrations, protests. But we could also protest it by not using it. I would choose not to use this bridge named after YVV for instance, I would get in more traffic rather than using it” (Alevi activist quoted in Akkan et al. 2019:22).

Also in other countries, the opinion leaders interviewed noted the powerful role of public protests in illuminating the current sentiments of the population. The UK report refers to the ‘symbolic representation’ of different forms of aesthetic and peaceful protests that are acceptable ways of participating in the debates over commemoration. The UK report observes that: “[...] participants conceived protests not only as argumentative but also an aesthetic activity which could mobilize persuasive strategies such as provocation, humour, disruption and aesthetic dis(pleasure)” (Anderson and Dupont, 2019: 30).

The importance of building/reaching a consensus to overcome moral dilemmas is a theme that is elaborated in the narratives of vignettes in all country contexts. The political spectrum that one represents could be determinant on how we reach decisions, the ways of deliberation in decisions on commemoration. The Netherlands case vividly demonstrates that respondents from right wing could call for more authoritarian governance, for the reason that they either do not believe that silent majority are taken seriously, or that they find that Dutch local politics can benefit from more decisive governance on the decision on commemoration; respondents on the left of the political spectrum have a very different opinion, valuing an open and democratic process of deliberation, where different voices are heard. Furthermore, they don’t only value the hearing of diverse voices, but consider that decision making bodies should also be diverse themselves – thus linking recognition with representation. In any case, reaching ‘consensus’ is a priority for opinion leaders from different political spectrums;

“Ultimately, we have to go on, here in society. We have to live together and really listen and be open to each other. Really keep looking for that common ground on all levels. Because if you don't do that, then [you will] fight, it will become a battle. But if you go into battle, but with a predetermined goal to achieve common ground, then my hope is that all parties with different starting points will engage in that conversation. They then do not start the conversation of "I want my way and nothing else". No, okay, we have money, we're going to do something here. We have to find a common ground. We have to go there (quoted in Hiah and Lepianka, 2019: 34).

In the Turkish study, the importance of taking the consent of the people in the process of commemoration in the urban space has been brought up in the interviews. The act of consent is presented as a metric of legitimization of certain decisions on commemoration. Taking the consent does not necessarily refer to a deliberation process for right-wing groups where the diverse views have an equal stand; here the intension is to influence the ‘other’ (impose a view in a way) to legitimize a particular political decision. The idea of consent as it is suggested by the respondent (right wing professor) is a contested idea as the priority is not a deliberation process that would lead to consensus; but an effort to take the consent of the ‘other’ to legitimize a decision that is not necessarily is a ‘just’ decision for the ‘other’. According to the respondent (right wing professor), it is not possible to measure justice and/or to decide on what is a fair decision. Informing people and getting their consent for the decision is a way to solve a conflict:

“Because taking the consent of the people and then make things is the essence of your legitimization. You cannot measure justice, therefore it’s metric/standard is consent. For instance, a municipality had reached a decision about a site. If you take the consent of the residents, if you inform them there is no problem. If people get bothered, it will turn into resistance. Justice has one dimension that is consent, if people give consent, they do not have any suspicion about justice”. (quoted in Akkan et al 2019:22)

On the contrary respondents that come from a liberal-left background suggested a deliberative process although the difficulty of it is expressed in a polarized political climate like Turkey.

The Austrian report points to the “constructive dialogue” as the essence of reaching a consensus: *“Out of compromise, dialogue maybe, yes. In any case, [it would be] from a concept successfully worked out by the partners. To say it differently, justice lies in the dialogical collaboration of these positions”* (quoted in Meier et al. 2019: 28).

Furthermore, in the country studies, the question of who should be represented in the decision-making processes on commemoration came up frequently; the experts’ (historians, urban planners, etc.) role in the decisions over commemoration is also suggested as a way to reach to acceptable decisions. The respondent in the Hungarian study reveals that *“a remembrance committee could be set up where scientist, historians, artists reach a consensus about what to put up for public debate”* (quoted in Veres 2019: 11)

The forms of representation as it is being reflected in the responses in the country reports recalling the question of the intentions. Are we aiming in reaching a consensus on a commemoration practice or are we aiming to challenge the prevalent politics of commemoration?

6. Conclusion: Reflections on the moral dilemmas

As it is being explored in the previous section, this deliverable contemplates the moral justice views of a diverse group of opinion leaders in different country contexts vis-à-vis the politics of commemoration in European public spaces. Through an exploration of the divergent and common views provided by the opinion leaders (with different identities, occupations, political positions, etc.) on the meaning of public commemoration in different country contexts, the study contemplates moral dilemmas pertaining to the recognitive and representative justice. As the analytical framework of moral psychology informs this study, moral justice is all about how individuals would justify their actions if placed in similar moral dilemmas; so to say the moral reasoning where moral dilemmas appear. What is justified as accepted/non-accepted, included/excluded, silenced/heard are results of moral deliberation processes. Understanding moral dilemmas in this respect are important to uncover the recognitive and representative injustices in society.

The major moral dilemma emerges with respect to the narration of selective historical memory in the commemoration practices. As the country studies demonstrate commemoration in the public space is a narration of a selective historical memory that defines majority/minority positions in society. Does politics of commemoration pursue a collective identity that denies the presence of the ‘other’-minoritised, colonized, victimized as a result of historical injustices?

While the contested nature of the selective understanding of historical memory that is solidified in the commemorative pieces in public space is presented critically in the country studies, the importance of “remembrance” as a way of not-silencing the past in overcoming the historical injustices is highlighted. Such controversy informs the moral dilemmas of how we commemorate along the lines of glorification/remembrance. The glorification of a selective history of an imperial/colonial past in the name of building a collective identity recalls the historical injustices for another group. The dilemmas around the nature and meaning of commemoration identify the injustices in the majority/minority relations. Recognizing complex

historical figures in their times (as it came up in all studies) is one way of overcoming such a dilemma. The intention behind a commemoration practice as it was revealed in the Dutch study is not to glorify racism and discrimination in current societies; as it is being conveyed nobody supports slavery by commemorating a contentious historical figure who is associated with slavery trade. As it is conveyed in the Turkish case, commemorating Sultan Selim by giving his name to the new bridge is not a controversy for many in Turkey as the intention is not to glorify his massacres of Alevi which is unknown to many. The practices of commemoration though evoke different feelings for different groups whose narrative is silenced in the commemoration practices. In this respect the sentiments around justice pertaining to the inclusion of the alternative narratives in the politics of commemoration defines the sense of belonging to a society. Politics of commemoration in this respect encourages one to question how such belonging could be achieved in a framework where an overarching narrative of collective history is major the moral dilemma. The idea of “not insulting/hurting the other”(see Turkey report) in commemoration practices as it comes up in the interviews of the opinion leaders from different backgrounds in many respects that is also manifestation of a moral dilemma as not insulting the other could emerge as way of non-remembrance built on a discourse of “the past should stay in the past” or “perception of complex figures in their own times”. Thus, politics of commemoration as a remembrance of historical injustices /rather than a narrative of a glorified past or a narrative of victimhood pave the way to build the links between the present and the past. The recognition of continuities between past and present injustices (see UK study); understanding the relevance of history for our times and its influences on the normative core of society (see Netherlands study); which also implies ‘coming to terms with the past harms’ (see Austria study) are contemplated to resolve the moral dilemmas. As the Portuguese report (p.11) illustrates “Collective and historical memory isn’t only about what we ‘remember’ as a group, but also about the relationships established with other groups”. This is a matter of addressing the inclusive/exclusive nature of commemoration.

As the report discusses, the majority/minority positions with respect to the contested social categories of identities and ideological positions on the role of commemoration in society draw the inclusionary/ exclusionary boundaries of politics of commemoration. In this framework, the politics of commemoration identify the politics of recognition and representation. The inclusionary and exclusionary aspects of the commemoration practices pave the way to the injustices at both cognitive and the representative level as it has been explored in the previous section. ‘Whose story is worthy to be represented in the commemoration?’ defines who is

recognized as an equal partner in a shared history and eventually who is being represented in the commemorative practices.

The search for inclusiveness of commemoration in relation to justice claims in society informs the politics of commemoration and the historical responsibility of today's politics as the country reports explore. It is not a matter of anyone supporting historical injustices (slavery, holocaust, massacres, etc.) personally, but how a collective responsibility for remembering and for learning from the past defines the politics of commemoration. This indicates that it is not just the identities vis-à-vis the majority/minority positions that matter, but the political positions on cosmopolitan living and its relevance to historical memory in Europe that needs exploration to uncover the moral dilemmas. Contemplating the collective responsibility for historical injustices, a theme depicted in different country contexts, the inclusiveness of deliberation processes for reaching social consensus on the commemoration practices is a way of resolving the moral dilemmas around the inclusionary and exclusionary boundaries of politics of commemoration. Yet, such a search for inclusive politics of commemoration within a justice framework embodies the moral dilemmas of a normative construct of a 'good' society that goes beyond the addressment of historical injustices. 'Never again' is a strong consensus among the opinion leaders that recognizes the victims of the most severe forms of historical injustices; yet the prevailing injustice of today with regard to the insecurities and anxieties around majority/minority positions necessitates a politics of representation that would challenge the prevailing historical minoritization processes as the earlier ETHOS studies also demonstrate.

The difficulties and tensions around being on equal par in the society manifest themselves in the moral dilemma that pertains to several questions: Could we reach to a consensus on the shared narrative of historical injustices that would resonate on today's claims of justice? To which extent the dialogue is possible for an inclusive historical narrative which should contribute to the alleviation of justice? The search for a politics of commemoration within a justice framework embodies the moral dilemmas of a normative construct of a 'good' society that embraces the diversities that also challenges prevalent social categories by 'adequate' addressing of historical injustices. To which extent dialogue is possible for an inclusive historical narrative that contributes to the alleviation of today's injustices is a question to be tackled in contemplating the moral dilemmas. There are several ways suggested in the country reports tackling moral dilemmas through dialogue and creative representation of different moral positions pertaining to the historical memory. As the UK study draws attention, the

starting point could be a 'normative deliberation of commemoration' that would encourage one to contemplate the controversies around celebrating the good deeds and remembering the historical injustices for preventing them in the future.

Bibliography

Amy Sodaro (eds.) *Memory and the Future: Transnational Politics, Ethics and Society*, NY: PalgraveMcMillan.

Anderson, Bridget, Sara Araújo, Laura Brito, Mehmet Ertan, Jing Hiah, Trudie Knijn, Isabella Meier and Maddalena Vivona (2018). *Comparative Report on the History of Minority Formation in Europe*, ETHOS reference document.

Bickford Louis and Sodaro Amy (2010). Remembering Yesterday to Protect Tomorrow: The Internalization of a New Commemorative Paradigm In: Yifat Gutman, Adam D. Brown and Craig A.

Wendorf Craig, Alexander Sheldon and Firestone Ira (2002). Social Justice and Moral Reasoning: An Empirical Integration of Two Paradigms in Psychological Research1 *Social Justice Research*, 15(1):19-38.

Fricker, Miranda (2007). *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fricker, Miranda (2013). Epistemic justice as a condition of political freedom? *Synthese* 190: 1317–1332.

Fricker, Miranda (2017). Evolving Concepts of Epistemic Justice. In: Ian James Kidd, José Medina, and Gaile Pohlhaus, Jr. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice*. New York: Routledge: 53–60.

Hobsbawm, Eric (1994). *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century 1914-1991*. London: Abacus.

Hughes, R. and Huby, M. (2002). The application of vignettes in social and nursing research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 37, 382-386.

Irwin-Zarecka, Iwona (2009). *Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory*. NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Jenkins, N., Bloor, M., Fischer, J., Berney, L., & Neale, J. (2010). Putting it in context: the use of vignettes in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, 10(2), 175–198.

Judt, Tony (2008). *Reappraisals: Reflections on the Forgotten Twentieth Century*. New York: Penguin Books.

Kandemir, A., and Budd, R. (2018). Using vignettes to explore reality and values with young people. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 19(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-19.2.2914>

Kidd, Ian James, José Medina, and Gaile Pohlhaus, Jr. (eds). *The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice*. New York: Routledge.

Kohlberg, Lawrence (1981). *Essays on Moral Development, vol. 1: The Philosophy of Moral Development*. New York: Harper & Row.

Kohlberg, Lawrence (1984). *Essays on Moral Development: the nature and validity of moral stages, vol. 2*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Lepianka, Dorota (2018). *Discursive Construction of Justice in Politics. The Dutch case*. Country Report prepared for ETHOS Deliverable 4.2.

McDonald Sharon (2013) *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. NY: Routledge.

Meneses, Maria Paula; Martins, Bruno Sena; Brito, Laura (2017), *Report on “Portugal is not a racist country”? political debates on race and racial discrimination in the recent local elections (2017) and in legal case concerning racial violence by police officers*. Portugal report 4.2 prepared for ETHOS WP4.

Teski Marea and Climo Jacob (1995) *The Labyrinth of Memory: Ethnographic Journeys*. Westport: Bergin and Grvey.