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1. INTRODUCTION

This handbook examines the approach of *Histoire Croisée* (entangled history) and its adaptability to non-formal education work.

*Histoire Croisée* is a theory in the science of history that was developed approximately twenty years ago. Since then it has remained at the center of many discussions and was researched by various scientists. Still, applying this theory to non-formal education is quite a new approach.

This handbook is a result of the project *Histoire Croisée (entangled history) as a perspective for non-formal education*. An international training for developing methods in the non-formal education that assembled multipliers from Germany, Greece and Poland and took place in Krzyżowa (Poland) in October of 2015.

Krzyżowa served as the perfect site for this training since this location has been and remains a place of interest within the German, Polish and European historical and contemporary context. The many entanglements and intertwine-ments of past and present are very visible in Krzyżowa. The former Kreisau was a small village in the German Nieder-schlesien (Lower Silesia), at the heart of which was the estate of the von Moltke family. After the borders of Poland were changed in 1945, Kreisau became Krzyżowa and has since then been part of the Polish Voivodeship Dolny Śląsk with the German population expelled and Poles settled there. After being a state-owned collective farm for more than 40 years, in 1990 the former estate of the von Moltke family became the place that the Krzyżowa Foundation for Mutual Understanding in Europe calls its home. In cooperation with the Kreisau-Initiative e.V., the Krzyżowa Foundation carries out youth meetings, seminars, trainings and conferences in many different fields with participants from all over Europe.
This handbook consists of various methods that integrate the theory of *Histoire Croisée* into non-formal education, with a special emphasis on youth exchanges. Its aim is to provide a broader and therefore more accurate view on different topics. In order to strengthen tolerance and mutual understanding among international participants, their multiple perspectives are included in the methods. In addition, the *Histoire Croisée* approach is used as a response to our more and more globalized world that makes observing history or historical events from a national or Eurocentric point of view obsolete. Furthermore, this approach takes into consideration our growing multicultural and more diverse societies and the connection between different societies happening due to changes such as the internet that connects individuals from different parts of the world, or the migration and movement of people in general.

The authors do not claim that all methods originally stemmed from their own ideas, as they incorporated methods that have already existed in other contexts. What is new though is the application of those methods to the *Histoire Croisée* approach.

This handbook consists of an introduction to the theory of *Histoire Croisée* and several methods of non-formal education dealing with topics like stereotypes, memory, migration or historical narratives. The methods are developed mainly for youth projects but can be applied for other target groups as well.

In the first chapter the methods „Flower of Identity“, „Same event - different stories“ and „A European Museum of History“ are presented. These were developed during the project “Once upon today... in Europe“. That project analyses historical narratives in different communities, how people see history or historical events, how history is told and what impact it has on individuals and the surroundings they live in. The method „What do you know about migration“, developed by the organisation *With WINGS and ROOTS*, examines the topic of migration in Germany. Migration and changing borders are also central topics in the methods „Borders change – memory stays“ and „Talking about minority nations and their achievements – Silesian Nobel Prize winners“, both of them on the topic of German history of Silesia. The methods “Images of Europe in the eyes of its citizens“ and „Στερεοτυπική?! Deconstructing preconceived ideas and beliefs from an entangled perspective“ work with stereotypes and identity, the first one using a German-Greek context and the second one broadening it to a European one. “World War II and the Holocaust: The Molho family“ shows how to work with children on the topic Holocaust and gives a new perspective in this field while dealing with an individual story.

All the different methods hazard a try on a new way of perceiving and approaching history from different points of view in an intercultural setting and making history a linking rather than segregating tool that strengthens mutual understanding and reconciliation.
2. THEORY OF *HISTOIRE CROISÉE* (ENTANGLED HISTORY)

The theory of *Histoire Croisée* (entangled history) was developed by Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann more than 20 years ago. Despite the time that has passed since its development, the approach of entangled history in non-formal education is still a very new field.

Werner and Zimmermann developed this new theory due to events that where important at the time and remain so, such as globalization and Europeanization that made it much needed to investigate history from multiple perspectives rather than from a national point of view.

Already at the beginning of the 20th century, Marc Bloch saw a need to develop the very traditional discipline of history further and to implement transnational aspects. That is how the comparative approach came into being. Later critics of this theory accused it of not being neutral and flexible enough. At the beginning of the 1990s a new approach appeared: transfer studies (one of its most prominent representatives is Michel Espagne). Transfer studies focus on transformations that happen when concepts, norms, images and representations of one culture are brought from one (national) context to another. This can happen through migration, meetings of different people, literature and nowadays through the internet and social media. But this theory could not overcome the shortcomings of the comparative approach either. The researchers applying this method were still accused of not being neutral enough and being stuck to their own national background.

That is why Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann developed the approach of *Histoire Croisée*. As the name already suggests *Histoire Croisée* (entangled history) deals with entanglements, intersections and intercrossings.
Before going further into detail about the entanglements, the object of research should be explained first. An object is, for example, an event like the beginning of World War II or the Treaty of Versailles. An important aspect of the object is its ability to change its character regularly. This already shows the dynamics of the object which can also change its location as well as its position. According to Werner and Zimmermann, it is always possible to have more than one object. If this is the case, the objects can influence each other.

Beside the object(s) there is the observer, for example the researcher, who examines or researches them. The observer is also characterized by her/his changing positions, points of view and perspectives. This leads to a multiperspective view the observer has on the object(s). Her/his main characteristic is reflexivity, so that s/he analyses and questions her/his own position or role in the process regularly. This is needed to secure her/his neutrality (which was one of the shortcomings of the other two theories) and to permanently prove the validity of the methods applied by her/him.

The observer and the object are connected by the perspective the observer has on the object(s). This perspective consists of several dimensions, and three of those are named and explained here. The first dimension is time and it describes different interpretations of the object during different times. To give an example: How was the beginning of World War II researched, viewed or interpreted in different times, for example during the Cold War or in the 1990s. This also includes the reception of this event in different times. Space is the second dimension and includes the view on the object in different locations. These can be geographical (point of view of the Soviet Union, Germany, Western
Europe), social or scientific (historians, political scientists) spaces. The third dimension presented here are the actors. These are people that were involved in the event (soldiers, civilians, Adolf Hitler, Winston Churchill) as well as people that reported, talked about or researched the event or the target group for who the event is researched. All these dimensions are process-oriented and they are related to each other, influence each other and interact. During the research of the object the different perspectives intercross. An intercrossing can happen once or several times and is then called crisscrossing. During the research the intercrossings themselves are analysed as well as the effects that the intercrossings have on the object(s). This leads to multidimensional perspectives that are needed to analyse the object(s) fully. This can lead to a transformation of the object(s) and can also make the asymmetries between the object visible. There are several forms of intercrossings: The objects can intercross, the viewpoints can intercross and also the relationship between the observer and the object can intercross which leads to a reciprocity and can influence the observer her/himself.

With this theory Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann created a model that shows the complexity of history and historical events in a globalized and intertwined world in which everything is interdependent.

Since Histoire Croisée originates from science it is not easy for it to meet the demands of non-formal education. It is a very complex theory that assumes many aspects, such as the neutrality of the researcher who is informed about everything and reaches the neutrality by constantly changing perspectives and being self-reflective. In real life these conditions are hard to meet. What educators and trainers can learn from this theory is that teaching history in a globalized world is always difficult and cannot give simple answers to the questions of (young) people. The only thing they can do is to raise awareness towards the complexity and multiperspectivity of history and to create empathy and tolerance among participants by putting them into the shoes of someone else. The aim of non-formal education is not to teach the entire truth of history. Participants should, at the end of the day, learn that there is no truth and no real answer. If they realize that history is usually a product of current politics and is often misused by taking over certain perspectives, they have learned one of the most important lessons.

Merle Schmidt, Carolin Wenzel
3. „HISTOIRE CROISÉE (ENTANGLED HISTORY) AS A PERSPECTIVE FOR NON-FORMAL EDUCATION“ - AN INTERNATIONAL TRAINING FOR DEVELOPING METHODS IN NON-FORMAL EDUCATION

From the 23rd until the 27th of October 2015, multipliers from Germany, Greece and Poland met in the International Youth Meeting Center in Krzyżowa, Poland in order to work on methods of non-formal historical and political education. The multipliers edited and developed methods for their continuous work with young people in their areas of expertise. The project allowed the participants to deal with methods they already use within their work and reflect on them from an entangled historical perspective. In addition, new methods were invented in order to promote thinking from multiple perspectives while dealing with historical topics.

The basis for the contextual work was the permanent outdoor exhibition “Courage and Reconciliation” in Krzyżowa (http://odwagaijednania.pl/en). This exhibition deals largely with the Polish-German process of relations after the Second World War. It was created to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the Reconciliation Mass that occurred on 12th of November 1989 on the former estate of the von Moltke family in Krzyżowa (Kreisau). The aim of the training was to critically reflect upon historical education and investigate it from multiple perspectives rather than from a national point of view.

The specific work on methods in international teams was complemented by a program consisting of lectures, discussions, guided tours in Krzyżowa and activities aimed at getting to know each other. The training created an atmosphere in which participants started to think far beyond the original aims of the training and set up new partner networks and project ideas.
How can Histoire Croisée be used in practice? What does the theory mean for non-formal education and how can it be integrated in the work of trainers and multipliers? The methods presented below show how the theory of Histoire Croisée can be included in non-formal education. The methods vary from historical workshops “Borders change – memories stays”, “Talking about minority nations and their achievements”, “Once upon today... in Europe”, “World War II and the Holocaust: the Molho family”) over workshops on stereotypes (“Στερεοτυπες?! Deconstructing preconceived ideas and beliefs from an entangled perspective”, “Images of Europe in the eyes of its citizens”) to migration workshops (“What do you know about migration?!”). The goal of all methods is to enrich non-formal education with the approach of Histoire Croisée by considering a multidimensional perspective on our intertwined and interdependent world.

4. METHODS

“ONCE UPON TODAY...” IN EUROPE

The following methods, “Flowers of identity”, “Same event – different stories” and “A European Museum of History” have been implemented within the international training “Once upon today...” in Europe. Participants are multipliers working in the fields of history and civic education, international youth exchange and active citizenship. They have reflected and exchanged expertise on how to work with narratives in citizenship education, international youth meetings and other educational contexts.

Within the training those three methods were applied together, building on each other. In a different setting, it is also possible to use them independently.

For further information on “Once upon today...” in Europe, please visit the blog www.once-upon-today.org
### Objectives

- Participants reflect upon their self-perception and social perception
- Participants get to know each other more deeply; supports building trust within the members of a group
- They elaborate on the concept of identity and set it into context with the notions of history, memory, community and narratives
- Throughout the process, participants become aware of the fact that their own identity is a product of the communities they have been raised in and different stories that are connected to that community (community can mean family, neighbourhood, region, country, continent, etc.)

### Overview

 Participants are asked to draw a flower with petals and leaves and attribute to each petal a concept that they consider important to their identity. These can include gender, nationality or religion, but also less obvious characteristics such as hobbies, interests, voluntary work, sexual identity, occupation, marital status or others. In the first round, participants work individually and design a private flower that is not shared with others. In the second round, they are asked to create a public flower to be shared with one other member of the group from another country. In the third step, participants form groups of four people from different countries. They are now asked to put their flowers into a landscape. That means each participant shall put his/her identity into the context of concepts of history, memory, communities and narratives. How does one’s identity interact with the history of e.g. a certain country, memories and narratives that are shared in a certain community etc.? This exercise helps participants to draw on their own experience and the exchange with other group members to understand that identities are always rich and complex. As every person is unique, so are communities and people living in one country or in Europe as a whole.

### Background

“Who am I?” is one of the most basic questions an individual has to deal with. The method invites participants to think about this question in a playful way and usually leads to a large variety of possible answers. In this way, it raises awareness about the differences and similarities in people’s perception of themselves. International youth meetings, where participants from different backgrounds meet, provoke questions such as: *What connects me with, and what makes me different from others? What is my role in a group? What shapes my identity? Who am I?* This conscious and unconscious process can lead to a questioning of the previous self-perception and values of par-
Participants, in particular when controversies or critical questions arise. By dealing with those questions and facing possible difficulties, each participant and the group as a whole have the chance to grow personally and overcome boundaries or stereotypes.

Methods dealing with identity have been part of the basic repertoire within the international non-formal youth education for many years. Different activities use symbols for identity, such as a star, an onion or a molecule to help participants think about their individual identity, what one person may have in common with another and identify stereotypes and prejudices. In addition to these aspects, “Flowers of Identity” is particularly useful in seeing one’s personal identity in a landscape of (collective) memory, history, community and narratives and that everybody is a product of all these things that can hardly be influenced by oneself. It follows the approach that all our identities are shaped by stories that we have been told since we were born: family stories, stories about our society and country, the world we live in.

Identity can be described as “the qualities and attitudes that a person or group of people have, that make them different from other people” and give them a “strong feeling of belonging to a particular group”. Stories that are important for a certain group of people are shaping our identities and can be used to either unify or divide members of different groups. But these stories may change depending on the individual perspectives and choices of group members. “Flowers of Identity” wants to raise awareness towards the mechanisms that shape the self-perception as well as the social perception on our identities and which influence a collective memory has.

**Preparation**

As for the practical preparation, the following is needed:

- At least two pieces of paper (Din A4) per person and pens in different colours;
- posters for the landscapes
- pin boards to put the results on display.

**Course of the workshop**

**Phase 1:**

**Introduction (5 minutes)**

The trainer explains that the session will give the participants the chance to think about themselves and to get to know each other better:

“The method that we are going to do is called Flower of Identity, and it works this way: In a minute, each of you will get a piece of paper. Please draw a flower with petals and leaves. You can freely decide on the form of the flower and how many petals and leaves you want to add. Afterwards, you can write attributes in each of the flowers’ petals and leaves. This can be anything you consider important about your personality and life. You should also know that this first flower is only for you. You will work individually and you don’t have to present it to the other members of the group.”

---

2 See Council of Europe (2004): All different, all equal.
4 See Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English
Phase 2:
Individual time for reflection (15 minutes)
Participants have 10 minutes to draw their flower and to think about the attributes they want to write on the paper. During this time, there should be silence to give everybody the chance to work without disturbances. In case of questions, the trainers should stick to their initial description of the task, i.e. not give any examples or advice about attributes or the form of the flower. After 10 minutes, the trainer tells the participants:

“You have created a ‘private flower’ that is only meant for yourself. Now in the second step, we invite you to design something like a ‘public flower’, that means a flower that you would also like to show to others and explain to them. Maybe for some of you this won’t make any difference. Maybe some of you want to add something or erase an aspect that they don’t necessarily want to share with others. You now have 5 minutes to think about this and draw a new flower.”

Phase 3:
Work in pairs (40 minutes)
When all members of the group have finished their work, the trainer asks them to find a partner with whom they want to share their flower. This should be someone they would like to get to know better and share their personal stories with, but not someone they already know very well. The trainer says:

“Please find a partner and explain to each other the stories hidden in your flower. Please make sure that you meet someone new during this exercise, if possible from another country, but you should also do it with someone that you feel comfortable with. You will have 40 minutes to tell your stories to each other.”

Phase 4:
Exchange in groups of four (1 hour)
After 40 minutes the trainer asks the group to come back and sit in a circle. Now two couples should come together to form groups of four people.

“Now we would like to ask each couple to find another couple and form groups of four people. You will have one hour to draw one poster with your flowers in the middle by putting them into a context. To the context might belong the concepts of memory, communities, narratives and history. How does the context influence the identity of a person?”

Phase 5:
De-briefing (1 hour)
In this phase, the trainer initiates a deeper discussion on the experiences the participants made during this activity.

“After reflecting on your personal identity and sharing it in different settings, we would now like to invite you to share some of your experiences with everybody.”

The trainer could ask the following questions:
• How did you like the exercise?
• After this exercise, how would you define identity?
• What ideas came up about how identity is influenced by memory, communities, narratives, and history?
While discussing about the concept of identity the trainer can take notes on a flipchart what participants connect with the term identity and how in their opinion memory, communities, narratives and history influence it. In the end the group can try to find a common definition of the term identity. If this is not possible, the group can have several different definitions. The flipchart with the definition(s) should hang on the wall of the seminar room until the end of the meeting.

**Recommendations for implementation**

According to the timeframe and the group, it is possible to give an example of how the flower could look like or even to indicate some things that might be written into the petals and leaves, e.g. gender, hobbies, nationality, etc. However, it is very important to make sure that the participants reflect upon their identity in different terms than those assigned to them by society. Therefore, we have decided not to give specific examples, but to rather explain that it could be any characteristic that participants consider important for themselves. Also, we recommend giving participants full liberty to design their own flower.

**Variations**

As already mentioned, there are several variations of this method with a different focus. Therefore please check “Compass, Manual for Human Rights Education with Young People”, the Council of Europe’s “All Equal – All Different Education Pack” and Salto Youth’s “Understanding Youth. Exploring Identity and its Role in International Youth Work”.

"ONCE UPON TODAY... IN EUROPE
Objectives

- Participants elaborate on the concepts of memory and history and set it into context with the notions of identity, community and narratives
- Participants become aware of the fact that history and memory are two opposing concepts and that the way history is narrated often serves the current needs of a community and its self-image
- Participants get to know that there is not only one story connected to a certain historical event, they learn that different communities (families, regional or national communities) narrate history in different ways and that it is always important to consider the entanglements that are created by that
- They learn about their individual identity and the community’s identity they have been raised in
- Participants become aware of the self-perception of other countries and become able to listen to narratives that fundamentally oppose one’s own narrative

Overview

Participants are asked to analyse different stories and narratives related to one historical event. Participants first split up into working groups of 4-6 people, consisting of an equal number of people from two different communities or countries, e.g. 2 from Germany and 2 from Poland. Then they select one historical event that they consider important either on a global level, for both countries or from their personal point of view. In the first round every group splits into national subgroups; every subgroup has to agree on a dominant narrative about this particular event in one’s own country. In the second round both subgroups come together, share their narratives and compare them. In the end all groups prepare a presentation and report about differences and similarities as well as on aspects that struck or surprised them most. Finally, the group as a whole can try to identify characteristics of how narratives are constructed in each of the countries, pointing out concepts such as power, hierarchy or the creation of boundaries.

Background

“Same event – different stories” deals with the concept of collective memory and the relation between history and memory as well as oral tradition and a created cultural commemoration. According to Maurice Halbwachs, memories are no objective reflections of past perceptions of a certain reality. Memories are very much selective and dependent on the situation in which they are recalled by someone. The so called *cadres sociaux* are very im-
important for the collective memory. This means that the preconditions for individual memories are social frames of references, most importantly fellow human beings, but also media such as books, images, knowledge etc. Without any social group that is bearing the collective memory, memories cannot be passed on. A social community teaches the contents of the collective memory and gives them a certain perspective.

The activity follows Halbwachs’ approach that the notions of history and memory are incompatible. In contrast to memory, history is ideally something universal and neutral and includes entire events that happened in the past, so it is especially focused on the past. Memories are sectional. Its bearers are grading certain events and giving them a hierarchy. Their most important function is to build up a group’s identity. This means that events have to be remembered in a way that they are fitting to a group’s self-image and support its interests. Consequently, the notion of memory is very exclusive and not focused on the past but on the present. It fulfils current needs of a group. Actual events that happened in the past are distorted and can lead to complete fiction.³

Participants of the activity “Same event – different stories” are investigating the backgrounds of their memories in a method that focuses on self-awareness. After carrying out the activity they will realize that events that they considered as important for their own identity and the identity of a certain community can be remembered in order to serve a certain self-image as well as a policy of a certain country. By comparing different narratives of the same event the participants become aware of the fact that memory has nothing in common with history and while being taught about certain historical events, actual facts are not as important as serving a certain ideology.

Preparation

As for the practical preparation, the following is needed:

- Pieces of paper for taking notes (DIN A4) and pens
- Posters for the presentations of different narratives and markers in different colours

Course of the workshop

Phase 1:

Introduction (10 minutes)

The trainer explains that the session will give the participants the chance to learn more about different perceptions of history and prepare them that the activity probably leaves more questions than answers.

³ Today we are going to focus on the stories of your countries, that means the countries you were born in, raised and socialized. In case you are born and raised in different countries, chose one you feel strongly connected to. The method that we are going to do is called Same event – different stories. It works this way:

You will split up into working groups of 4-6 people, consisting of an equal number of people from two different communities or countries. Then you will select one historic event that you consider important either on a global level, for both countries or from all of your personal points of view.

---

Every group splits into national subgroups; every subgroup has to agree on a dominant narrative about this particular event in one’s own country.

Both subgroups come together, share their narratives and compare them.”

Depending on the group’s previous knowledge, it might be necessary to explain the term “narrative”.

Phase 2:
Forming groups (10 minutes)
First step: Everybody needs to find a partner that has a similar background (coming from the same region/country).

Second step: Each pair needs to find another pair (depending on the group size maybe two other pairs) with a different background.

Phase 3:
Group work part I (20 minutes)
The trainer presents the first part of the task to all groups:

“Now it is time to decide within your group on one historic event you want to go on working with. That historic event needs to be considered as important either on a global level, for both countries or from your group’s point of view.”

Group work part II (30 minutes)
The trainer presents the second part of the task to all groups:

“Every group splits into national subgroups. In your subgroups, please think about a dominant narrative about this particular event in your own country.”

Group work part III (30 minutes)
The trainer hands out markers and flip-chart paper for each group and presents the third part of the task to all groups:

“Both subgroups come together again, share your narratives and compare them with each other. After that, please prepare a poster that shows differences and similarities of your narratives and everything else you found out about it, so that you are able to present it later to the other groups.”

Phase 4:
Presentation of group work (20 minutes)
In the plenum, participants report of differences and similarities as well as on aspects that struck or surprised them most.

Phase 5:
De-briefing (30 min +)
In this phase, the trainer initiates a deeper discussion on the experiences the participants made during this activity.
“After reflecting on different narratives of the same historic event in different settings, we would now like to invite you to share some of your experiences with everybody.”

The trainer could ask the following questions:

- How did you like the exercise?
- After this exercise how would you define history and memory?
- What do you think is influencing history and memory and how is it connected to your individual identity and the identity of your community/country?
- What do you think about the misuse of the term history especially for political purposes?

**Recommendations for implementation**

Part I of the group work might take more time than 20 minutes, because your participants are unsure which historic event to choose. Walk around and try to get an impression how the decision is proceeding and if some groups might need your help. Depending on the structure of your group you could already think of possible topics that might be interesting for your participants in advance. If there are groups that have difficulties in finding a topic, you could give them some ideas. It may also be helpful for the discussion not to choose the most obvious topics such as most controversial events.

The trainer should be aware of the fact that participants might react very emotional towards the narratives of other participants. It can lead to harsh discussions as well as positive reactions. The most challenging aspect of the activity might be listening to each other and tolerating opposing narratives.
METHOD:
A European museum of history

PROJECT
“Once upon today…” in Europe

AUTHORS
Ole Jantschek

PARTICIPANTS
10-50

DURATION
minimum 1,5 days

KEYWORDS
representation of history, narratives, European history, rewriting history, multi-perspectivity and diversity

Objectives
- Participants contemplate their understanding of European history and the possibility to create shared spaces of memories and histories in Europe
- Taking over the role of exhibition makers and educators, the participants have to make a number of practical choices that translate their understanding of history into a tangible concept for a European museum of history
- Throughout the process, participants become aware of different presuppositions, perceptions and beliefs about history and the way it should be told
- In finding a common solution in their group to tell history in a way that fosters understanding and brings people together, they develop ways to let diverging and even conflicting interpretations coexist

Overview
The method encourages the participants to think about the representation of history in a European museum of history. Participants split up in groups and are given the task to develop a concept for an exhibition that fosters mutual understanding and respect among the people living in Europe. They can freely decide about any features of the museum. This includes the name, place, the structure and form of presentation (including digital formats), the time period and topics to be covered. After this phase, they have to pitch their concept in a plenary session and receive feedback and critical advice from other groups. In the next step, the working groups are asked to develop their concept further, creating a narrative and deciding on specific concepts, events, processes or objects to be covered. They are also invited to work creatively, designing their own objects, media or other components of the exhibition. It is crucial to the exercise that the participants are encouraged to add their personal perspectives and stories.

Background
In 2007, Hans-Gert Pöttering, the President of the European Parliament at the time, first proposed to create a House of European History in Brussels. The opening of the museum is scheduled for 2016 and will give visitors the opportunity to learn about European history and the history of the European Union in particular: “The House of European History will be a cultural institution with a very specific scope, that of conveying a transnational overview of European history that is inclusive of its diversity, its varied interpretations and differing perceptions.”

It comes as no surprise that such an ambitious project has been watched with great interest from the very start by politicians, historians and the general public: Critical questions were raised, whether it was the aim to present history in a way that reflected the perspectives of the whole continent or to construct some kind of new European meta-narrative. In this respect, the concept for the permanent exhibition states: “The scope of the House of European History transcends national, regional and local boundaries. Its permanent exhibition will present a broader perspective than the summation of national histories. It will also reveal the diversity of European history and its interpretations and perceptions. […] The development of the House of European History […] is based on a dichotomy of objectives: on the one hand, the exhibition will convey a coherent historical narrative which will be easy to grasp for any interested visitor; on the other hand, it will raise awareness of the existence of a variety of different historical interpretations, points of view, nuances of perception and memory, so as to stimulate reflection and debate.” There certainly is some ambiguity in this mission statement that reflects the different objectives every history museum is meant to achieve: It should at the same time impart knowledge as objectively as possible, educate people about different perceptions and interpretations, trigger critical reflection and debate, but also foster better understanding among people from different countries and communities. Since its initial conception, the House of European History project has been controversial. From a critical perspective, it has been argued that European history should not be conceived of in the same way as traditional national history. In this perspective, European history is mainly a space of shared memories and histories which necessarily entails a multitude of places of remembrance spread across the continent, in particular at the periphery. It has also been argued that the inclusion of minority perspectives, a dialogue about conflicting perceptions and a focus on the Holocaust, Gulag, genocide, the colonial past, war and migration history will be crucial.

Against the background of these critical debates, the method “European museum of history” gives participants the freedom to develop their concept fully, because any assumption about the place, form or concept of such an endeavour would effectively prescribe a certain understanding of European history and the way it can be told. For instance, the idea for the museum will change considerably when the place is not Brussels as the capital of the European Union, but some city in Central and Eastern Europe. Likewise, the time period that participants may want to cover will vary according to their understanding of “Europe”. Others may even decide that a single, central exhibition is not the right approach, opting instead for a network of exhibitions or a digital format. These are just a few examples to encourage trainers to keep their instructions to a minimum and to not give any specific advice on the concept or form of the museum. The only normative objective that is given in advance does not refer to the European Union as a political entity, but Europe as a continent and to the people living in it: How can European history be told in a way that fosters mutual understanding in Europe and brings people together? Yet again, the answer to this question may focus on positive achievements in some concepts, but on the downsides and conflicts of European history in others.

**Preparation**

As for the practical preparation, the following is needed:

- handout with tasks for each group (described further down);
- large papers and pens in different colours;

---

7 loc. cit., p. 22.
• for the creative workshops: a broad range of material giving participants the possibility to work creatively, i.e. to paint, draw, work with digital media / video / photography, build a model, etc.

Course of the workshop

The workshop includes six different phases. The duration of each phase can be adjusted to the overall timeframe. In the following time indications refer to a 1,5 day long workshop.

Phase 1:
Introduction (20 minutes)
The trainer informs the group that the next method will last 1,5 days and briefly explains the task:

“Imagine the following situation: The European Parliament has decided to commission an European museum of history. It has issued a Call for Proposals asking for innovative concepts. The primary goal of the project is to present history in a way that fosters mutual understanding in Europe and brings people together.”

“You will now split up in groups of 5-6 people. For this exercise it is important that you find a group of people with whom you would like to work during the next two days. Please also pay attention that there is at least one member from each country in your group.”

Groups assemble in different corners of the room. The trainer writes down the members of each group on a poster.

The trainer distributes the handout with the written task:

“You will now split up in groups of 5-6 people. For this exercise it is important that you find a group of people with whom you would like to work during the next two days. Please also pay attention that there is at least one member from each country in your group.”

The trainer informs the participants that they now have time to develop their concept and prepare a 3-minute presentation of their main ideas. The team also offers its support in case of questions.
Phase 2:
Conceptualization – Participants develop a concept for a European Museum of History (2.5 hours)
Groups exchange their ideas and develop a concept for their European museum of history. Trainers can walk around to offer support, but should not interfere with the group interaction or conceptual discussions.

Phase 3:
Pitch – Groups present their concept in a plenary session, collecting feedback and ideas from the other participants (1.5 hours)
Back in the plenary, the trainer invites the participants to sit in a circle. The trainer may change to the role of the president of a commission that has to select the most promising concepts for the European museum of history:

"Today we have come together to present a first selection of concepts for the future European museum of history. We are very pleased to announce that so many teams from all over Europe have answered our call and sent in their proposals. We are now going to hear presentations of the most promising concepts. Each presentation must be no longer than three minutes. Afterwards every member of the commission (i.e. all the trainers and the other participants) are invited to give their feedback and share their ideas. Please note: In this session you are asked to put special emphasis on positive feedback: Which aspects of the concept are convincing? Which ideas do you support and would like to see further elaborated?"

Groups present their work one by one in a strictly limited timeframe. The trainers should remind the participants of the positive feedback culture. They could even propose to start a statement with the sentence "What I like about your idea is..." Groups are asked to write down ideas that can help them to further develop their project.

Phase 4:
Realization / Creative workshops – Groups work out a sample part of their future exhibition (4 hours)
After the presentations, the trainer explains the next phase of the workshop:

"We have seen many inspiring ideas for the future museum. The commission now invites all of you to develop your ideas further and to work out a sample part of the exhibition. That means: you should now put your concept into practice. Of course, you may also take some time to reconsider your ideas in the light of the feedback that you have just received.

Please create a narrative for your exhibition and decide on one part of it that you are going to work out in detail, selecting specific concepts, events, processes or objects.

We also invite you to work creatively. This can include designing a certain object, creating videos or photos, writing a text, building a model, drawing or painting, etc."

During this phase it is important that for each creative method or medium at least one team member is competent to give guidance and help with practical questions.
Phase 5:

Gallery Walk – Groups put the results of their work on display and give a presentation (1,5 hours)

Before the actual gallery walk and the presentation of the projects can take place, approx. 30 minutes are needed for setting up the objects and models in the room, uploading videos or photos to the computer or testing the technical equipment (projector, sound).

The trainer officially opens the gallery and invites the participants to walk around and have a look at the different projects. Afterwards, all participants come together in a circle. Each group presents its concept and answers questions from the other participants.

Phase 6:

De-briefing (1 hour)

In this last phase, the trainer thanks all groups for their work and invites them to individually think about the experiences they have made:

“We now want to switch back to our roles as participants in this seminar. Please take a moment to think about the last one and a half days. Which experiences did you make during this exercise?”

After a short time of reflection (up to 5 minutes), everybody is invited to share some insights in the plenary. The trainer may bring in some of the following questions to trigger the discussion:

• Was there anything surprising when you first started working in the group?
• Was it difficult to agree on an idea for the museum?
• Was it difficult to agree on a narrative?
• What was your understanding of history/European history in the group?
• Were there any conflicts in the group? How did you solve them?
• How did you solve the task of telling history in a way that fosters mutual understanding in Europe and brings people together?
• Are you satisfied with the results?
• Which of the projects would you like to see being put into practice?
• Do you think that it is a good idea to have a European museum of history?

Recommendations for implementation

The method can be adapted to different settings ranging from a short workshop to several days. However, in order to work properly, it is recommended to assure a prior establishment of a good working atmosphere, trust and reliable rules for dealing with conflicts in the group. Equally, participants should already have discussed theoretical concepts of history, made the experience of different perceptions of historic events or processes, and gained some insights in different ways how history can be rewritten.

It is not necessary, though, that the participants know about the actual project of a “House of European History” in Brussels.
Variations

With regard to the participants, it can be advised to encourage participants to develop alternative narratives in detail. For instance, some participants may find it interesting to create a museum of untold European history by actively referring to stories they know from their own life, family, friends, communities, cities or countries.
4.2
Borders change, memory stays

"Borders of memory"  
4-16 (age: 16 years and older)

Jolanta Steciuk from the Young Journalists Association "POLIS"  
4 hours without breaks

history, propaganda, taboo, dealing with the past, dominant narrative, marginalized narrative, space, various perspectives, dialogue, state borders, forced movement of populations, migration, interculturalism

Objectives
- Deconstruct post-war propaganda related to forced transfers of populations and shifts of Polish borders; identify present meaning of those events
- Provide skills allowing critical analysis of propaganda and its influence on collective memory
- Raise awareness about missing narratives and gain access to marginalized ones
- Facilitate dialogue and inspire exchange of points of view in the group related to space (city, town, village, neighbourhood)

Overview
The method has been designed specifically to deal with shifts of borders of Poland in the aftermath of WWII, to challenge taboos and analyse various narratives related to this topic. The full cycle of the workshop “Borders change, memory stays” and internal logic is as follows:
Introduction:
participants understand the topic of the workshop and agenda

Mind-map:
they understand notion of propaganda, dominant and marginalized narratives

Historical map:
they are aware of Polish border changes after the Second World War and forced migrations

Postcards:
they understand the content of the dominant narrative related to shift of borders and forced transfers of populations in the aftermath of the Second World War

Brainstorm:
various perspectives to look at the space (town, city, neighbourhood) are identified

Fieldwork:
participants observe space through the lenses of an assigned perspective (through photos and making notes)

Debriefing:
they learn new perspectives and acknowledge the change in their initial one

Background
After the Second World War, based on decisions made during the Yalta and Potsdam conferences (1945), Poland’s borders were changed significantly both in the East (territories annexed by the Soviet Union) and in the West (territories acquired from Germany, “regained territories”). The forced transfer of populations in the region were part of this process (Poles and Germans and other national groups). Whereas flight, expulsions and resettlements of Germans are present in the collective memory of Germany (especially in the Western part), they were a taboo in Poland. And it was the propaganda of communist times that influenced the collective memory of Poles in relation to border shifts.

Preparation
The trainer prepares basic facts related to the Potsdam and Yalta conferences, information about the shift of borders and forced transfers of populations in the aftermath of WWII (visit the online exhibition prepared by the Polish History Museum: www.google.com/culturalinstitute/exhibit/shifting-poland/QR9NfYt?hl=en)

• The trainer needs to look at propaganda postcards from the ‘40s and ‘50s and examine their message related to the shift of borders and forced migrations
• The trainer should develop possible support questions for the group s/he works with, taking under consideration the level of knowledge of the group and participants’ relation to the historical events in question
The materials needed are
- Polish propaganda postcards from ‘40s and ‘50s related to shifts of borders and forced migrations
- Flipchart and markers
- Paper and pencils for participants
- Map of pre-war Poland
- Cameras or participants’ phones to take photos
- Computer and projector to show pictures taken by participants

Course of the workshop

Phase 1: Mind-map (20 minutes)
Participants form subgroups of 3-4 people each. They are given a coloured paperboard and have to form a mind map using the word “propaganda”, adding their association with the notion (e.g. mass media, control, terror, lies).

Each subgroup presents their mind map to the rest of the group and discusses the words they chose to connect with the word “propaganda”. All participants reflect on the selected words and discuss the rationale supporting their choices.

The trainer creates an inclusive mind map on “propaganda” on a flipchart. The mind map contains all the words brainstormed by the subgroups, organized in distinct categories.

The trainer asks representatives of each group to provide examples of propaganda or dominant narratives in any field they encountered in their own lives, and write those fields down on a flipchart.

Phase 2: Introduction to the historical contexts and map (20 minutes)
The trainer shows a pre-war map of Poland and explains the shift of Poland in the aftermath of WWII, and movements of populations. S/he indicates territories in the East acquired by the Soviet Union and explains which parts of present-day Poland were part of Germany before WWII.

Participants look at the map and try to locate their hometowns or other significant places related to their family history (e.g. grandparents’ houses) in the pre-war map of Poland. Some of them might find out that those places now belong to a different country than before WWII.

The trainer asks participants for voluntary comments (Would you like to share your comments with the others? What has been new to you? Has anything surprised you?)

The participants form subgroups of 3-4 people each. They receive postcards used in the late ‘40s and ‘50s, under communist rule in Poland, to justify and explain the shift of borders in the aftermath of WWII. They also get paper and markers.

---

9 Mind maps usually refer to the dominant narrative (its elements, features and ways to be delivered to the public), the notion of „marginalized” narrative usually is not mentioned on the mind map. Thus the trainer stresses that the propaganda phenomenon is about a dominant narrative being imposed on society and equally so it is about censorship and marginalized narratives that exist but do not reach the audience.
Phase 3:
Postcards (30 minutes)
Participants discuss in subgroups the content of the postcards (they discuss each visual element and try to deconstruct their meaning) and write down their findings. If needed, the trainer provides groups with additional supporting questions or tips:

• How „East” and „West” are presented (What elements are being used to symbolize them)?
• What elements (visual, inscriptions, numbers) are used to describe and symbolize Germany, Poland and the Soviet Union after WWII and why?
• What emotions do the individual elements and their message as a whole impose on the audience and how?
• Does anything seem to be missing in the pictures?

The trainer sums up the group findings, provides additional explanations related to the visual representation of the dominant narrative of the ’40s and ’50s, if needed.

Phase 4:
Brainstorming (10 minutes)
Based on previous materials (mind map, list of fields participants encountered propaganda in their lives, historical map, postcard analysis), the group brainstorms possible ways to look at space (city, neighbourhood, town). The trainer writes on the flipchart perspectives and agendas that might determine one’s way of looking. Examples of fields/perspectives: perspective of Poles, perspective of Germans, local development, tourism, etc. (See example of the method implementation below).

Phase 5:
Field work (120 minutes or longer depending on the destination to be reached)
Preparation: In the conference hall, participants divide the tasks they need to work on during the field trip, namely each participant is assigned to take photos and make notes related to the perspective / field brainstormed in the previous exercise. Participants are encouraged to write down suggestions for further development/ of the space (city, neighbourhood, town) in the field they observe. The trainer makes sure that every participant or every subgroup (depending on the number of participants) has a different perspective to follow during field work.

Production: Participants go for a walk and follow their agenda. Firstly, they look at the space through the perspective assigned to them and detect signs relevant to this perspective. Secondly, they make suggestions for change in the space that is needed in the framework of their perspective (improvement as they see it).

Presentation: Participants present their findings, they explain the perspective they were assigned to and present photos that illustrate it (projector needed).

Phase 6:
Debriefing (40 minutes)
The group discusses the results of the fieldwork and the possible changes in the initial way of looking at the space (city, town, village, neighbourhood). They share what surprised them, what was new, if the workshop made them reject some of their outdated beliefs and how that happened. This part is meant to be an open forum with supporting questions from the trainer.
The group comes back to the notion of “propaganda” and looks again at the mind maps created in the beginning of the workshop. Participants then discuss the following issues:
1. Why might people, groups and societies want to counteract propaganda from the past?
2. Who can be active in this field?
3. How can individuals protect themselves from propaganda?

Depending on the group and relation of the group to the topic, participants might work on final questions in an open forum, in groups or in pairs. If needed, the trainer might point out (in relation to the above mentioned questions): 1 - advantages and difficulties; 2 - responsibilities of state, media, private institutions, individuals and others; 3 - attitudes, behaviour, specific actions.

In the evaluation form, additional question might be added: “What can I do to protect myself from propaganda in my life?”

Variations

It is possible to apply the method in other contexts. The workshop can be adapted to facilitate dialogue and points of view sharing in the group; it can allow the expression of various narratives - dominant and marginalized ones - related to a space a group lives in (e.g. neighbourhood); it can be used to explain different experiences of local population and migrants, allowing marginalized narratives to be expressed and acknowledged. In this case, the trainer focuses on possible angles from which the neighbourhood can be seen.

Key words: group communication, dialogue, sharing perspectives, space, neighbourhood, migration, multiculturalism, migrants, refugees, neighborhood, community.

Workshop cycle and internal logic:
Introduction:
participants understand the theme of the workshop and the agenda

Mind-map:
they understand the notion of propaganda, dominant and marginalized narratives

Brainstorm:
various perspectives to look at space (town, city, neighbourhood) are identified

Fieldwork:
participants observe space through the lenses of assigned perspective (photos, notes)

Debriefing:
they learn new perspectives and acknowledge the change in their own
Please, note: The collection of personal observations and opinions presented below do not reflect the full complexity of Krzyżowa, its history or present. This has never been the aim of the workshop. The material is neither an official statement of the Polish-German-Greek group, nor of the Krzyżowa Foundation for Mutual Understanding in Europe. This material aims to examine diversity of narratives and is an invitation for discussion.

Participants went for a walk in Krzyżowa, took pictures and made observations through the lenses of specific perspectives, namely: touristic view, development and economic growth, attitudes towards German heritage. They were also free to make comments on improvements in the given field of observation.

**Perspective 1:**
**Touristic view (observed by a participant from Greece)**

Walking in the village of Krzyżowa our team has found that there are a lot of interesting points with great historical significance such as the former residence of the von Moltke family, the so called house on the hill (nowadays owned by the Krzyżowa Foundation), the cemetery, the train station and some old houses. In the streets a visitor can find a lot of panels with information.

The International Youth Meeting Centre - Krzyżowa Foundation is very well preserved and does a great job. All the other historical sites are abandoned and there is a great need for renovation. A part of this the village is situated in
a picturesque valley with farms, a small river passing through, many different kinds of trees, plants and seeds.

Suggestions for improvement:
Our proposal is that the place should be used for environmental education providing walks, field visits and information about animals, plants and agriculture.

A leaflet or a small guide in the English language is a necessity.

**Perspective 2:**
*Development and economic growth (Observed by a participant from Greece)*

- The renovated building complex that belonged to the von Moltke's, that currently houses the Krzyżowa Foundation and the International Youth Centre.
- The House on the Hill, which is fully functional and open to visitors.
- The exhibition "Courage and Reconciliation".
- Recently constructed pedestrian streets and streetlights, at least in the central roads of the village.
- Multilingual signs directing to main points of interest around the area.
- Recently constructed short bridge and clearly marked road signs.
- Modern, renovated houses and new cars, at least in the central area.

Suggestions for further development:
- Restoration of the functional railway station.
- Denser lighting in the streets.
• Preservation of the von Moltke cemetery and the church close by.
• A mini-market and a food-bar facility, outside the von Moltke estate.
• Portable audio-guide devices, provided to tourists for a walk-through around the main historical sites of the area.

Perspective 3:
Poles suppressing German past (Observed by a participant from Poland)

After the Second World War, when Polish people have been transferred to Lower Silesia, there were many situations of fighting with German heritage. During our workshop I was wondering if Krzyżowa is an example of such phenomenon. As we were walking through Krzyżowa, it was clear to me that the Polish community didn't fight German heritage, although I noticed negligence. There was a building for sale and while it was not devastated on purpose it looked like there were no renovation works done since 1945. The same is true of the railway station in Krzyżowa. The station is still working but buildings around it look post-apocalyptic. My conclusion is that Poles don't fight German heritage, they just don't care about it.

Perspective 4:
Poles trying to preserve German heritage (Observed by a participant from Poland)
Perspective 5:

Signs of German past - “German glasses” (Observed by a participant from Germany)

I tried to look at the village through “German glasses”, trying to detect German traces from the past which are still left or have been preserved. Unfortunately, there is not a lot to detect. We saw an old mill which still had a German sign. It seems as if the mill has not been in use for a long time so it is probable that people don’t consider it worthwhile to renovate. Private houses didn’t have any signs of German ancestry. The old German graveyard of the former nobility is still preserved though we haven’t examined who is keeping it - whether it is the people of the village or the employees of the Kreisau estate. There were several street signs in Polish and German language guiding the way to the cemetery.

The train station has been built in German times, but it was not possible to detect any German traces. There were several run-down buildings around it, but no German signs to detect. At least a sign pointed out the history and historical sights of the area.

It is possible that knowing more about architecture allows one to see more traces, but I was more or less limited to look for language.
Debriefing

The filed work has been followed by debriefing. Participants shared their findings (photos and observations) and discussed the way preconceptions define what people notice.
4.3 .
Talking about minority nations and their achievements – Silesian Nobel Prize Winners

Objectives
- To learn more about the Nobel Prize Foundation
- To discover Nobel Prize winners in the region
- To explore the entangled historical context in which the winners made their contributions
- To develop the participants' skills on New Technologies in Education
- To acquire meta-cognitive skills, such as critical thinking etc.

Overview
This activity involves a workshop of 3 hours in which participants get to know the Nobel Prize Foundation and the Award winners and acknowledge German/Silesian Nobel Prize winners

Background
The concept of this activity is to speak about national minorities without addressing them directly. Being introduced to the biographies of Nobel Prize winners (or any other outstanding personalities coming from the minority) and creatively dealing with them, participants find out that they are living in the same region as the Nobel Prize winners who nowadays belong to a minority. For participants it is significant to realize that their region once belonged to another nation, but it gave birth to some outstanding personalities that they can nowadays still relate to.

Preparation
The materials needed for this method are computers, internet connection, a map, colourful flag pins, paperboard tags, markers in different colours, notepads, pens, flipchart paper, rope and clothes pins. These need to be prepared in the following manner:
- Paperboard tags - each has a decade written on it, starting from 1900
- Paperboard tags - each has the name of a Nobel Prize winner
- Paperboard tags - each has an invention/discovery/contribution of the winners examined in this project
- The rope is hung wall to wall and some clothes pins are fastened on it (like for drying laundry).
Course of the workshop

Phase 1:
Getting to know the Nobel Prize Foundation and the Award winners (60 minutes)

(20 minutes) Nobel's background research (in English):
Participants are divided into groups and visit the official Nobel Prize Site and learn more about the Foundation, its goals etc. based on Alfred Nobel’s testimony.

The following links direct to the targeted info:
www.nobelprize.org/alfred_nobel/will
www.nobelprize.org/educational/nobelprize_info/index.html

(30 minutes) Pin it on a map game:
The trainer hangs a global map on the wall. Participants are expected to locate through the official Nobel Prize Site (www.nobelprize.org) the Nobel Prize winners per category/per country and place a respective pin of the map. For each one of the six categories a different colour of pin must be used.

(10 minutes) Debate on global distribution:
Participants reflect on the geographical distribution of the Nobel prize awards per category and discuss potential reasons for the distribution being even or uneven

Phase 2:
Working with German/Silesian Nobel Prize winners (60 minutes)

(20 minutes) Matching game on a timeline:
The instructor places paperboard tags in line on the wall (each tag has a decade written on it, starting from 1900, the decade when the awards began). Then each participant is invited to select from paperboard tags on a table the name of each winner and tape it under the corresponding decade. As soon as the matching exercise is over, participants are invited to select from another set of paperboard tags, the invention/discovery/contribution that corresponds to each winner and tape it under the personality’s name.

(40 minutes) Historical context research:
Participants reflect on the outcome presented on the timeline (decade-winner’s name-contribution) followed by the evaluation of the tasks until this point. They are then requested to form smaller groups and search the internet for the historical context during which each winner they have been assigned to won his/her award. Participants are expected to keep notes on political, financial and social situation of the corresponding era.

Phase 3:
Acknowledgement of German/Silesian Nobel Prize winners (60 minutes)

(40 minutes) The “laundry” presentation:
Participants, staying in their smaller groups, search the internet for biographical details of the Nobel winners and keep notes. Then, on an A3 flipchart paper or digitally on an infographic (such as http://piktochart.com or www.easel.ly), they sum up the name, contribution, decade, place, historical context and other biographical info for each winner. The printed outcome (either a flipchart or an infographic) is hung from a clothes pin on a rope, placed wall to wall in the classroom.
(20 min) **Summative discussion on the project:**
Participants go around all the hung infographics, present their work in smaller groups to their peers and discuss the lives of the winners they were assigned. Speaking about the geographical distribution of the Nobel prize awards leads to the conclusion that there are many extraordinary Germans coming from Silesia and the German minority was enriching Poland.

By now, participants have been already confronted with the fact that Silesia was a German region before the World Wars. Polish borders changed after the end of World War II which resulted in mass relocations. Silesia became almost completely Polish and for many years the German heritage of this region was ignored. There are political reasons for this concealment. People were forced to accept the relocation and see the new region in which they moved in as thoroughly Polish. Participants learn through this workshop that depending on the perspective from which the region’s history is seen, it appears in a completely different light. This approach provides a different perspective on transnational history that allows to surpass the shortcomings of the classical history lessons.

**Phase 4:**
**Optional**
Participants can visit the educational section of the Official Web Site of the Nobel Prize, where a lot of educational games and fun activities are included: [www.nobelprize.org/educational](http://www.nobelprize.org/educational)

**Recommendations for implementation**
Any other region may be the focus of this workshop. Look at cases of marginalization of minorities in your own surrounding and discuss whether any changes or extra efforts need to be made by your institution to pick out this topic as a central theme.

**Variations**
This 3 hours long module can be extended into a 4-hour workshop. The researching part (hours 1 and 2) would be followed by a 2-hour creative part of the workshop, in which participants will have more time for making the infographics. Additionally, they can also design buttons, T-Shirts and bags after being encouraged to collect ideas and associations they have with Nobel Prize winners.

Materials needed to create logos with the Nobel Prize winners theme: button maker, metal and plastic button pieces, T-Shirts, bags, paint for clothes, markers, paint rollers.
4.4.
World War II and the Holocaust: The Molho family

Objectives
The objectives of this method are for the participants to
- Familiarize themselves with memory and past
- Investigate facts using a variety of sources
- Get to know historical facts
- Be sensitive in matters of exclusion, racism and xenophobia
- Think about right and morality in our life
- Express themselves in many different ways
- Respect each other
- Develop empathy
- Think for a peaceful co-existence
- Work in groups, cooperate
- Use Information and Communication Technology (ICT) tools
- Create multimodal texts
- Enhance their critical thinking

Overview
According to new approaches of teaching and learning, in education (formal and non-formal) there is a necessity to help participants acquire competences for citizens of the 21st century - skills that will facilitate to understand and decode the reality in which they live, to strengthen respect for all and to realize the benefits of variety and multiculturalism. Education has to adopt a collaborative style of learning, project based learning, problem solving, empathy, dialogue, interaction so participants can see from different points of view and have respect not only for themselves but also for others.

In this context, an educator is a trainer who is trying to consult and support the groups where there is difficulty and give directions for research where appropriate.

This project relates to the subjects of History, Social Studies, Geography, ICT and Arts.
Participants are working in plenary at the beginning and at evaluation. They split into groups during the rest of the workshop.

The groups work separately and in the end present the results of their investigation. The participants have to choose data from different sources like the internet, multimodal texts, museum websites, etc.-ask questions, investigate, interact, try to think critically as they work, cooperate with their colleagues in order to answer and prepare their presentations.

It is preferable during the process to alternate the roles such as researcher, presenter etc. within the team.

**Background**

The Second World War was a great catastrophe for humanity. Many people were killed and the Jewish population was faced with tremendous cruelty.

Jews lived in almost all European countries. In Greece they played an active role in the country’s political, economic and intellectual life. They kept their identity strong and they lived peacefully with others from different cultures in most Greek cities.

During the Second World War, the Jews were forced to leave their homes and work, lost their relatives, houses and property. They were forced to stay in ghettos at the edge of the cities and many were transferred to the concentration camps where they were killed.

Talking about the Holocaust is especially difficult with participants that are 11 or 12 years old. It is a necessity to help the young people to get familiarized with the era, to understand that the Jewish people had a life like any other; they owned houses, they had families, friends and relatives. They went to work every day, they paid taxes and they enjoyed their social life and celebrations.

The workshop is aimed at participants that are 11 or 12 years old. Young people of that age have usually already attended history lessons in their formal education and they have some knowledge about the Second World War and the Holocaust. They also might have stories in their family about people who lived or fought in the Second World War and know about the presence of Jewish people in their area.

Even if they have no previous knowledge of the topic, in this workshop participants are watching a film about the Molho family in Thessaloniki, a Greek city with a big and powerful Jewish community. The Molho family story is the vehicle towards understanding the context and everyday life during that period of time.

While teaching young people about the past, it is extremely useful to talk about individuals instead of talking about people in general. Watching faces and listening to personal stories can help the young people to put themselves into another’s shoes and see things from a different point of view.

Additional thought is given to these people not only to Jews but to other individuals - relatives, priests, soldiers, Nazis, neighbours etc. – and their points of view. A very important thing to keep in mind is that there were
people who helped the Jews survive hiding them despite the danger they faced. These brave actions show us that people can make a difference; there is still hope for a better future.

It’s time to get to know the Molho family.

**Preparation**

The trainer prepares the seminar room for the participants’ working groups. Ensure that there is an internet connection; create website shortcuts on the desktop.

Participants must be used to work in groups and have basic skills using ICT.

The materials needed for the workshop are:
- A laptop and a projector or a smartboard
- Internet connection
- Dry Erase Markers and Whiteboard
- Paper and pencils for participants
- Maps of Europe and Greece
- Historical maps of the Second World War

**Course of the workshop**

**Phase 1:**

**Mind-map (15 minutes)**

*Mind-maps are tools that usually concentrate previous knowledge and participants’ ideas and help them to organize their thoughts.*

Participants are divided into small groups of 3 or 4. They are given a piece of paper and they brainstorm in a mind map having as a central notion the word “HOLOCAUST”.

After that the trainer creates a mind map on “HOLOCAUST” on a flipchart which it contains all the words brainstormed by the subgroups, organized in distinct categories.

Then all the participants reflect on the written words and explain their choices.

**Phase 2:**

**A BOOKSTORE IN SIX CHAPTERS: Watching the film (45 minutes)**

The film about the MOLHO FAMILY is available in Greek and English language. It is preferable for the participants to listen to it in their native language so that they don’t get confused while watching and trying to find answers for their worksheets.
The film is divided into six chapters where there is a lot of information for that specific period of time. The chapters can be separated in three parts, same as the participants’ group and investigation:

**Before the war:**
- Chapter 1: There was once a world
- Chapter 2: The world we found, the world we made
- Chapter 3: This is the girl for you

**During the war:**
- Chapter 4: When the world went dark
- Chapter 5: Escape

**After the war:**
- Chapter 6: A world of books Words that never said

The film is downloadable for free from the link: [www.centropa.org/centropa-cinema?language=el&field_audio_language_value=1=All&subtitle_language=All&field_subtitle_language_value=All&title=](www.centropa.org/centropa-cinema?language=el&field_audio_language_value=1=All&subtitle_language=All&field_subtitle_language_value=All&title=)

It is advisable to pause between certain chapters and make sure what is being seen or recorded by the participants is being understood in order to do their work.

**Phase 3:**

**WORKING IN GROUPS (90 minutes)**

In the seminar room, every group has to investigate a specific subject and to write down the things they find out. If necessary, the group members can watch the film again in order to check their findings.

At the end of the film, discuss the family members and life in Thessaloniki but please avoid making the participants feel pity for them. Let the participants answer the questions that are in their worksheets.

After watching the film participants have time to prepare a presentation on their topic. They should be encouraged to use different types of tools and materials.

**1st group: Life before the war**

Participants of the first group describe the city of Thessaloniki before the war using 4 to 6 adjectives.

They talk about the Jewish community and the great importance that the Molho bookstore had for the community and the city.

They write down the cities and areas that are mentioned.

They find the feasts that Jews celebrate.

They discuss the Molho family and its members, their jobs and hobbies.

They write thoughts and feelings about their work, the special connection with the bookstore.
2nd group: During the war
Participants of the second group try to find the signs showing that the situation was becoming bad for the Jews in Thessaloniki.

They write the “measures” that Nazis took for Jews in Greece and in other countries.

They think of the meaning of the words: persecution, relocation, looting, escape, camp, extermination, Holocaust/Shoah and they use a dictionary if needed.

They talk and take notes about the way that the members of the Molho family avoid capture; they write down the cities and areas that are mentioned.

They comment about the ways that Greek people helped their Jewish neighbours, the difficult decision they had to make and the dangers they had to face.

They express their thoughts about “Dilemmas” and “Doing the right thing” in our everyday life.

3rd group: “Life after the war”
Participants from the third group discuss the marriage of Rene and Solon Molho and the Jewish community in Thessaloniki.

They comment on the surprising clue for the marriage of Rene and Solon Molho and their “silence” about the life in the camp.

They search information and write an article about the Jewish cemetery in Thessaloniki.

They comment on the thoughts and feelings coming from the Jewish community after the destruction and loss of the cemetery.

PRESENTATION
Every group presents the results according to their topic and in the most suitable way for the group members.


Phase 4:
EVALUATION (45 minutes)
An evaluation is a necessity for the learning process because not only can it provide information about the success of the intervention, but is also useful for the learning experience and helping both the educator and the participants to become familiarized with self-control procedures.

In the classroom, participants
• find and put Post-its in the maps of Greece and Europe pointing the cities and areas that are mentioned,
• find similarities between Jewish and Christian celebrations and holidays,
• make a timeline with significant dates for that period and for the family,
• think and write letters asking questions to some members of the Molho family.

The participants discuss their work, the results, possible changes in the initial way of looking at the topic, what they learnt, what else they want to learn, what ideas, thoughts and beliefs changed in some way. They have to share their feelings on the way they worked, what they liked, what they need to change next time.

Phase 5:
EXTRA INVESTIGATION (90 minutes)
Participants visit the website of Yad Vashem organization (www.yadvashem.org) and find The Righteous Among Nations.

• They discuss why these people are called this way. They choose some of the Greek names that are mentioned and try to find more information about them. They may try to choose names from any other nation as well, do the same and find similarities in the stories.
• Participants are encouraged to talk about the meaning of morality in our life - Right, Respect, Love, Hope, Faith, Memory.

They organize a visit to the theatre and attend the theatrical performance based on David’s Greg play “Who is Doctor Korczak?” or read the text that refers to the Polish doctor, educator and author Janusz Korczak (1878 -1942). They discuss his ideas and his life in Poland during the Second World War, the affection that his beliefs had to the children that took care of but also in the whole world after his death.

• Search for signs of Jewish history in your hometown or other significant places related to their family history.
• Try to explore your own family histories of that period by interviewing family members.
• They can also read another family history such as Anne Frank’s diary and try to see the different contexts.
• Visit the websites of the Jewish Museums in Europe (Greece www.jewishmuseum.gr, www.jmth.gr/indexGR.htm, Germany www.jmberlin.de) listen to the stories of other Jewish people and find out similarities with the story of the Molho family.
• Read the book “The last black cat” by Eugenius Trivizas a famous Greek author and discuss the big issue of racism in our society.

Variations:
The activities that are suggested for participants 11-12 years old can be adopted for other target groups as well. They may also be developed according to the interests and needs of your group.

It is possible to apply the method in other contexts as “Diversity in the societies nowadays”. This workshop can be adapted to other aspects such as interculturalism, migration, human rights, dialogue, refugees in order to facilitate dialogue in the modern multiculturalism societies.

Suggested project “Diversity in the societies nowadays”
In the film it is said that “Thessaloniki before war, was a multicultural city,” like most of the Greek and European cities today. What are the problems that people have to face and solve?

The project allows different perspectives, various narratives related to a space a group lives in. It can be used to explain different experiences of local population and migrants.

In this case, the educator focuses on possible angles from which we should see the others.

Key words: diversity, refugees, migrants, migration, dialogue, multiculturalism, violence, tolerance, sharing perspectives, interculturalism

Recommendations for implementation:
• Before watching the film, introduce to the participants the CENTROPA website (www.centropa.org), talk about goals and mission and give them some time to explore it.
4.5.
What do you know about migration?!

Objectives
• Provide new insights on Germany’s migration history
• Create links to stories from other countries
• Learn to understand history as a complex and entangled constant
• Look at migration as an ongoing normality
• Get to know different ways of migration
• General reflection on one’s ideas and expectations

Overview
This exercise is suitable in educational work for an international exchange, but can also be applied in the context of school education (for example for English, German, History classes, etc.) or non-formal education. However, in the latter cases the last phase of the exercise should be omitted, since this is specifically made to fit an international framework.

Background
How to work with the WINGS and ROOTS timeline within an international context:
Migration is a phenomenon that is as old as human history itself. People have always been moving from one place to another in order to protect their lives and those of their family from war, disease and hunger. To find better living conditions, education, work or to be close to one’s loved ones. Sometimes people are also moving just to satisfy their wanderlust or to gather experience abroad.

Some people migrate only once in their life, others more often, which is often influenced by one’s legal status or nationality. While some may choose whether they, for example, want to move to a different country temporarily for further studies, others don’t see any other way for themselves (and their family) but to flee or move away from their country of origin.

Therefore, migration does not happen in the same way or for the same reason for all; the ways and reasons why people change places differ and are often connected to historical events. The following exercise aims to expand one’s own perspective on migration. Participants can learn more through different stories more about immigra-
tion to and from Germany and expand their knowledge on migration in other countries. Overlapping events make the connection between individual stories and political events very clear. This is why they need to be looked at from different perspectives.

**Preparation**

The materials needed for the method are:

- 15 Timeline cards that are numbered by decade (See Annex on page 92)
- 8 Timeline pictures
- 16 Timeline events
- Information handout about the timeline
- Worksheet on the timeline
- 2-3 blank A4 sheets of paper for each participant
- Blank paper to make notes
- Notebook(s) with Internet connection and/or smartphones
- Sticky tape
- Markers and pens

The space used for the method should be a seminar room or a classroom with good internet connection.

All pictures, cards and events should be printed out.

The exercise requires access to the website of the initiative WINGS and ROOTS: [www.reimaginebelonging.org](http://www.reimaginebelonging.org)

Ideally, the workshop trainer would read through the Information handout to the timeline, in order to be able to explain the aims and objectives of the timeline and its genesis better. Additionally, it is advisable to acquaint oneself with all the sixteen event cards and the website before the workshop.

Shortly before the workshop the numbered cards need to be stuck/hung up on the wall making up a timeline starting from 1870 till 2010.

**Course of the workshop**

The participants should be seated in a semicircle in front of the timeline and all the eight timeline pictures need to be kept in the middle of this semicircle on the floor.

**Instructions**

The trainer can then introduce this method as a method suggested by the education team of the initiative with WINGS and ROOTS and mention that the timeline can also be found online.

It is further suggested that the trainer informs the participants that the workshop is made up of two parts and that the first part deals with the migration history of Germany while the second part focuses on stories of other countries.
It is also important to make the participants aware of the fact that even though the timeline has been divided in decades and begins only in 1870 and ends in 2010, in reality there is no end and no beginning. People have been migrating since time immemorial. The timeline of the initiative With WINGS and ROOTS has been, for practical purposes, restricted to the above mentioned period, starting in the year 1870 with the foundation of the German empire and the new understanding of “being German” and belonging to the German nation. The timeline ends in the current decade.

Implementation of the exercise:

Phase 1:

(40 minutes)

The participants should, if possible, be divided into eight (or less) equally sized groups. If there are less or equal to eight participants, then each works individually. If there are more participants then, small groups of 2-4 people are suggested.

Each person/group should then select one of the eight pictures and in ten minutes try to guess the following information:

- Type of event (law, demonstration, protest, work situation etc.)
- The year or decade to which the event belongs
- The type of migration (for e.g., work, flight, exile, war, etc.)
- The groups or persons that could have been involved

After completing this task, each person/group then presents their/her/his picture with the newly gathered information to the others. Depending on the time available, the trainer can decide if the presentations can be followed by a discussion.

Once all the presentations are over, the participants are then requested to check if the information they have presented is correct. This can be done either on their smartphones or on the notebooks. They can look up the information on the website of the initiative ‘with WINGS and ROOTS’ and search for their picture on the timeline of the website. Once they have found them, the participants then can read through the corresponding text on the website and make notes if needed. Once they have finished reading their text and making notes, all the participants return to the semi-circle and narrate to the group turn-wise, about what they were able to find and whether their assumption and the text matched. In the next step the participants are requested to put up their events on the timeline on the wall.

Phase 2:

(20 minutes)

The trainer then lays down all the 16 event cards from the timeline on the floor for all the participants to see. Each person/group is then requested to select their event and one additional event. These events don’t need to be connected to each other. The participants then return to their groups and read out the new event to the whole group. The trainer then asks the participants if they were already aware of the new situation and whether they have any additional information on their event. After everyone has read their respective new text, both events are brought onto the timeline on the wall.
If needed, a short break of five minutes can be taken before the last task of this exercise is carried out.

**Phase 3:**
**(30 – 60 minutes)**
With the third phase the last part of the exercise starts. This part includes the previously discussed events in an international framework. It serves as a bridge between the events that took place in Germany and their importance for other countries. Especially in recent decades it can be assumed that migration is no longer just the movement from one country to the other, whereby the migrants remain in the incoming country from the first day of arrival until the day they die, but may include many different forms and lengths of stay. One can no longer assume that migration happens only between two countries – it must rather be seen as the interaction of many countries, whose historical pasts are interconnected. It can therefore be assumed that migration doesn't happen in a linear way, but that there are rather quite a lot of crossings and entanglements involved. The investigation of this is the aim of the third phase.

In the last phase of the exercise the participants are requested to think about the country they are currently relating to the most or about which they know the most. This can be their country of origin, the birth country of their parents, the country they spend their childhood or study time in, the country they are working in or currently staying in.

The participants are then given their worksheets and either alone, or in self-selected groups, find and collect events from their chosen country that have something to do with its migration history. These events can be related to the previously discussed events from the German timeline. The use of the internet for research is allowed and welcome. The questions on the worksheet can be used as a stimulus. The participants should note the events on an A4 sheet of paper, using a new paper for each new event. The participants have 20-30 minutes of time for this task.

After completion of their individual tasks, all return to the semicircle and share their events. A room for questions is foreseen at this point. For example, in case of questions or if other participants observe parallels to their stories, now would be a good point to share them.

In case time allows, the trainer can discuss the following questions after the presentation:
- How does a story/how do stories come into being?
- Why do we have different perspectives?
- Which narratives are important today and how do various countries deal with them?

**Modified version**
Alternatively, the exercise can also start right from the beginning with the involvement of international events. In this case the moderator prepares the 16 timeline events for the international framework and asks participants in Phase I to pick one or two event(s) out of the stack. The participants are then asked to go to the website www.reimaginebelonging.org and research the picked events a bit more. This can be done alone or in small groups. All 16 events are of relevance to the European context. The research should therefore focus on that. Furthermore, participants can find out whether the events have more of an economic, political, or rather cultural aspect and what they mean for the groups that are mentioned. The aspect of privileges and disadvantages can be explored as well. Here, the participants take a closer look at the people who have been benefiting from that
event, but also at those for whom it had a negative connotation.

As soon as the participants are done with their research, they gather together and report back to the group. At the very end all of the events need to be attached to the timeline on the wall.

In addition, participants can now have a closer look at the 16 events that are already up there and suggest others that are missing and have not been mentioned yet.

**Fact Sheet: How to work with the timeline**

The timeline of „Migration, social and political rights and belonging“ deals with events of migration processes and migration policies of the last 100 years of German and US-American history. Those events are only rarely mentioned in dominant historical discourses.

The timeline can be filtered by following topics:
- citizenship
- identity and belonging
- discrimination and inequity
- media and culture
- activism and resistance
- labour and economy
- borders
- education
- families and relationship
- migrations
- race and ethnicity
- gender and sexuality
- religion

**Each event of the timeline includes:**
- 1-3 paragraphs of explanatory text
- audio-visual material – either an image, a video from the Story Collection or archive material
- links to additional education material, activist groups and other cultural resources
- used sources and further reading suggestions

Important for the selection of the events are the following criteria:
- most important laws and political events in context of migration and asylum
- international events in relation of migration in Germany and the USA
- Media representation of the migrants who have an influence on the migration and integration discourse
- Collective experiences of discrimination, which are often underrepresented (For example; Colonialism, deprivation of rights of Black Germans in the Nazi-era and the history of Sinti and Roma)

**Task:**

Please choose a country, which you can relate to the most and whose history you are most familiar with. Think of events that are related to the country’s migration history and which you would like...
to share with others.

You can also just describe the event, in case you don’t remember a specific one, or if you are missing certain facts such as the exact date or people involved. It is also helpful to look at the events that are already on the timeline and see if you can connect yours with those.

You can work alone or with others and choose who that might be. Internet research is permitted and welcomed.

Feel free to use the following questions as a suggestion:
• What do you know about the country’s migration history?
• How is it referred to? Is it referred to at all?
• What events are referred to the most (for example through media)?
• What events are blanked out? Why?
• What kind of connections do you see with the events that are already on the timeline? Does the narrative of the country you selected match with the narrative you are aware of? Or is it different? Why do you think it is so?

Further information:
www.reimaginebelonging.org

Movie:
www.withwingsandrootsfilm.com

Facebook:
www.facebook.com/withWINGSandROOTS
E-Mail: info@withwingsandroots.com
Objectives

The objectives of this method can be separated into 3 categories: knowledge, skills and attitudes.

Knowledge

- Learn about new concepts via brainstorming, recalling previous knowledge about one’s own past, his/her family history etc.
- Understand key-issues based upon the subject of the program. Some of the key-issues addressed could include migration, identity, membership, acculturation etc.
- Transfer the knowledge in new situations
- Work on critical thinking
- Make elaborate judgments and build solid arguments

Skills

- Distribute, organize and time-manage activities
- Collaborate with other participants of diverse nationalities, places of residence, religion, language etc.
- Present outcomes to an audience

Attitudes

- Reflect on one’s personal stereotypes and issues of identity
- Empathize with other people’s life-story narratives
- Re-negotiate values and beliefs regarding third parties
Overview

This workshop briefly presents the theoretical background of key-concepts such as cultural deterritorialization, hybridity and creolization whilst also discussing key-issues of identity, mobility and belonging. It then comprises two interconnected experiential methods, which can also be used individually, for groups of educators, historians, youth workers and other stakeholders interested in *Histoire Croisée*, politics, development and social studies. The first method is based on the *re-occurring strands* (Buruma and Margalit, 2004, p.11) and the second on Berry’s (2005) 4 *acculturation strategies*.

Background

Globalization and human mobility have been around for millennia; throughout the centuries, people have chosen or been forced to relocate often. Along with them, they take some of their possessions, their families, but also their identity, culture, language and religion. However, as time away from the homeland flies, ties between culture and place weaken and migrants are simultaneously welcomed and rejected both in their new homes and in their home-lands as they undergo cultural and psychological changes of acculturation. What happens to these people who experience a major identity crisis due to acculturation stress? Can host countries accept them for who they are? Can governments reconcile their past differences? How can we all remember our common history and perceive/share it towards our mutual benefit? Today, these questions seem more relevant and hot than ever in Europe and need to be addressed immediately with sincerity and good-intentions.

Preparation

Ideally, the trainer will have prepared in advance a digital presentation including key-concepts, based on what is previously mentioned in the overview and context. The list of references can assist her/him with the presentation.

The materials needed for the method are: Overhead projector, computer, flipchart, markers, bibliography for further reading and preparation (as suggested below).

Course of the workshop

Phase 1:

*Intro: Map of Europe. Warm-up activity (10 – 15 minutes)*

The aim of this activity is to help participants realize how in today’s era of globalization and mobility people are not settled in one place for life but also that throughout the ages people have always been mobile and shared more common things than they might thought.

*Description:* All participants stand in an empty wide space. The trainer pre-defines the four cardinal directions in the room (North-South-East-West). Then, s/he suggests participants make a mental image of Europe based on the cardinal points and asks them to locate themselves in the room according to the country they were born in. On the next step, participants are requested to move and locate themselves in the room, according to where they currently live. Then, participants reposition themselves according to where they studied, or where their parents and grandparents come from etc. After a few re-positions, it should become clear that not all of the participants...
(or their families) have spent all of their lives in one country and that they have been more or less mobile across Europe or even the whole world.

Phase 2:
Presentation of key-concepts.
Brainstorming. (30 minutes)
The trainer assists a brainstorming activity on cultural deterritorialization, hybridity, creolization, and acculturation.

On flipcharts s/he forms spider-webs with the concepts and participants’ input.

Then, s/he presents widely acknowledged definitions of the concepts on the overhead projector (Definitions are provided in the Annex on page 71)

The trainer and the participants can have a follow-up discussion on identity in relation to the concepts presented in plenary session. Some suggestive questions can be the following:
1. When moving to another country for longer periods of time (e.g. studying or working) did you feel any changes in your identity? How about changes in your habits or lifestyle?
2. How easy was it for you to describe a person of the country you moved in? Was the society in this country homogeneous or heterogeneous? In what aspects were they either of the two?
3. How well did you fit in in the country you moved in? Which aspects were easier or more difficult?

Phase 3:
Re-occurring strands.
Highlighting stereotypes. (45 minutes)
The trainer presents the 4 re-occurring strands (Buruma and Margalit, 2004, p.11) which are the focus of differentiation and controversy among people from different nations, cultures, religions etc.; simplified 1. the city, 2. the mind, 3. the lifestyle, 4. the moral values.

In theory, Buruma and Margalit (2004, p.11) identified four reoccurring strands of Occidentalism: 1. the city as a symbol of arrogance, rootless, greed, decadence, 2. the West mind of rationality, logic and science, 3. the corrupted, sinful, comforted bourgeois and 4. the infidels who deserve the wrath of God. Evidently, prejudice is part of the human condition and it clouds judgments, obstructs communication and forms illusive and dangerous misconceptions, shaped from and addressed towards all directions. These four key-concepts can be the basis of investigating why and how identities fall into crisis, partially supported by key issues dealt with in the Identity Process Theory (I.P.T.) and the Social Identity Theory (S.I.T.).

Participants are divided in groups of mixed nationalities. Then, they are asked to reflect on their experiences, opinions, beliefs about the 4 re-occurring strands in Europe and note them down on a flip chart looking like this figure:
Note: Depending on variations of this method people can compare between Europe and other continents, as was originally intended by Buruma and Margalit (2004).

Each group presents the flipchart with the strands it has been working with. Then, all the participants in the plenary can comment on the stereotypes, beliefs and opinions written on the flipcharts about Europe. Issues such as European identity and citizenship, European culture and values might come up and be discussed even further.

**Phase 4:**

**Berry’s acculturation strategies.**

**Issues of belonging. (45 minutes)**

The trainer presents Berry’s (2005) 4 acculturation strategies, which focus on relationships among ethno-cultural groups and the maintenance of their heritage culture and identity. Namely the four strategies are: integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization.

In theory, Berry claimed that "not all groups and individuals undergo acculturation in the same way" (2005, p. 704). As he stated, all acculturating people face two great issues: one is the maintenance of their heritage, culture and identity but they are also faced with the communication and the relationships that need to be sought with people belonging to other groups. As he developed his theory he formed four acculturation strategies which are: integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization. As seen on Figure 2 below, when someone manages to maintain a good relationship with members of other groups and also maintain her/his culture, identity and heritage in the new place of residence then s/he is integrated. On the exact opposite side, if someone does not manage to maintain any relationship with members of other groups and also lost her/his culture, identity and heritage then s/he becomes completely marginalized. Somewhere in between is assimilation, which assumes that the individual has good relationships with other groups but lost her/his heritage, identity and culture and separation in which an individual maintains her/his heritage, culture and identity but does not manage to have good relationships with other groups. Of course, Berry included these acculturation strategies in a broader framework of understanding acculturation, which explored what happens to identity, relationships, etc. on a cultural/group level and on a psychological/individual level.

Based on Berry’s theory (2005), participants are divided into groups according to the country they currently reside in (not necessarily their homelands). On a flipchart looking like figure 2 below they place a round nametag on the area they feel they belong in. (Alternatively, they can just write their name on the selected area or draw a dot, if they want to remain anonymous).
Each group presents its flipchart to the other groups and they all discuss the reasons behind their feeling of belonging (or less, or not belonging) in relation to the four re-occurring strands/stereotypes mentioned in the previous method. Though guiding questions are not really suggested when people voluntarily discuss personal narratives, the trainer can prompt participants to reflect on the reasons why they didn’t manage to fit in into their new place of residence or ask other participants to share the strategies they used in order to feel well accommodated into their new settings.

**Phase 5:**
**Debriefing and evaluation. (15 minutes)**
The after-math discussion can take place either in a plenary session or in subgroups or even anonymously via disclosed notes on a paper. Participants can comment on various topics such as, but not limited to:

- The solidity and credibility of the theoretical input.
- The way in which groups were formed, worked and presented their outcome.
- The methods; their degree of creativity, interest, applicability etc.
- Stereotypes about Europe; What people think about the life, values, etc. in other countries of Europe besides the one they come from or the one they live in. How and why stereotypes are formed, what can be done to dismantle them down.
- Issues of identity. What is it? How important is it? What threatens it?
- Reconciliation. Can a person reconcile her/his inner multiple roles, identities, cultures? Can countries reconcile with their past and their present towards a multicultural peaceful future?

**Recommendations for implementation:**
Before this workshop prepare well; as the topics of stereotypes, identity and reconciliation dealt with in this workshop are really sensitive and can heat things up, read the theory that supports them carefully. Make sure that the
participants are distributed appropriately in their subgroups. Try not to pressure all participants into revealing personal information regarding their sense of belonging in groups, their identity or the stereotypes they might have; this will only bring about a cold distant mood. Be very cautious of hate speech, even if it is disclosed (e.g. when working with a specific country people might write ugly hurtful things in a distasteful manner). If time is limited, keep method 1 but choose only one between methods 2 or 3.

Variations:

Brainstorming and spider-webs are tasks that can be performed on any subject matter and they conveniently bridge theoretical inputs with experiential methods.

The 4 reoccurring strands is a method that can be used between participants living in the same country but belonging to different ethnic groups. In addition, it can be used among various countries or targeted towards a specific country which all participants want to discuss.

The 4 acculturation strategies is a method with multiple variations. It can be tried out in a school class, in order to see if all students feel comfortable in their environment. It can be tried out in a non-formal training or seminar, to check if all international participants feel good about the program they joined. Of course, it mostly addresses minority groups, ethnic groups but it can also be employed as a method for less socially privileged people (such as drug addicts, people with special needs, homeless etc.).

Appendix: Definitions

Orientalism: The term Orientalism describes anyone who teaches, writes about or researches the orient, which has been the main focus of attention, as it was considered by the West the “unknown” place to be explored, understood and developed.

* Orientalism researches the Orient, despite or beyond any correspondence, or lack thereof, with a “real” Orient and the other (Said, 1979).

Occidentalism: Occidentalism is “the dehumanizing picture of the West painted by its enemies” (Buruma and Margalit, 2004). Occidentalism is the “formed challenge to those Western hegemonists who have always had a bias against the Orient” (Wang, 1997).

Cultural deterritorialization: The term refers to a weakening of ties between culture and place. This means the removal of cultural subjects and objects from a certain location in space and time. It implies that certain cultural aspects tend to transcend specific territorial boundaries in a world that consists of things fundamentally in motion. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1977)

Acculturation: It is a dual process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individual members. At the group level, it involves changes in social structures and institutions and in cultural practices. At the individual level, it involves changes in a person’s behavioral repertoire (Berry, 2005, pp. 698-699).
Acculturation stress: It is a reduction in health status—psychological, somatic, social—of individuals who are undergoing acculturation (Chryssochoou, 2004). Issues of responsibility, self-efficacy, self-esteem, negotiation, distinctiveness and categorization (marginalization and separation), definition of values come up.

Hybridization: It is an antidote to the cultural differentialism of racial and nationalist doctrines because it takes as its point of departure precisely those experiences that have been banished, marginalized, tabooed in cultural differentialism. It subverts nationalism because it privileges border-crossing (Pieterse, 2009).

Creolization: It is the process of assimilation in which neighbouring cultures share certain features to form a new distinct culture. “Creole” denoted the offspring of Old World progenitors born and raised in the New World (Stewart, 2010).
Objectives

“Στερεοτυπεν?”, a project designed to follow the principles of *Histoire Croisée*, targets to:

- Reinforce the participants’ **critical thinking** to overcome conflicting memories and national/ethnic prejudices
- Stimulate **empathy** by taking the other’s perspective into account and inspire a change of one’s own perspective and self-image
- Acknowledge the **relativity** of knowledge and the possibility of coming closer to the past and the present from different perspectives.

Background

It all starts with etymology: the originally Greek term „stereotype“ that refers to solid or firm types and categories has been adopted by most languages of the world. Stereotypes express what is arguably an intrinsic human need to put things into boxes in an attempt to reduce the increasing complexity of the world. By reproducing stereotypes, we attribute characteristics not only to others but also to ourselves. This behaviour is harmless up to the point when labelling becomes discriminatory and exclusive. For example, ideologies or practices such as racism, antisemitism or homophobia are closely related to deeply embedded ideas and beliefs that people or societies have towards the other. Deconstructing stereotypes can be a demanding process as preconceived ideas and firm beliefs often derive from family, school and socialization with peers.

„Στερεοτυπεν?!“ is a project that derives from the culmination of negative labelling between Germans and Greeks during the on-going Eurozone crisis. The relationship between Germany and Greece has been historically marked by noteworthy ups (e.g. Philhellenism throughout the 19th century) and downs (e.g. Nazi Occupation in World War II) but it was the latest crisis that brought existing reciprocal stereotypes to the surface after a long period of post-war euphoria. Populist-prone politicians and media from both sides contributed decisively to the deterioration of German-Greek relations by using a nationalist narrative in order to attract wider audiences. The re-emergence of existing stereotypes in a setting of financial recession and political instability resulted in, among other things, a hostile depiction of “the other”.
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Being inspired by the concept and approach of *Histoire Croisée*, these methods aim not only at the deconstruction of stereotypes between Germans and Greeks but also suggest common and yet adjusted methods of non-formal education that can be applied to various settings.

*Histoire Croisée*, a transcultural perspective with reference to the European history, describes a reconsideration of the way history can combine empirical and reflexive concerns into a dynamic and flexible approach. It’s about how social, cultural and political ideas are interrelated, in a practical and intellectual way. Different perspectives and different points of view allow us to bring to the surface issues which play a crucial role to recompose historical knowledge and re-shape stereotypes.

I.

**Methodology based on experiential learning**

The usage as well as the construction and deconstruction of stereotypes is a process happening beyond our level of awareness and it is connected to our attitude towards the world rather than theoretical knowledge about it. The method presented below is based on a methodology giving the opportunity to work deeply and make the participants realize mechanisms they adapt unconsciously in their everyday lives. All the exercises are designed according to the experiential learning approach which is based upon the well-established concept that one's experience plays a crucial role in the acquisition and consolidation of knowledge.

In David Kolb’s\(^{10}\) theory on genuine learning experience, four abilities are required from the learner: s/he must be willing to be actively involved in the experience; must be able to reflect on the experience; must possess and use analytical skills to conceptualize the experience and must possess decision making and problem solving skills in order to use the new ideas gained from the experience. All the exercises presented below must be implemented according to Kolb’s following circle:

On a more practical level, it is the trainer’s task to create the appropriate circumstances as a prerequisite for making this process valuable. It requires her/him to be actively present during the exercises and lead the group process without interrupting it. Last but not least, the Socratic method should not be underestimated. In other words, ask participants questions in order to make them realize the objectives of the workshop.

**Overview**

There are several exercises that can be relevant and applicable to various formats of non-formal education (e.g. workshops, seminars) as well as contexts (e.g. global terrorism, media propaganda) and case studies (e.g. Russia and Ukraine, nationals and migrants) within the framework of the method "Στερεότυπα?!". They are linked to each other and correspond to the following sequence.

For example, a *treasure hunt* could be an introductory activity that aims at team building among participants that don’t know each other and may possess over preconceived ideas towards the others. Another activity could be a *collage* through which participants get acquainted with the notion of stereotypes. Collage is a method through which participants can deconstruct stereotypes by interacting with people from different backgrounds. On a given topic, participants create an image out of several other images from e.g. old magazines, newspapers, postcards or leaflets. Thus, collage can deal with a variety of topics that are associated with social or national stereotypes such as poverty, exclusion, globalisation, multi-speed Europe etc.

After that participants can get involved in an exercise called *(Whole) picture* in order to understand the mechanism behind the construction of stereotypes. Further down this exercise is described more in detail. Finally, newly gained knowledge could be applied through the method of *simulation*. During a simulation the participants are confronted with a fictitious or real scenario (e.g. “Greece is in the Eurozone crisis”). Each participant gets a clearly defined role such as a German or Greek politician (Wolfgang Schäuble or Yanis Varoufakis), EU officials, trade unions’ representatives, journalists etc. The participants gain an insight into group dynamics and their impact upon stereotypes according to a majority-minority scheme. They improve argumentation and negotiation skills, reinforce critical thinking and stimulate empathy by putting themselves into the other’s position as a prerequisite for deconstructing existing stereotypes.

Thus, the combination of the described exercises can support the deconstruction of stereotypes in a certain setting, in this case the German and Greek stereotypes that emerged in the context of crisis.
Objectives

• To engage in cooperation and exchange visions and imaginations in order to create a common perspective in the process of dialogue
• To broaden the participant’s perspectives and cultural sensitivity as well as to enhance their intercultural and communicational skillset
• To show that there is always a broader context that needs to be taken in the account before judging;
• To encourage participants to self-reflect, when the whole story is revealed
• To set a discussion in order to question the role of the media in forming opinions, especially in times of crisis
• To promote a learning effect in regards of media competence, as well as critical thinking towards the media in general
• To establish mutual understanding

Preparation

The pictures need to be cut into two pieces. The whole story is only revealed when they are put together as one picture (see Annex an page 88);

Other materials needed for the exercise are pens and paper to take notes and write key points of the stories behind the pictures.

Course of the workshop

Phase 1:
Introduction (5 minutes)
The trainer explains that the session will encourage the participants to use their own thoughts and imagination powers in order to broaden their perspectives and become sensitive for differences, so they can emancipate from simple minded content published in the media.

Phase 2:
Forming groups (5 minutes)
According to the size of the entire group, the trainer forms subgroups that consist of 4-6 participants from different backgrounds. S/He gives the groups suitable working space and equips them with one picture-piece and necessary materials such as posters, markers, tape etc.

Phase 3:
Group work part I (20 min)
The participants discuss within their groups the probable story behind the picture. After discussing they are asked to write the story down. When participants write their story, they should not let their imagination run wild, but stick close to the picture. During that phase, the trainer should not intervene or answer any questions related to the picture.
Phase 4:
**Group work part II (20 min)**
In the next step the trainer hands in the missing part of the pictures to each subgroup that reveals the crucial whole story behind it. The participants are asked to discuss what they see now in the picture and to write the “new” story down.

After that they are asked to compare both stories with each other. The participants should prepare a presentation for the rest of the group by considering the main differences and most important parts of their discussion.

Phase 5:
**Presentations (ca. 30 min, depends on the amount of participants and subgroups)**
Each group presents the results of their group work. The presentation should include the initial thoughts about the first picture, thoughts and emotions after the revelation and a conclusion from the new perspective, putting an emphasis on the changes brought forward by the revelation of the whole story.

Phase 6:
**Debriefing and evaluation:**
The trainer should include all participants in a debriefing and evaluation round. During the discussion participants can reflect on their feelings during the activity and how they liked it in general. Additionally, the trainer should evoke a discussion on the role of the media as producer of irregular pictures. The discussion can be facilitated by asking the following questions:

- What do you think was this activity’s intention and what kind of resolutions can you draw for yourself?
- Was this activity useful in terms of changing your viewpoint or providing you with a new impulse?
- How did you feel during this exercise and how would you assess your emotions in the context of the whole objectives of the meeting/conference etc.?
- What was it like to work in a group? Did you mostly agree or disagree as a group?
- What did you learn in general after doing this exercise?
- Which things did you personally find interesting/strange/confusing/exciting?

**Recommendations for trainers:**
Choose pictures where there is a clear difference between the things to expect and the actual background story, after they have been cut in half.

Explain clearly but also simply the different steps of the activity to the groups but one after another and not the whole method at once. Answer the questions if there are any. Avoid mentioning that this exercise is media related, the participants should find this out by themselves in the process. Induce a discussion on media by asking the right questions in the debriefing round.

**Variations:**
In conclusion, the above exercise and the other shortly presented ones (treasure hunt, collage, and simulation) have been chosen as tools that have the potential to deconstruct stereotypes between Germany and Greece that...
emerged during the ongoing crisis. Through their implementation and especially through reflection afterwards, participants have the chance not only to understand how stereotypes are constructed but also to deal with one’s own preconceived ideas and beliefs. As a consequence, these exercises can be applied in a variety of similar contexts (e.g. global terrorism, media propaganda) and case studies (e.g. Russia vs Ukraine, nationals’ vs migrants).
1896

Kolonialausstellung und Völkerschauen


Colonial Exhibitions and Ethnological Expositions

Ethnological Expositions or “Peoples Shows” became increasingly popular during the heyday of European Colonialism in the mid-19th century. Non-European persons were put on show in zoos, circuses, in industry and colonial expositions by white people.
1914 - 1918

Zwangsarbeiten im Ersten Weltkrieg


Forced Labor in World War I

At the outbreak of World War I, approximately 3 million Germans who worked in agriculture volunteer or are drafted for military service. As a result, forced labor migrants, primarily from Poland, become indispensable to maintain German agriculture during the war.

1933 - 1945

Widerstand im Nationalsozialismus


Resistance during National Socialism

During National Socialist rule, numerous forms of resistance emerge both in Germany and neighboring countries under occupation. Especially remarkable are the incidents of resistance and rebellion in the Ghettos and concentration camps erected by the Nazis, including Warsaw, Treblinka and Sobibór.
1939 - 1945

Migration and Exil im Nationalsozialismus

Mehr als eine halbe Million Menschen, darunter mehr als 90% jüdischen Glaubens, fliehen nach der Machtübergabe an Adolf Hitler in europäische Nachbarstaaten. Viele gehen zunächst davon aus, bald wieder nach Deutschland zurückkehren zu können. Als aber die Nationalsozialist*innen auch ihre Nachbarstaaten zu okkupieren beginnen, setzen sie ihre Migration in Richtung USA, Leitamamerika, Palästina oder die Türkei fort.

Migration and exile during National Socialism

Following the transfer of power to Adolf Hitler, more than a half million people, over 90 percent of whom are Jewish, flee Germany to neighboring countries. Many initially assume that they can return soon, but when the Nazis move to occupy neighboring countries, they migrate further abroad, seeking new homes in Latin America, the USA, Palestine and Turkey.

1939 - 1945

Zwangsarbeit im Nationalsozialismus


Forced labor under National Socialism

Nazi Germany establishes one of the largest systems of forced labor in history: between 1939 and 1945, approximately 26 million people in the German Reich and occupied territories are pressed into compulsory labor. Alongside prisoners of war and concentration camp inmates, the largest segment of these laborers is comprised of around 8.4 million civilians – men, women and children – deported into the Reich.
1951

Genfer Flüchtlingskonvention


1979

Selbstorganisation Sinti und Roma


1979

Sinti and Roma Civil Rights Movement

Without an official policy of remembrance or recognition of Sinti and Roma suffering as state-sponsored genocide, Sinti and Roma in Germany experience a perpetuation of stereotypes, exclusion, discrimination and criminalization. At the end of the 1970s, Sinti and Roma groups organize public events in order to draw attention to these continuities.
1985

Schengener Abkommen


1991

Grenzöffnung Osteuropa und UdSSR

Die Öffnung der Grenzen Osteuropas und der Zerfall der UdSSR bewegen viele Menschen dazu vor allem in die neuen Länder der BRD zu migrieren. Dazu zählen unter anderem jüdische Kontingentflüchtlinge und (Spät-) Aussiedlerinnen aus der ehemaligen Sowjetunion.

Schengen Agreement

On June 14, 1985, an agreement is signed in Schengen, the tri-border area between Germany, France and Luxembourg, representing the first step in the elimination of border controls between the future states of the EU. While the borders within the EU were opened, control of Europe’s outer borders has been continuously intensified.

Opening of Borders of Eastern Europe and the USSR

The opening of the borders of Eastern Europe and the collapse of the USSR prompt many to migrate into the newly integrated Germany. These include among others, so called Jewish “Contingent Refugees” as well as “(late) resettlers” (German emigrants) from the former Soviet Union.
2001

11. September und antimuslimischer Rassismus


2003

Dublin II-Verordnung

Der Europäische Rat beschließt am 18. Februar 2003 die Dublin-II-Verordnung und gibt somit eine weitere Regelung in der Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik der EU vor. Die Verordnung leitet den Beginn einer restriktiven Asylpolitik ein, die die ursprünglichen Gründungsmitglieder der EU weitestgehend davor schützt, Geflüchtete aufzunehmen.

9/11 and Anti-Muslim Racism

On September 11, 2001, a set of coordinated attacks on the U.S. World Trade Center, Pentagon and White House leave several thousands dead, sparking heightened national security measures and an anti-Muslim backlash in the US and Europe.

Dublin II Regulation

In the late 1990s, numerous films emerged in Germany that took a new approach to tackling themes of “cultural identity.” Rather than expounding upon questions of origin and identity or clinging to stereotypical portrayals, these films chose to tell confident alternative stories in which cultural identity represented but one aspect.
Die EU-Wirtschaftskrise trifft vor allem Spanien, Griechenland, Italien und Portugal. Dies hat zur Folge, dass überwiegend junge Menschen sich innerhalb der europäischen Union auf Arbeitssuche begeben.

Innereuropäische Migration

Erster EU-Roma-Gipfel


Erster EU-Roma-Gipfel First EU-Roma-Summit

Inspite of the fact that the Roma community is the biggest European ethnic minority with 10 to 12 million members, of whom approximately 5 to 6 million reside in member states of the European Union, Roma issues are only placed on the political agenda of the European Union in 2008. On September 16, the European Commission’s first ‘EU Roma Summit’ is held in Brussels.

Internal European Migration

The economic crisis of the European Union has tremendous effects on the populations of Spain, Greece, Italy and Portugal. Consequently, many young people living in these countries begin to move and search for job opportunities in other parts of the EU.
Refugee protests in Europe and Germany

Since September 2012, migrants across Germany and Europe have been protesting the precarious circumstances under which asylum seekers and refugees are forced to live, as well as demanding more just asylum policies. Long-term political solutions, however, remain forthcoming.

Refugee-Proteste

Seit September 2012 protestieren Geflüchtete an vielen Orten in Deutschland und in Europa gegen die prekären Lebensbedingungen von Asylbewerber*innen und geflüchteten Menschen und für eine gerechtere Asylpolitik. Langfristige politische Lösungen bleiben allerdings bis heute aus.

2012 - 2014

Revision of German Asylum and Nationality Law

On September 19, 2014, the upper house of the German parliament adopts changes to German asylum and nationality law proposed by the federal government, clearing the way for the designation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia and Serbia as “safe countries of origin.” As a result, people from these states can henceforth only claim asylum in Germany under exceptional circumstances.

Neuregelungen Asyl- und Staatsangehörigkeitsrecht


Rechtsruck in Europa

Rightward Shift in Europe and EU Parliamentary Elections

Elections to the European Parliament took place in 2014. The rising prevalence of racist, right-wing populist and extremist attitudes in many countries of the EU was reflected in the widespread electoral success of parties of the right.
**Arbeitsmigration im Kaiserreich**


**Sinti und Roma im Kaiserreich**

**1880 - 1914**

**Migration in die USA**

Im Zuge der industriellen Revolution und der damit einhergehenden Verarmung breiter Bevölkerungsschichten verlassen zwischen 1880 und 1914 über 20 Millionen Menschen Deutschland und migrieren zum größten Teil in die USA. Dadurch entwickeln sich transatlantische Migrationsnetzwerke und viele weitere Menschen wandern in entstehenden „Kettenwanderungen“ nach.

The industrial revolution and the associated impoverishment of broader social classes leads to the migration of more than 20 million persons from Germany, mostly to the USA, between the years 1880-1914. In the so-called “emigrant letters,” the people inform about their new life. Transatlantic migrant networks develop and many leave in migration waves.

---

**1884**

**Berliner Konferenz**


The Berlin Conference

On November 15, 1884 representatives of ten European states, the USA and the Ottoman Empire assemble at the invitation of Germany and France at the Berlin Conference. The objective was the colonial distribution of the African continent among the represented powers. This marks the official beginning of German colonial politics, which until the independence of the colonies is characterized by oppression, expropriation, forced labour and murder. Transatlantic migrant networks develop and many leave in migration waves.
Kolonialausstellung und Völkerschauen


Colonial Exhibitions and Ethnological Expositions

Ethnological Expositions or "Peoples Shows" became increasingly popular during the heyday of European Colonialism in the mid-19th century. Non-European persons were put on show in zoos, circuses, in industry and colonial expositions by white people.

Zwangsarbeit im Ersten Weltkrieg


Forced Labor in World War I

At the outbreak of World War I, approximately 3 million Germans who worked in agriculture volunteer or are drafted for military service. As a result, forced labor migrants, primarily from Poland, become indispensable to maintain German agriculture during the war.
1933 - 1945

Migration und Exil im Nationalsozialismus

Mehr als eine halbe Million Menschen, darunter mehr als 90% jüdischen Glaubens, fliehen nach der Machtübergabe an Adolf Hitler in europäische Nachbarstaaten. Viele gehen zunächst davon aus, bald wieder nach Deutschland zurückkehren zu können. Als aber die Nationalsozialist*innen auch ihre Nachbarstaaten zu okkupieren beginnen, setzen sie ihre Migration in Richtung USA, Leitamamerika, Palästina oder die Türkei fort.

Migration and exile during National Socialism

Following the transfer of power to Adolf Hitler, more than a half million people, over 90 percent of whom are Jewish, flee Germany to neighboring countries. Many initially assume that they can return soon, but when the Nazis move to occupy neighboring countries, they migrate further abroad, seeking new homes in Latin America, the USA, Palestine and Turkey.

1933 - 1945

Widerstand im Nationalsozialismus


Resistance during National Socialism

During National Socialist rule, numerous forms of resistance emerge both in Germany and neighboring countries under occupation. Especially remarkable are the incidents of resistance and rebellion in the Ghettos and concentration camps erected by the Nazis, including Warsaw, Treblinka and Sobibór.
1955 - 1968

Anwerbeabkommen der BRD


Recruitment agreements in the FRG

The strong postwar recovery of the West German economy brings about a labor shortage in the early 1950s, which the government hopes to counteract through the recruitment of foreign workers. These migrant workers are referred to as “guest workers,” which makes clear that their stay in Germany is seen as temporary.

1971 - 1973

Arbeitsabkommen DDR | osteuropäische Staaten


Labor Treaties GDR-Eastern European states

In the early 1970s, East Germany signs labor treaties with several Eastern European states, motivated by its precarious economic status and a rising wave of emigration. The first recruitment agreements were signed with Poland (1971), Bulgaria (1973) and Hungary (1973).
Die Öffnung der Grenzen Osteuropas und der Zerfall der UdSSR bewegen viele Menschen dazu vor allem in die neuen Länder der BRD zu migrieren. Dazu zählen unter anderem jüdische Kontingentflüchtlinge und (Spät-) Aussiedlerinnen aus der ehemaligen Sowjetunion.

ADEFRA und ISD


Foundation of Black German Activism

In 1986, the book “Show our colors: Afro-German women speak out” is published. It represents an important step towards the establishment of organizations by black people in Germany, including ADEFRA (Afro-German Women) and the Initiative of Black People in Germany (ISD).

Grenzöffnung Osteuropa und UdSSR

Die Öffnung der Grenzen Osteuropas und der Zerfall der UdSSR bewegen viele Menschen dazu vor allem in die neuen Länder der BRD zu migrieren. Dazu zählen unter anderem jüdische Kontingentflüchtlinge und (Spät-) Aussiedlerinnen aus der ehemaligen Sowjetunion.

Opening of Borders of Eastern Europe and the USSR

The opening of the borders of Eastern Europe and the collapse of the USSR prompt many to migrate into the newly integrated Germany. These include among others, so called Jewish “Contingent Refugees” as well as “(late) resettlers” (German emigrants) from the former Soviet Union.
**1991 - 1992**

**Anschläge Hoyerswerda und Rostock-Lichtenhagen**


**Racist pogroms in Hoyerswerda and Rostock-Lichtenhagen**

In the early 1990s, several brutal attacks are carried out on shelters for asylum-seekers throughout Germany. The rioting in Hoyerswerda and Rostock-Lichtenhagen marks the high point of racist violence in reunited Germany.

**2012**

**Mahnmal für Sinti und Roma**


**Memorial for Sinti and Roma**

On October 24, 2012, a memorial to the Sinti and Roma murdered under the National Socialist regime is officially opened in Berlin, more than 67 years after the end of the World War II. It is the result of a decades-long struggle to gain recognition of these Nazi crimes as acts of genocide.
Refugee-Proteste

Seit September 2012 protestieren Geflüchtete an vielen Orten in Deutschland und in Europa gegen die prekären Lebensbedingungen von Asylbewerber*innen und geflüchteten Menschen und für eine gerechtere Asylpolitik. Langfristige politische Lösungen bleiben allerdings bis heute aus.

Wegfall der Arbeitsbeschränkung


Refugee protests in Europe and Germany

Since September 2012, migrants across Germany and Europe have been protesting the precarious circumstances under which asylum seekers and refugees are forced to live, as well as demanding more just asylum policies. Long-term political solutions, however, remain forthcoming.

Omission of Working Restrictions

In the year 2007, Bulgaria and Romania join the European Union as member states. The German government decides, however, to restrict the rights of workers from both countries in Germany (as it did before with the new member states that joined the European Union in 2004). The last restrictions on the freedom of movement for workers from Bulgaria and Rumania were lifted in Germany on January 1, 2014.
1890
1900
1930

1940
1950

1960
2010


Council of Europe (2004): *All different, all equal.*


Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English
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