



Constructing Europe in history textbooks. An analysis of the discourse on World War I and World War II

Patricia von Münchow

Introduction

The role of memory in European integration can be interpreted and explored in multiple ways and on multiple levels, but it seems to me that it cannot be examined without taking into account its counterpart, *i.e.* the role memory plays in the construction of national identities. European integration and the construction of a national identity do not necessarily exclude one another—the collective dimension of identity consisting in a sense of belonging can (simultaneously) concern various entities on a local, regional, national, transnational level, etc. (see Lamizet 2015: 26, 33, 37-38)—but we need to pay attention to their interplay in order to understand what kind of European integration is exactly envisioned.

Memory is “a vital mechanism of selection of what to remember and what to forget”, says Rousso (2016: 11)¹, to which we might want to add “and *how* to remember or to forget it”. In his pioneer study from 1925, Halbwachs distinguished two kinds of collective memory—which is the dimension of memory of particular interest here—, “social memory” (*i.e.* the everyday presence of memories within a family or other small community) and “historical memory”, *i.e.* macro-collective narratives having a unifying function. Although they can only be seen in constant interaction (see Rousso 2016: 20), “historical memory” is our main concern in this study.

As I pointed out in detail in an earlier study (von Münchow 2019b), history developed as a professional discipline at the same time and in interaction with nation states, which “recognized the enormous potential of national history writing for collective identity construction” (Berger 2017: 39). Starting from the late 1950s historians gradually became more and more critical towards “historiographical nationalism” (*op. cit.*: 47) and in the 1990s new—either transnational or self-reflective—forms of historiography finally started to develop (*op. cit.*: 49-52). Although, according to Berger, historians never abandoned their status as guardians of nations (*op. cit.*: 52-53) it has become relevant to check if they also engage in the construction of transnational entities now that memory has become a transnational phenomenon (Rousso 2016: 25). Nations being “mental constructs”, it is indeed “*discursively*, by means of language and other semiotic systems” that “national identities—conceived as specific forms of social identities—are [...] *produced, reproduced, transformed and destructed*” (de Cillia *et alii* 1999: 153). The same could be said about European identities. These discourses are

disseminated essentially via education systems, in which the “minds and memories of the nationalized [and one could add, “Europeanized”] subjects” (*ibid.*) are formed.

Within national education systems, history classes have been designed, for more than 100 years now, to transmit the shared representations that create a national community and, at the same time, to make students into members of that community (Christophe & Schwedes 2015b: 17).² These classes can also shape, or at minimum aim to shape, students into members of a transnational community. Indeed, French curricula seem to adopt a European or universalist perspective not so much in regards to the choice of themes, but as far as the interpretation of events and historical developments is concerned (Tutiaux-Guillon 2017: 275), furthering European integration as well as acknowledging globalization while respecting a humanist French tradition (*op. cit.*: 282). In Germany, every *Land* and type of school has its own curricula, but Europe always holds an important place. The *Bildungsstandards* in history for Baden-Württemberg from 2004 to 2015³, for instance, insist on the “particular importance” of the “construction of European identity” (p. 219).⁴

As an essential tool for teaching in schools, textbooks are quite suitable for a discursive study of the construction of European memory and identity. In his comprehensive study on the history and methodology of international textbook research and revision, Pingel (2010) emphasizes how textbooks deal with nationalistic attitudes or the construction of oneself and “the other”. As Christophe and Schwedes put it, “memorial cultures are bundled up in textbooks like in a magnifying glass” (2015a: 9), even if in the past two or three decades textbooks, like primary and secondary education altogether, seem to have lost some of their capacity to transmit an official memory and thus the basic values of what could be considered a national “civil religion” (De Luna 2011)⁵.

Just as in the case of national memory and identity (de Cillia *et alii* 1999: 154), we can expect the construction of “Europeanness” to not be consistent, but to vary according to context. The variation of context this study will focus on is the country—France or Germany—on the one hand, and the topic addressed in the textbooks, on the other hand. The chapters on the First World War will be compared to the ones dealing with National Socialism, the Second World War and the Holocaust. While the memory of the

² This means that, contrary to what some authors assert (e.g. Bucciarelli 2007 [2002]: 167) it is not (necessarily or entirely) true that what is or should be taught in history classes is history rather than memory. As for the teaching and the transmission in the media of shared representations, or of representations that are meant to be shared, Nora (2002) takes a critical stance while De Luna (*TtL, tuttoLibritempolibero*, supplement of *La Stampa*, 24/01/2004, p. 1; quoted by Bucciarelli (2007 [2002]: 159) adopts a more positive position towards passing on a “light” version of collective memory.

See Bucciarelli (2007 [2002]) for a comprehensive account of the different types of associations one can see between history and memory, in which he reviews the works of a number of authors, notably Nora, Le Goff, Todorov, and Ricoeur.

³ http://www.bildungsplaene-bw.de/site/bildungsplan/get/documents/lbw/Bildungsplaene/Bildungsplaene-2004/Bildungsstandards/Gymnasium_Bildungsplan_Gesamt.pdf (accessed 15/09/2020).

⁴ See von Münchow 2019b for a more detailed development on French and German history curricula.

⁵ Apart from an ever more present power struggle for what is considered legitimate knowledge (Apple & Christian-Smith 1991: 2), certainly what textbook authors want to convey is not necessarily taught and what is taught is not necessarily learnt (*op. cit.*: 14).

First World War has recently been at the center of attention due to the celebrations of its centennial, “National Socialism and the Holocaust” are considered one of the most relevant “pasts” in “today’s dominant discourses” by the recent *Palgrave Handbook of Textbook Studies* (Fuchs & Bock 2018: 7).

In summary, this contribution deals with the construction of a European identity in its relationship with national identity by means of memory in French and German history textbooks. While history, memory studies or textbook research contribute to the overall framework, as well as to the interpretation of the results, the study has a resolutely discourse-analytic objective⁶ consisting of observing the discursive procedures through which identity is constructed, reflecting on the types of identity built as a result and detecting similarities and differences between countries as well as topics.

1. Theoretical and methodological framework

The study was conducted within the theoretical framework of Cross-Cultural Discourse Analysis (CCDA) (see von Münchow 2009 [2004], 2020), in the tradition of French Discourse Analysis. CCDA’s aim is to bring to light different “discursive cultures” by means of their verbal products. A discursive culture is a set of social representations that form a hierarchy. Their contents as well as their status within the hierarchy are taken into account, transmitted, constructed and transformed in discourse by means of different levels of markings or the absence of marking (see von Münchow 2018b). A discursive culture can thus be defined by what must, can and cannot be said about a given social object in a certain context and community and how it can and cannot be said.

In order to be able to describe discursive cultures, the analyst compares data from a specific discourse genre in different communities, identifying linguistic markers or traces of discursive operations and inferring hypotheses on the contents and on the status of social representations—as the speaker interprets them—underlying the discursive operations as well as arising from them. In other words, the aim is not only to reveal which representations circulate within a community, but also to distinguish representations that are considered obvious or, on the contrary, unacceptable from those that are dominating, emerging or declining. The status of these representations can be identified by means of their specific linguistic marking or the absence thereof. Thus comparison is not only the objective of CCDA studies, but also an important tool for the discovery of what remains more or less unsaid—namely obvious as well as unacceptable representations—in one community under scrutiny but not in the other.

Other methods for the detection of the unsaid or the “little-said” (see von Münchow 2018b) are the search for associated but unmentioned actors or the clarification of

⁶ It thus differs on some levels with similar studies which are written from a more educational or historiographical perspective. One such example is the much-quoted account by Crawford (2001) of how the *Blitz* is constructed in British history textbooks and established as an essential element of national memory.

argumentative premises. To effectively use these methods, the discourse analyst must have extensive knowledge of the communities where the discourses being compared originate. This partially explains the choice of French and German textbooks for the present study, but their comparison is relevant for several other reasons. Both countries are on the European continent and were involved—as enemies—in the First and the Second World War before becoming founding members of the European Union. In both countries, research on the construction of collective images in history textbooks has been an important area of study for the past 50 years (Pingel 2010: 43). Their education systems however are different; the system in France is centralized with a unified middle school, whereas in Germany, education is mostly under regional control with students attending different types of schools starting at the lower secondary level according to their academic achievements⁷.

The approach in CCDA is qualitative and inductive (see Pingel 2010: 69-71) and thus conducted on representative rather than comprehensive data sets. Research can be carried out from either a horizontal (synchronic) or vertical (diachronic) perspective (*op. cit.*: 30). This contribution is an example of the first kind. Several close readings of the data set determine which discursive operations within an extensive list (see von Münchow 2020) will be the most productive in relation to the specific objectives of the study. Among these discursive operations, the present study draws in particular on the “backgrounding” or “foregrounding” of social actors (see van Leeuwen 2008) as well as on procedures of “assimilation” and “dissimilation” (Reisigl & Wodak 2001), mainly through comparison⁸ and various enunciative operations. Indeed we must take into consideration the fact that “directly contrary to the form in which they are constantly invoked, identities are constructed through, not outside, difference[,...] through the relation to the Other” (Hall 1996: 4) and that discursive procedures of “dissimilation” thus characterize “identification”, as Hall puts it, at least as much as “assimilation” or the construction of sameness (de Cillia *et alii* 1999: 151).

As mentioned above, one (discursive) identification does not exclude another, though, as

identities are never unified and, in late modern times, increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions. They are subject to a radical historicization, and are constantly in the process of change and transformation. (Hall 1996: 4)

The same is true for “memory cultures” (Christophe & Schwedes 2015a : 9) or “memory regimes” (Rouso 2016: 21), which depend not only on past events, but primarily on present needs, as Halbwachs (1925) had pointed out already and researchers in the field of memory studies regularly reiterate (*e.g.* Kansteiner 2006, Lebow *et al.*

⁷ The multiplicity of school types in Germany has been taken into account in the construction of the data set, but is beyond the scope of this contribution as far as the interpretation of results is concerned.

⁸ Here “comparison” refers to the discursive device used by textbook authors, which is different from the use of comparison as a discourse-analytical tool.

2006). Those present needs can be multifold, conflicting among themselves and with previous needs, making for “competing narratives of the past” (Wodak et alii 2009 [1999]: 237).

It is precisely this complex “organisation of the past in relation to the present and future” (Carrier 2018: 193) that is central to this study. By focusing on—rather than explicit attempts at the construction of European integration—representations that are transmitted in a non-explicit or even unconscious way when the topic has nothing to do, at least on first sight, with any kind of European community, it is possible to highlight multilayered sets of representations and tensions between competing narratives even within the same textbook. In particular the analysis of what remains more or less unsaid thus allows for a novel approach of the construction of European or national identity in textbooks⁹.

The third section will provide a tangible example of how exactly CCDA’s methodology can be put to work, besides answering the already sketched out research questions: which representations of European or national identity do French and German textbook authors construct and through which discursive means when addressing World War I and World War II respectively? Which representations are clearly marked, which ones only leave discursive traces and which ones are not present in the texts at all and why?

2. Data

This study is based on a data set consisting of four French textbooks, all of them containing chapters on World War I as well as World War II, seven German textbooks in which World War I is addressed, two of which (*Forum Geschichte* and *Von... bis*) also contain chapters on World War II, and three additional German publications dealing (among other subjects) with World War II, as well as National Socialism and the Holocaust¹⁰:

- Arias Stéphan, Chaudron Eric (eds) (2012). *Histoire Géographie 3^e*. Paris: Belin. [Belin]
- Azzouz Rachid, Gache Marie-Laure (eds) (2012). *Histoire Géographie 3^e*. Paris: Magnard. (Magnard)
- Hazard-Tourillon Anne-Marie, Fellahi Armelle (eds) (2012). *Histoire Géographie 3^e*. Paris: Nathan. (Nathan)
- Ivernel Martin, Villemagne Benjamin (eds) (2012). *Histoire Géographie 3^e*. Paris: Hatier.
- Ebeling Hans, Birkenfeld Wolfgang (eds) (2013). *Die Reise in die Vergangenheit. Nordrhein-Westfalen 2*. Braunschweig: Westermann.
- Lenzian Hans-Jürgen, Mattes Wolfgang (eds) (2005). *Zeiten und Menschen 3*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Oomen Hans-Gert (ed.) (2013). *Geschichte Hessen. Entdecken und Verstehen 3. Von der Französischen Revolution bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*. Berlin: Cornelsen. (Entdecken)

⁹ Textbook studies focused on explicit identity construction, on the contrary, are far from being uncommon these past twenty years. See Szakács (2018) for a meta-analysis.

¹⁰ The elements in brackets correspond to the references used for the textbooks throughout the contribution.

- Regenhardt Hans-Otto, Tatsch Claudia (eds) (2009). *Forum Geschichte. Band 4: Vom Ersten Weltkrieg bis heute*. Berlin: Cornelsen. (FG)
- Sauer Michael (ed.) (2011), *Geschichte und Geschehen 5*, Stuttgart/Leipzig, Klett. (GG5)
- Simianer Norbert (ed.) (2006). *Von... bis 3. Geschichtsbuch für Realschulen*. Paderborn: Schöningh. (VB)
- Christoffer Sven, Eck Guiskard *et alii* (2012). *Mitmischen 2*. Stuttgart/Leipzig: Klett.
- Christoffer Sven, Dominik Michaela *et alii* (2013). *Mitmischen 3*. Stuttgart/Leipzig: Ernst Klett Verlag. (MM3)
- Lenzian Hans-Jürgen, Mattes Wolfgang (eds) (2006). *Zeiten und Menschen 4*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Sauer Michael (ed.) (2011). *Geschichte und Geschehen 6*. Stuttgart/Leipzig: Ernst Klett Verlag. (GG6)

When the study started all textbooks were in use either in the ninth grade only, for the French data set, or in the ninth and tenth grade in the case of the German publications. The German data set covers several *Länder* and school types.

3. Results: The discursive construction of European and national memory and identity in history textbooks

The following sections will deal with the construction of European or national memory and identity in textbooks via various discursive means. The foregrounding and backgrounding of national actors will be examined before focusing on comparison. Finally, enunciative procedures will come under scrutiny. The treatment of World War I in history textbooks having already led to extensive publication from a CCDA point of view (e.g. von Münchow 2013, 2018a, 2019b), it will only be alluded to briefly here and mainly used as a counterpoint to the findings concerning the discursive representation of World War II, National Socialism and the Holocaust.

3.1. Syntactic and semantic backgrounding or foregrounding of national actors and actions

One of the forms the construction of European integration takes in textbooks is the backgrounding or suppression of nations as social actors (see van Leeuwen 2008).¹¹ When actors are backgrounded, they are

not [...] mentioned in relation to a given action, but they are mentioned elsewhere in the text, and we can infer with reasonable (though never total) certainty who they are (*op. cit.*: 29).

“Suppression” is a more radical form of exclusion from the text. Both of these general procedures can be seen as being achieved through various syntactic, semantic, and even textual tools, one of which is generalization through the use of plurals or hypernyms, as I showed for the discursive representation of World War I in French textbooks (e.g. von Münchow 2019b):

¹¹ Loitfellner (2008) uses this analytical tool for the treatment of war crimes in particular.

- 1) *Les États* organisent l'économie de guerre : ils reconvertissent les industries en usines d'armement [...] (Belin 34)
The states organize the war economy: they convert industries into armament plants [...].
- 2) *L'Europe* connaît un déclin économique. (Belin 38)
Europe is in economic decline¹².

As I have also shown in the studies mentioned above, the backgrounding of national actors—which is not an explicit procedure—is contradicted in the same textbooks by the foregrounding of one national actor in particular, namely Germany. In the following example only “Germans” are mentioned, the other belligerents being “passivated” (van Leeuwen 2008: 33) and thus backgrounded:

- 3) **En 1918, la guerre de mouvement reprend.** Ayant déplacé à l'Ouest les troupes du front russe, *les Allemands tentent une offensive décisive*. Comme en 1914, *ils sont arrêtés* sur la Marne. (Belin 29)
In 1918, the war of movement resumes. After having moved the troops from the Russian front to the West, *the Germans attempt a decisive offensive*. As in 1914, *they are stopped* on the Marne.

In the German textbooks, nations—or states—are generally foregrounded as actors in World War I, but Germany is often represented as being the only actor there, too (see von Münchow 2019b).

On first sight, the findings concerning the treatment of World War II in French textbooks seem similar to those concerning World War I. At times, the authors even use roughly the same words:

- 4) *Tous les belligérants* ont recours à la propagande pour obtenir le soutien de la population, mais aussi pour démoraliser l'ennemi. [...]
Les États mettent en place une économie de guerre [...]. (Magnard 76)
All warring parties use propaganda in order to obtain public support, but also to demoralize the enemy. [...]
The States set up a war economy [...].

Generalization, however, which strongly characterizes the way World War I is treated in French textbooks, is significantly less used when dealing with World War II. War actions are often “ethnified” (Reisigl et Wodak 2001: 50) by the use of national toponyms and demonyms (von Münchow 2019a). Especially “Germany” (“*l'Allemagne*”) and “the Germans” (“*les Allemands*”) are further foregrounded as actors by being subjects of verbs in the active voice:

- 5) **En Europe, après l'invasion de la Pologne en 1939, l'Allemagne occupe de nombreux pays.** [...].
Le 22 juin 1941, l'Allemagne attaque l'URSS (plan Barbarossa). Jusqu'en 1942, *les Allemands* multiplient les succès militaires contre une armée soviétique désorganisée. (Magnard 70)

¹² Italics are used in the excerpts throughout the contribution in order to point out the focus of the analysis. Bold letters appear as such in the textbooks. Colored letters cannot be reproduced here.

In Europe, after the invasion of Poland in 1939, Germany occupies numerous countries. [...].

On June 22, Germany attacks the USSR (operation Barbarossa). Until 1942, the Germans have built military success upon success against a disorganized Soviet army.

However, war crimes and the Holocaust, albeit never being absent from any textbook, give way to a completely different representation. As I showed in an earlier study (von Münchow 2019a), the actions themselves are explicitly mentioned, but the agents are generally backgrounded by the use of the passive or reflexive voice and national actors disappear behind nouns (or adjectives) such as “SS”, “Nazi(s)”, and “Einsatzgruppen”:

- 6) Comment se manifeste la *violence nazie* pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale ?
En 1940, le transfert des populations juives dans les **ghettos** s’amplifie. Au printemps 1941 [...] sont mises sur pied des « unités mobiles de tuerie » (les *Einsatzgruppen*¹³) chargées d’assassiner les responsables communistes et les juifs. Selon l’historien Raul Hilberg, 800 000 personnes seraient mortes dans les ghettos et 1 300 000 aurait [sic] été assassinées par les *Einsatzgruppen*. (Magnard 72)

How does *Nazi violence* manifest itself during World War II?

In 1940 the transfers of Jewish populations towards the **ghettos** increase. In the spring of 1941 [...] “mobile killing units” (the *Einsatzgruppen*) are put in place, which are in charge of the assassination of communist leaders and Jews. According to historian Raul Hilberg, 800 000 people died in the ghettos and 1 300 000 were assassinated by the *Einsatzgruppen*.

Exactly the same distinction, based on exactly the same discursive procedures, between the representation of war actions on the one hand and war crimes and genocide on the other is made by the authors of German textbooks (see von Münchow 2019a: 28-29). But it is the French textbooks—which cannot be accused of wanting to avoid showing their fellow countrymen as being criminals—that highlight the will to “denationalize” (and thus, maybe, “Europeanize”) war crimes in general and the Holocaust in particular. Moreover, even the war itself is portrayed in a rather allusive way as far as Western Europe is concerned, as opposed to Eastern Europe (in excerpt 5 above, Germany’s occupation of Western European countries is generalized: “*de nombreux pays*”, Engl. “numerous countries”). In many French textbooks it hardly appears at all in the chapter about World War II and when it does, it is backgrounded, for instance in a circumstantial proposition:

- 7) *Après plusieurs victoires en Europe*, Hitler lance le 22 juin 1941 l’opération Barbarossa contre l’URSS. En septembre 1942, les troupes allemandes assiègent les grandes villes du pays et la bataille de Stalingrad s’engage. (Magnard 66)

After several victories in Europe, Hitler launches operation Barbarossa against the USSR on June 22, 1941. In September 1942, German troops besiege the big cities of the country and the battle of Stalingrad begins.

¹³ The term “Einsatzgruppen” appears in italic in the textbook.

The general representation of events thus created is that Germany waged war on Eastern Europe only (and in excerpt 7, the USSR is not even considered to be European)—with the notable exception of Great Britain in some textbooks—and that war crimes and genocides were committed by perpetrators of no nation in particular. In German textbooks also, the war is mainly portrayed as having taken place in the East (even if war actions in Western Europe are more thoroughly represented than in French textbooks) and when Allied war actions (or their results) in Germany are mentioned the agents are backgrounded as in the enumerative non-verbal phrase in the following excerpt:

- 8) Die Menschen in Deutschland erlebten, was moderner Krieg bedeutete: Bombenangriffe, brennende Städte, Trümmerlandschaften, unzählige tote und verwundete Kinder, Frauen und Männer. (MM3 70)

The people in Germany experienced what modern warfare means: bombings, burning cities, rubble sceneries, countless dead and wounded children, women and men.

Backgrounding of national actors seems to be a “negative procedure” in the sense that it silences difference rather than creating sameness. There are probably various reasons for this—not to offend a now friendly neighbor and fellow EU country such as Germany in French textbooks or not to put blame on the Allies for defeating Nazi Germany and thus deflect German responsibility for the war in German textbooks—and it might not always be designed to create a European memory, but probably nevertheless always has the effect to create one. It is noteworthy, though, that the European integration thus promoted is limited to Western Europe.

3.2. Establishing sameness or otherness through comparison

A genuine means to establish either sameness or otherness is comparison in a broad sense. In previous studies about the treatment of World War I (e.g. von Münchow 2019b), I showed how Germany is set apart from other nations in German textbooks through comparison. In the following excerpt, all other actors appear in a coordinated list and the student is given the task to compare their politics, as a whole, to “the German position” (*“der deutschen Haltung”*), set apart, or “discriminated”—in the etymological sense of “distinction” or “differentiation” (Reisigl & Wodak 2001)—by means of syntax:

- 9) Vergleiche die Politik der österreichischen, der englischen und der russischen Regierung in der Julikrise mit der deutschen Haltung [...]. (GG5 71)

Compare the politics of the Austrian, English and Russian government during the July crisis to the German position [...].

Obviously, the contrast does not rely upon military alliances here but may be explained by a differentiation between the Self and the Other, which it helps to reinforce at the same time. Comparison can also be the desired outcome of tasks the student has to accomplish:

- 10) Beurteilt den Versailler Vertrag aus der Sicht eines damaligen Franzosen und eines damaligen Deutschen. (Entdecken 161)

Assess the Versailles treaty from the viewpoint of a Frenchman and of a German from the period.

Again, the procedure is designed to highlight difference, but also to produce “multiperspectivity” (“*Multiperspektivität*”, see Bergmann 1979, 2000), which has occupied an important place in German history didactics for decades.

As for French textbooks, which always insist on sameness more than on otherness, it is probably because of the particularly obvious German responsibility for the Second World War that its treatment results in less backgrounding of nations than World War I. The fact that World War II is comparatively recent probably also has an impact on how it is represented. At any rate, the construction of European integration via this event seems to require a more explicit discursive procedure than backgrounding because it corresponds to representations that need yet to be established. Indeed both French and German textbooks feature a recurring procedure to strongly assert sameness, *i.e.* the dialogic marker “[...not only x, (but also) y]” that Brès (1999: §39) calls “*renchérissement*” (“expansion”). The dialogic procedure entails the acknowledgment of prior discourse in which clear national distinctions in war or criminal actions were observed and at the same time aims to overcome these distinctions, as is the case in the following excerpt from a French textbook about mass bombings:

- 11) L’Allemagne mais aussi les Alliés utilisent les bombardements aériens massifs des villes pour terroriser les populations et remporter la victoire [...]. (Belin 74)

Germany, but also the Allies use massive aerial bombings of cities in order to terrorize the population and to obtain victory [...].

In the following excerpt of a German textbook sameness is established on the subject of the expulsion of different ethnic groups from their homes:

- 12) Bereits zu Beginn und im späteren Verlauf des Zweiten Weltkrieges kam es an vielen Orten zu Zwangsumsiedlungen. Nicht nur die Deutschen hatten darunter zu leiden. Viele Völker Europas wurden in Mitleidenschaft gezogen. (VB 354)

In the beginning already and then over the course of the Second World War there were forced relocations in many places. Not only the Germans had to suffer from them. Many peoples in Europe were affected.

Generalization precedes expansion here and the dialogic marker draws attention to the fact that there is a well-known prior discourse in Germany about the expulsion of Germans from areas that mainly became Polish or Czech after the war, that generally does not mention prior expulsion of other nationals by the Germans. Interestingly, the expansion might also be the strategy that actually makes it possible to mention the expulsion of Germans, which, from the early 1970s until the early 2000s, seldom appeared in legitimate public discourse (see Kansteiner 2006: 196-213, 303-06, 329-31). Thus fighting against German national exceptionalism is not necessarily the only aim here.

Several French textbooks insist on the participation of the French police in the arrest of Jews, the existence of a prior discourse—on exclusive German action—being

marked in a rather discrete way only, through the use of the verb “*collaborer*”:

- 13) Où sont déportés les Juifs raflés par la police française ?
 [...] Décrivez la violence des mesures antisémites du gouvernement de Vichy. [...] Montrez que le régime de Vichy collabore au génocide des Juifs. (Nathan 169)
 Where are the Jews deported after having been rounded up by the French police?
 [...] Describe the violence of the Vichy government’s antisemitic action. [...] Show that the Vichy government collaborates in the genocide of the Jews.

“Vichy” can be considered the backgrounding denationalizing equivalent of “the Nazis” or “the SS”, but the police having arrested Jews are mentioned along with their (French) nationality. This discursive procedure could be described as “owning” one’s country’s implication in crimes committed during the war and is comparable to explicit discourse in German textbooks on the participation of the (regular German) army in war crimes, which cohabitates with the above-mentioned non-explicit procedure consisting in the backgrounding of national actors in war crimes (see von Münchow 2019a: 37). The “owning” of one’s own crimes probably corresponds to accomplishing one’s “memory duty” (see Rouso 2016: 26-27 and Ledoux 2016: 82, 145-178 on the “*devoir de mémoire*”). In the case of French textbooks it also creates European sameness, while the German discourse on the Wehrmacht’s responsibility contributes instead to the upholding of national distinction. One of the German textbooks, on the other hand, contains the following question:

- 14) Die Regierungen mancher mit Deutschland verbündeten Staaten haben beim Abtransport ihrer jüdischen Bürger geholfen. Welche Gründe mögen sie dafür gehabt haben? (MM3 61)
 The governments of some of the countries that were allied to Germany helped to deport their Jewish citizens. What reasons could they have had to do so?

Whereas the first utterance establishes sameness between Germany and other countries (which are not explicitly mentioned), the second one potentially highlights difference.

As mentioned above, comparison is a more or less explicit discursive procedure and thus a rather arduous means to establish sameness. If authors need to state that X and Y are the same, they probably have not been seen as such so far. The very necessity for strong assertion of sameness thus highlights difference. This could explain why French textbook authors tend to avoid explicit dialogic marking. They might not want to insist on the existence of a discourse of national distinction even if it means arguing against it.

3.3. Enunciative community building

The final discursive procedure that will be examined in this contribution is community building through enunciative tools. Unlike some of the examples of comparison highlighted in the previous section this is never done through strong

assertion. It can be achieved in an explicit manner, though, by the use of the first-person-plural pronoun.

With the exception of historical sources, this pronoun is completely banned from French textbooks. In German publications as well, and especially in regards to the treatment of World War I, it is overwhelmingly used in historical sources and in reported speech, along with a few occurrences of a pedagogical *wir* ("we"). But a community-building first-person-plural pronoun does appear, albeit infrequently, in the chapters on World War II, National Socialism and the Holocaust. Most of the time, it refers to a universal contemporary community. This universal community seems to be what one could call a "community of memory", as the following example shows:

- 15) Je länger die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus zurückliegt, desto dringender stellt sich die Frage, wie eine Erinnerung an das Geschehen lebendig gehalten werden kann, wie *wir* eine „Kultur der Erinnerung“ entwickeln können. (FG 146)

The more distant in time National Socialism is the more urgent becomes the question of how to keep the memory of what happened alive, how we can develop a "memory culture".

In a few other cases, on the contrary, the first-person-plural pronoun refers to a rather local community (e.g. GG6 39). Exceptionally it can also refer to Germans as a whole. In the following excerpt it is precisely the past (*Vergangenheit*) that unites them:

16) **Die Auseinandersetzung ist nicht zu Ende**

In jüngster Zeit haben neue Themen in die historische Forschung Einzug gehalten, die ein differenzierteres Bild auf *unsere* Vergangenheit geben. So wurde beispielsweise die Rolle der Wehrmacht und der Polizei genauer untersucht. Dabei kamen viele bislang unbekannte Verbrechen ans Tageslicht. [GG6 193]

Dealing with the past is not over

In recent times new subjects have come on the scene of historical research that give a more differentiated image of *our* past. The role of the Army and of the police, for instance, have been screened more closely. In the process many crimes that were unknown so far came to light.

Finally, the title *Wir sind kein Volk von Mördern* ("We are not a people of murderers") (GG6 195) for a source that consists of excerpts from a speech member of Parliament Ernst Benda held in the *Bundestag* on March 10, 1965 against a statute of limitations for Nazi crimes seems noteworthy as the textbook authors chose to insert a first-person-plural pronoun in what is not exactly a quote since the corresponding utterance within the actual source refers to "this German people" (*dieses deutsche Volk*) in the third person. The preceding source (p. 194) is an excerpt from an article published October 10, 1989, in which East German writer Christa Wolf describes how everyone in the GDR was somehow and quite incomprehensibly made into an antifascist "winner of history" in the decades after 1945. Interestingly, the title of the source is *„Das haben wir nicht gelernt“* ("That's not what we learnt"), within quotation marks. The impression the reader gets is that East German discourse needs to be clearly marked as reported

speech whereas West German discourse can spare the marking, giving the reader the possibility to feel included in the community to which the first-person-pronoun refers.

But the enunciative construction of a community of Germans—in the chapters on World War I as well as World War II—is far more often achieved by less explicit means than a first-person-pronoun or even remains completely unsaid... and is yet tangible. In the following excerpt of the introduction to one of the textbooks, the students seem to be constructed as being German by means of the deontic modality. It is because they are German—which is treated as being obvious here—that they “will have to deal with” Germans having committed “innumerable terrible crimes”:

- 17) *Du wirst dich damit auseinandersetzen müssen, wie die Nationalsozialisten eine Diktatur errichteten, in der von Deutschen zahllose schreckliche Verbrechen begangen wurden und an deren Ende Millionen Tote und ein verwüstetes Europa zurückblieben. (GG6 3)*

You will have to deal with how the National Socialists established a dictatorship within which countless crimes were committed by Germans and which resulted in millions of dead people and a devastated Europe.

Again, belonging to a community comes with a “memory duty”. A German community is constructed in an even less explicit way when past events are viewed from an unspoken German perspective. I showed in earlier publications (e.g. von Münchow 2013) how the outbreak of World War I is treated in a German textbook without any information on which country (or countries) are being described... because unless otherwise specified, one always talks about Germany in a German textbooks. The same is true for the following paragraph about prisoners of war during and after World War II:

18) **Kriegsgefangenschaft**

Viele Soldaten gerieten im Zweiten Weltkrieg in Gefangenschaft und wurden in Gefangenenlagern festgehalten, die zunächst nichts anderes als der blanke Boden in einem von Stacheldraht umzäunten Gebiet waren, das von Soldaten bewacht wurde, z.B. die berühmten Rheinwiesener Lager der US-Armee. In vielen Lagern mussten die Gefangenen mit sehr wenigen Lebensmitteln auskommen. Besonders schlimm war es dort, wo aufgrund der wirtschaftlichen und politischen Lage auch für die Wächter keine ausreichende Nahrung vorhanden war, z.B. in der UdSSR oder in Gebieten, die Deutschland besetzt und ausgebeutet hatte. Hass und Rache taten das Übrige. (VB 356)

War captivity

Many soldiers fell into captivity during the Second World War and were held in detention camps that initially were nothing else than bare soil in an area surrounded by barbed wire that was guarded by soldiers, e.g. the infamous Rheinwiesen detention camp of the US army. In many camps the prisoners had to subsist on very little food. The situation was particularly terrible where even the guardians did not have enough food due to the economic and political circumstances, e.g. in the USSR or in areas that Germany had occupied and exploited. Hatred and revenge did the rest.

The title as well as the beginning of the first sentence convey the impression that the subject matter are prisoners of war in general, but all examples only apply to German prisoners of war. The situation is “terrible” (“*schlimm*”) for these German prisoners of war, which is not specified because, again, it seems to be obvious that one would adopt a German perspective.

This construction of a German community through obviousness is probably achieved in an unconscious manner by the authors. As for the students, they not only learn to adopt a German perspective, but they also learn how natural it is. The corresponding discursive procedures would go unnoticed if it weren't for the fact that the analyst's attention is drawn to them because of the comparison to French textbooks, where the “default perspective” tends to be European or universal.

4. Conclusion

The contrastive discourse analysis of French and German textbooks shows that while European integration is likely important in both countries it is not achieved exactly in the same way. French textbook authors mainly use non-explicit discursive tools such as the backgrounding of social actors by generalization in order to—implicitly—erase differences between (Western) European countries or nations and thus construct what Bull & Hansen (2016), following Mouffe (2004, 2013), call a “cosmopolitan mode of remembering”. (This type of) European integration is achieved in a more complete—yet not exclusive—way for the representations of World War I than World War II. However, the backgrounding of national actors is well on its way also for World War II, especially concerning war *crimes* and the Holocaust, while war *actions* as such are often represented as having been conducted by national actors. Beyond the erasure of differences, there is also a conspicuous, yet less frequent effort through more explicit procedures such as comparison to establish sameness between nations concerning war actions and even war crimes. This does not go without saying, but needs to be established in an assertive way.

German textbook authors clearly represent both wars as having been carried out by national actors, with a special emphasis on the role of Germany, but also generally refrain from the use of national toponyms and demonyms for war crimes during World War II and the Holocaust. This can hardly be interpreted as tending towards European integration, though, as it might well be due to not wanting to create too close a link between the students and those mass crimes. Indeed, the sense of belonging that is “naturally” constructed in German textbooks, *i.e.* without any kind of verbal presence, be it explicit or not, pertains to Germany. Being German probably is so obvious for textbook authors as well as—according to these authors—for students that it goes without saying. Especially concerning World War II, National Socialism and the Holocaust, representations of national identity can also become explicit, though, through the use of the first-person-plural pronoun. It is probably because these events are more recent and because Germany acted in a far more criminal way than during World War I—which is perceived as a more “ordinary” conflict between nations—

that a problematic approach of memory and identity becomes necessary. It is as if the period from 1933 to 1945 imposed a critical reflection on Germany as a nation all the while reinforcing a sense of national belonging. While national exceptionalism and German history are—explicitly—treated in a critical way in textbooks (see von Münchow 2019b: 165-167), authors create a national community and attach students to it without words, thus making the process unquestionable.

It would not be correct to say that there is no effort of European integration in German textbooks, though. A constant shift of perspective is explicitly triggered by comparisons, on the one hand, and by exercises of identification in which students are asked to adopt a different (national) point of view, on the other. Rather than sameness, authors thus create what could be called “equal otherness”. Following Bull and Hansen (2016) again, one could call this an “agonistic mode of remembering”, calling for reflexivity and “plurivocal” procedures. The agonistic mode of remembering runs in contrast not only to the “antagonistic mode”, but also to the “cosmopolitan mode”, which, according to the authors (2016: 10), tends to simplify past events. Christophe and Schwedes (2015b: 92) also believe “memorial Europeanization” should consist in “reflective remembering”, *i.e.* being conscious of what determines contrasting interpretations in different communities and accepting a shift of perspective (which is consistent with the tradition of “multiperspectivity” in history didactics; see Bergmann 1979, 2000). One could ask, though, if the obviousness and unquestionability arising from the non-explicit construction of national belonging will not leave a more lasting impression on the students than the explicit effort of reflective Europeanization, which they can consciously reject.

As for the Holocaust, several authors insist on the major role it plays for a common European memory (see Rouso 2016: 229-64, Kansteiner 2006: 328-33), even if, according to Kansteiner (2006: 331) the “Holocaust-centered European mnemonic community” is mostly an elite construction. In our textbooks, the Holocaust is, on the one hand, the most “Europeanized” part of World War II as a macro-event because of the unanimous backgrounding of national actors. On the other hand, German as well as French textbook authors strongly assert their respective country’s responsibility in the Holocaust, which highlights national identities. But the (memory) duty it has become to deal with one’s own past is also a common attitude. The past thus becomes “a problem to solve”, “an obstacle to overcome” or even almost “an enemy to fight” (Rouso 2016: 26). Finally, even the “antagonistic mode of remembering” (Bull and Hansen 2016) can be put to use in the construction of European integration since “facing the past” as a common enemy provides an opportunity to create sameness or identification through difference.

This study in Cross-Cultural Discourse Analysis has thus shown how different discursive procedures, some of which entail explicit marking, while others lead to representations remaining more or less unsaid, create or translate a different “identity distribution” in French and German history textbooks between the national and the European level, between what is or should be taken for granted according to the authors and what is problematic and thus needs to be strongly asserted in order to

be admitted. The results of this study have also indicated that discourse in textbooks contributes to the construction of European identity, not only when this discourse emphasizes sameness or creates it more discreetly, but also when the discursive procedures across textbooks and countries are the same.

References

- Apple Michael, Christian-Smith Linda K. (1991). "The politics of the textbook". In: Michael Apple, Linda K. Christian-Smith (eds). *The Politics of the Textbook*. New York: Routledge, 1-21.
- Berger Stefan (2017). "History Writing and Constructions of National Space: The Long Dominance of the National in Modern European Historiographies". In: Mario Carretero, Stefan Berger, Maria Grever (eds). *Palgrave Handbook of Research in Historical Culture and Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 39-57.
- Bergmann Klaus (1979). "Multiperspektivität". In: Klaus Bergmann, Klaus Fröhlich *et alii* (eds). *Handbuch der Geschichtsdidaktik*, Band 1. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 216-218.
- Bergmann Klaus (2000). *Multiperspektivität. Geschichte selber denken*. Schwalbach: Wochenschau.
- Brès Jacques (1999). "Vous les entendez ? Analyse du discours et dialogisme". *Modèles linguistiques*, 40, 71-86.
- Bucciarelli Stefano (2007 [2002]). "Storia e memoria". In Umberto Baldocchi, Stefano Bucciarelli, Stefano Sodi (eds). *Insegnare storia. Riflessioni a margine di un'esperienza di formazione*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 149-186.
- Bull Anna Cento, Hansen Hans Lauge (2016). "On agonistic memory". *Memory Studies*, 9/4, 390-404.
- Carrier Peter (2018). "The Nation, Nationhood, and Nationalism in Textbook Research from 1951 to 2017". In: Eckhardt Fuchs, Annekatriin Bock (eds). *The Palgrave Handbook of Textbook Studies*. New York: Palgrave, 181-198.
- Christophe Barbara, Schwedes Kerstin (2015a). "Einleitung". In Barbara Christophe, Kerstin Schwedes (eds). *Schulbuch und Erster Weltkrieg. Kulturwissenschaftliche Analysen und geschichtsdidaktische Überlegungen*. Göttingen: V&R unipress, 7-13.
- Christophe Barbara, Schwedes Kerstin (2015b). „Den Ersten Weltkrieg erzählen – Schulbücher als Erinnerungstexte lesen“. In Barbara Christophe, Kerstin Schwedes (eds). *Schulbuch und Erster Weltkrieg. Kulturwissenschaftliche Analysen und geschichtsdidaktische Überlegungen*. Göttingen: V&R unipress, 15-92.
- de Cillia Rudolf, Reisigl Martin, Wodak Ruth (1999). "The discursive construction of national identities". *Discourse & Society*, 10/2, 149-173.
- Crawford Keith (2001). "Constructing national memory: The 1940/41 Blitz in British History textbooks". *Internationale Schulbuchforschung*, 24, 12-23.
- De Luna Giovanni (2011). *La repubblica del dolore*. Milan: Feltrinelli.
- Fuchs Eckhardt, Bock Annekatriin (2018). "Introduction". In: Eckhardt Fuchs, Annekatriin Bock (eds). *The Palgrave Handbook of Textbook Studies*. New York: Palgrave, 1-9.
- Halbwachs Maurice (1925). *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Hall Stuart (1996). "Introduction: Who Needs 'Identity'?". In: Stuart Hall, Paul du Gay (eds). *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage, 1-17.
- Kansteiner Wulf (2006). *In pursuit of German Memory: History, Television and Politics after Auschwitz*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press.

Lamizet Bernard (2015). "Rhétorique de l'identité et discours identitaires". In Arnaud Richard, Fred Hailon, Nahida Guellil (eds). *Le discours politique identitaire dans les médias*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 25-48.

Lebow Richard Ned, Kansteiner Wulf, Fogu Claudio (eds) (2006). *The politics of memory in postwar Europe*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Ledoux Sébastien (2016). *Le devoir de mémoire. Une formule et son histoire*. Paris : CNRS Éditions.

van Leeuwen Theo (2008). *Discourse and practice. New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Loitfellner Sabine (2008). "'The Appalling Toll in Austrian Lives...': The Wehrmacht and Its Soldiers in Austrian School Books". In: Hannes Heer, Walter Manoschek et alii (eds). *The Discursive Construction of History. Remembering the Wehrmacht's War of Annihilation*. Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan, 155-74.

Mouffe Chantal (2004). "The Limits of Liberal Pluralism: Towards an Agonistic Multipolar World Order". In: András Sajó (ed.). *Militant Democracy*. Utrecht: Eleven International Publishing, 69–80.

Mouffe Chantal (2013). *Agonistics: Thinking the world politically*. Londres/New York: Verso.

von Münchow Patricia (2009 [2004]). *Les journaux télévisés français et allemands. Plaisir de voir ou devoir de s'informer*. Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle.

von Münchow Patricia (2013). "Le discours sur les conflits entre nations dans les manuels d'histoire français et allemands. Représentations de la Première Guerre Mondiale". In: Anne-Catherine Gonnot, Nadine Rentel, Stefanie Schwerter (eds). *Dialogue(s) entre langues et cultures*. Francfort am Main: Peter Lang, 85-106.

von Münchow Patricia (2018a). "Discours rapporté, rapport à l'histoire et construction de communautés : la Première Guerre Mondiale dans les manuels scolaires d'histoire français et allemands". In: Hélène Barthelmebs, Greta Komur-Thillooy et alii (eds). *Le discours rapporté. Temporalité, histoire, mémoire et patrimoine discursif*. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 107-122.

von Münchow Patricia (2018b). "Theoretical and methodological challenges in identifying meaningful absences in discourse". In: Melani Schröter, Charlotte Taylor (eds). *Exploring silence and absence in discourse. Empirical approaches*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 215-240.

von Münchow Patricia (2019a). "National Socialism and World War II in German and French history textbooks. Learning through words and through silence". In: Hartmut Lenk, Juhani Härmä et alii (eds). *Studies in Comparative Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 19-44.

von Münchow Patricia (2019b). "Quel 'Soi' et quel 'Autre' ? Une étude de la construction discursive de l'appartenance dans les manuels d'histoire français et allemands". *Langage & Société*, 167, 145-174.

von Münchow Patricia (2020). *L'analyse du discours contrastive. Théorie, méthodologie, pratique*. Limoges: Lambert Lucas, forthcoming.

Nora Pierre (2002). "Pour une histoire au second degré". *le débat*, 122/5, 24-31.

Pingel Falk (2010 [2009]). *UNESCO Guidebook on Textbook Research and Textbook Revision*. Paris/Braunschweig: UNESCO, Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research, 2nd revised and updated edition.

Reisigl Martin, Wodak Ruth (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination. Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism*. London: Routledge.

Roussio Henri (2016). *Face au passé. Essais sur la mémoire contemporaine*. Paris: Belin.

Szakács Simona (2018). "Transnational Identities and Values in Textbooks and Curricula". In: Eckhardt Fuchs, Annetrin Bock (eds). *The Palgrave Handbook of Textbook Studies*. New York: Palgrave, 199-214.

Tutiaux-Guillon Nicole (2017). "History in French Secondary School: A Tale of Progress and Universalism or a Narrative of Present Society?". In Mario Carretero, Stefan Berger, Maria Grever (eds). *Palgrave Handbook of Research in Historical Culture and Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 275-294.

Wodak Ruth, de Cillia Rudolf *et alii* (2009 [1999]). *The discursive construction of national identities*. Edinburgh: EUP (2nd revised edition).