

*Narrating history in the museum: the Oslo Holocaust Centre,
multiculturalism and human rights education*

MOMODOU OLLY MBOGE



MSc Thesis in Human Rights and Multiculturalism

Faculty of Teacher Education & School of Business and Social Sciences

Buskerud University College

Date: 5 October 2012



Buskerud University College
 Faculty of Teacher Education &
 School of Business and Social
 Sciences
 Papirbredden-Drammen
 kunnskapspark
 Grønland 58
 3045 Drammen

<u>Name:</u> Momodou Olly Mboge	<u>Date:</u> 5 th October 2012
<u>Title and subtitle:</u> <i>Narrating history in the museum: the Oslo Holocaust Centre, multiculturalism and human rights education</i>	
<u>Abstract:</u> <p>Museums are implicated in the national project of identity formation; exhibition narratives can be reaffirming and equally contestable. Citizens confront culture, memory, history, and myth in the museum narrative which may enable a sense of belonging and inclusion or which may serve to exclude. I consider the extent to which the OHC can be understood as a project which supports and promotes an inclusive Norwegian national identity. The museum tells of Norway's Nazi occupation during the Second World War and of the arrest and deportation of Norwegian Jewish citizens to death camps with the connivance of fellow-citizens as either actors or bystanders. The story challenges the dominant Norwegian narrative of the war period. I reflect on ways in which museum visitors experience a diverse portrayal of Norwegian nationality, in line with the national story of commitment to human rights and multiculturalism. My thesis seeks to establish whether there is a new identifiable Norwegian national consciousness evolving from the narrative of the Centre, as presented in its exhibition, regarding the experiences of Norwegian Jews during the Second World War. The key research question considered is: <i>How is the Oslo Holocaust Museum contributing to the narrative of the national story of Norway in relation to human rights education and multiculturalism?</i> Data was collected by means of semi structured interviews from 7 key OHC staff and from a sample of 20 English-speaking visitors to the museum, who were interviewed in July and August 2011. Questions focused on visitors' perceptions of the exhibition in general and on their understandings of its messages for and about Norway today. My argument is that the OHC narrative, premised on human rights and democratic values, has the potential to contribute to a deeper understanding of common citizenship and human rights in a Norway that is increasingly becoming multicultural.</p>	
<u>Key words:</u> National Identity, Multiculturalism, History, Memory, Human Rights, Human Rights Education, Museums, Norway	
<u>Number of words:</u> 24 647 [Text ONLY]	

DECLARATION

I certify that this is all my own work. Any material quoted or paraphrased from reference books, journals, www. Etc. has been identified as such and duly acknowledged in the text or foot/end notes. Such sources are also listed in the bibliography. I have read the College's policy on plagiarism and am aware of the penalties for plagiarism.

I have retained a copy of my work.

Signed:.....

Name: **Momodou Olly Mboge**

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my late brother Mbye Baboucarr Mboke whose friendship, loyalty, trust and encouragement I miss every day.

I equally dedicate this work to my four children Aminata, Olimata, Omar and Haddy. I hope you grow up to value education and celebrate humanity with humility, love, respect and kindness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The support and encouragement of several people guided me in the process of writing this thesis. Their support gave me confidence to plod on during very challenging moments. I wish to thank all those who helped in the process of preparing this thesis.

Courtesy obliges me to mention some individuals who never got tired in giving and offering counsel and advice. I am particularly grateful to my supervisor PROFESSOR AUDREY OSLER, who nudged, challenged and clarified my assumptions and ideas.

I also thank the programme co-ordinators of the Master in Human Rights and Multiculturalism at Buskerud University College for giving me the chance to be part of the first intake of students on the programme. It has been a great experience and an eye opener. Staff at the HIBU library in Drammen has been extremely helpful. I wholeheartedly thank them for their assistance.

I thank the Center for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities (Senter for studier av Holocaust og livssynsminoriteter) for allowing me to conduct research at their institution. Special thanks to Georg Andreas Broch, the Administrative Director who allowed me access. I am very grateful to the warm welcome of Ann Elisabeth Mellbye and Kristin Aldrich Zwick who made me feel at ease. I wish to thank the Centre's staff who found time in their busy schedules to grant me interviews. I thank the visitors as well who spoke to me even though they remain anonymous.

I acknowledge and thank the FALSTADSENTERET for awarding me a Master stipend/scholarship worth 20 000 Norwegian Kroners. I am as well grateful to FALSTADSENTERET for appointing Dr Liv Sem and Jon Reitan as my mentors. I wish to thank both gentlemen for their inputs in my project.

I wish to express my gratitude and appreciation to my wife JUNE FYLKESNES for her patience and love. Last but not least I thank Sandra FYLKESNES, my sister-in-law for discussing and reviewing some of the chapters in this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	4
DEDICATION	5
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	6
TABLE OF CONTENTS	7
LIST OF TABLES	9
ABBREVIATIONS	9
 CHAPTER 1: Research statement	 10
1. Introduction	10
1.1 Norway's international image, self-image and human rights	11
1.2 Contemporary demography, national consciousness, far right politics and multiculturalism after Brevik's 22 July terrorist attack	13
1.3 Integrating the Norwegian Jewish narrative into the dominant master narrative	15
1.4 Scope and limitations	16
1.5 Structure and organization of thesis	16
 CHAPTER 2: Theoretical Framework and brief mapping of key concepts	 17
2.0 Theoretical framework	17
2.1 Brief definitions of key concepts	19
2.2 National consciousness and National Identity	19
2.3 Multiculturalism	21
2.4 Human rights and human rights education	22
2.5 Historical consciousness and collective memory	24
2.6 Museum	24
 CHAPTER 3: Literature review	 26
3.0 Museums, nationalism and identity formation	26
3.1 Power and authority of museums in historical context	26
3.2 Museums and national heritage	27
3.4 Museums as social agents	27
3.5 Changed role of museums in response to late twentieth century and early twenty-first realities	28
3.6 Museums and the 'new museology'	29
3.7 Museums, education and learning	30
3.8 Museums and cultural diversity	31
3.9 Museums, Human rights education and Holocaust history education	33
 CHAPTER 4: The museum institution in Norway, The Oslo Holocaust Centre	 36
4.1 The museum institution in Norway	36
4.2 Norway's 'national master narrative' of the post-war history	38
4.3 Re-negotiating Norway's shared history and collective memory: The Oslo Holocaust Centre, multiculturalism and human rights education	41
4.4 The OHC's exhibition (Mandate and Description)	42
 CHAPTER 5: Research Methodology	 43
5.0 Interpretive paradigm within research	43
5.1 Selecting an interpretivist approach	44
5.2 Research strategy	45
5.3 Choice and justification of case study method, site and data sources	45

5.4	Access, data gathering and analysis	46
5.4.0	<i>Access</i>	46
5.4.1	<i>Observation</i>	46
5.4.2	<i>Interviews</i>	47
5.4.3	<i>Visitor interviews</i>	48
5.4.4	<i>Staff interviews</i>	49
5.5	Data Analysis.....	50
5.6	Ethical considerations and reflexivity	51
5.6.1	<i>Reflection on access to site</i>	51
5.6.2	<i>Informed consent and confidentiality</i>	52
5.6.3	<i>Reflections, Reflexivity and the actual interview process and circumstance</i>	53
CHAPTER 6:	Findings and discussion-perceptions of Norway's past.....	55
6.0	OHC's representation of diversity and human rights in Norway's past: Visitor perceptions.....	55
6.1	Categories and themes	55
6.2	Motivation for visit and the visitors own identity	56
6.3	Cultural diversity and its negative impact on Norwegian national identity in the past.	57
6.4	Human rights and never again	60
6.5	Analysis and discussion.....	61
CHAPTER 7:	What does the OHC say about Norway, social cohesion and inclusion of minority citizens today?-Visitor perceptions.....	63
7.1	Present narratives of Norway's collective memory, historical consciousness, and Holocaust education in lieu of social cohesion	64
7.1.0	<i>An inclusive narrative</i>	66
7.2	Norway imagined as nation of fjords, natural beauty: a 'peace nation' that is coming to terms with its difficult past	68
7.3	The future narration of Norway's Second War experience	69
7.4	Summary.....	71
CHAPTER 8:	Concluding Remarks	72
9.	REFERENCES/BIBLIOGRAPHY	76
APPENDICES	82
Appendix I:	Visitor Interview Questions/Protocol	82
Appendix II:	Interview protocol for Staff.....	83
Appendix III:	Access letter to research location	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Visitor interviews
Table 2	Staff interviews

ABBREVIATIONS

CRC-----	Convention on the Rights of the Child
GPI-----	Global Peace Index
HDI-----	Human Development Index
HRE-----	Human Rights Education
ICESCR-----	International Convention on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
ICOM-----	International Council of Museums
OHC-----	Oslo Holocaust Centre
NORAD-----	The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
UDHR-----	Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948
UN-----	United Nations
UNDHRET-----	United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training

CHAPTER 1:

Research statement

1. Introduction

The purpose of this dissertation is to explore how one museum, at the Oslo Holocaust Centre (OHC), narrates Norway's national story and the extent to which such narration contributes to the construction of national consciousness and identity formation. The study will draw on empirical data collected during fieldwork at the OHC in July/August 2011, when I interviewed visitors to the museum. I interviewed staff of the OHC as well in order to complement and enrich my findings. I focused on non-Norwegian visitors since most outsiders' associate Norway's national identity with egalitarianism, peace, democracy, nature and so on. Norwegians as well project this image. As I show in my findings some visitors registered surprise on the existence of Norwegian Jewish citizens and that Norway participated in the Nazi attempt to exterminate Jewish people. I am approaching the Norwegian national story as an outsider, someone who has not grown up with the national story but who settled in the country some seven years ago. Since settling in Norway I have become interested in the ways in which discourses around human rights, multiculturalism and race are constructed, and particularly in the silences and partial silences which pertain, both in relation to the period of the Second World War and to current events.

The ways in which history is constructed is likely to impact on the ways in which the human rights of Norway's citizens of minority cultures and religions are addressed. The present multicultural debate on citizenship and belonging as well as the constructions of Norway's current human rights discourse are directly implicated in the history of immigration to this country. The OHC presents a national story to Norwegians and international visitors through its exhibition which highlights the complexities of Norway's national identity. It is against such complexity concerning national identity constructs that this study seeks to establish whether there is a new identifiable Norwegian national consciousness evolving from the OHC's narrative of the experiences of Norwegian Jews during the Second World War. It is hoped that the study will contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between history education and human rights education through museums.

The OHC in contrast to the wider museum narratives of Norway's culture and history is in my view quite special for understanding of issues of national identity, race, migrant integration and belonging and so on. The Centre's narrative and its potential contribution in the discourse

about human rights, human rights education and multiculturalism in Norway is still an open book, making it attractive to explore. In view of the above I intend to investigate how an institution like the museum narrates the national story of Norway during the Second World War, thus I pose the following research question:

How is the Oslo Holocaust Museum contributing to the narrative of the national story of Norway in relation to human rights education and multiculturalism?

My overall objective is to develop a nuanced and deep understanding of how one museum contributes to a national narrative and the construction of national consciousness and identity. Specific objectives are:

- To **identify** issues of human rights and multiculturalism in what is being narrated by the Oslo Holocaust Museum
- To **analyse** the narrative the museum is projecting and promoting and how it is being received/understood by foreign visitors in particular.
- To **evaluate** the potential educational value of the Holocaust Centre in terms of human rights and multicultural education.

1.1 Norway's international image, self-image and human rights

Norway has cultivated and built an international reputation as a liberal democratic and egalitarian nation-state with a welfare system that is the envy of most modern societies (Abram, 2008). Several UN reports including the Human Development Report (2010)¹ have ranked Norway as the best country to live in terms of well-being and human development. It is perceived as a tolerant society with a high profile in promoting peace around the world, thus part of Norway's national identity is constructed within the idea of it being a peace-orientated nation (Skånland, 2010). The Global Peace Index 2011 ranks Norway as the ninth most peaceful country in the world (GPI 2011)². The Nobel Peace Centre which awards the Nobel Prize to deserving world citizens has its residence in Norway. Norway is also at the forefront in the field of international development. Many countries of the South benefit from Norway's generous aid assistance. Norway's lead development agency, The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) is highly visible in international development circles. The observation below aptly captures the national character of Norway as represented both at home and beyond. According to Witoszek:

¹ http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2010_EN_Table1_reprint.pdf

² <http://www.visionofhumanity.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/2011GPIMethodologyResultsFindings.pdf>

At the beginning of the twenty first-century, an achieved utopia of the European left seems to have emerged in the North. It embodies equality, freedom, welfare, and justice, and it combines these blessings with immense affluence. [...] Today, Norway is the only country which uses 1.06% of its GDP towards development aid and to advance the causes of peace, human rights, and democracy.

(Witoszek, 2011, p. 1)

Norway also has a history of welcoming refugees from around the world. Thus Norway's national self-image is of a genial and welcoming host that has always treated immigrants and minorities well. Norway has been historically perceived by many immigrants regardless of how they came to settle in the country as a 'symbol of hope, freedom and dignity' (Levin, 2010, p. 128). The Norwegian geniality is storied in four strands according to a report titled *Norwegian Public Diplomacy* (Leonard & Small, 2003, pp. 31-40). According to this publication in relation to identity and self-image Norwegian society is categorized in the following:

- a) A humanitarian superpower
- b) Living with Nature
- c) Equality
- d) Internationalist/Spirit of adventure

These national identity attributes have been and are still salient in making citizens feel their 'Norwegianess' (Abram, 2008; Vassenden, 2010). The imagined national identity of Norway woven around it being the ideal model of an egalitarian society has been questioned by some commentators (Eriksen, 2012; Gullestad, 2002). According to Gullestad (2002), this apparent equality or egalitarianism, as perceived and acted upon by the ordinary Norwegian, is far from the lived reality of some people, especially citizens with immigrant backgrounds..

Given that Norwegian identity is not monolithic or as homogenous as widely narrated and that differences in terms of kin, colour, religion, and so on do exist, notwithstanding ordinary folk in Norway enact ideals of equality in terms of 'Likhet meaning, "likeness", "similarity", "identity", or "sameness" ' (Gullestad, 2002, p. 46)'. In such a situation the majority population has the privilege and power to label other segments of the citizenry (ibid). National consciousness and identity are located in a narrative which in many cases essentialises national history, myths, symbols, culture, and kinship, as well as ethnicity, resulting in manufactured distinctiveness between groups and individuals. As Smith (2011, p.

224) points out ‘...myths of ancestry and ... meanings of ancient historical events and heroes are reinterpreted’ to conform to current national identity constructs. The national identity and consciousness that has evolved since 17 May 1814 when the nation-state was born have been constructed along the terms described above.

Furthermore, Norwegian identity in the aftermath of World War II has been woven around a narrative of victimhood and resistance against the occupation of Nazi Germany (Eriksen, 1993). However, the realities of the national story of Norway concerning the Nazi occupation are complex and layered. Norway, like all nation-states, has many stories buried beneath the official and dominant narrative. The alternative narrative, made silent for over half a century and which became visible in the past decade and half, is what underpins the research interest of my thesis. Before I come to that, I will highlight the present conversation in Norway in relation to identity and national consciousness especially after the 22 July 2011 terrorist attack which shattered the country’s innocence and contradicted the accepted image of the modern terrorist (as depicted by the now infamous Danish cartoons).

1.2 Contemporary demography, national consciousness, far right politics and multiculturalism after Brevik’s 22 July terrorist attack

Norway, like most European countries after the Second World War have witnessed an increase in its immigrant population (Gullestad, 2002; Vassenden, 2010). Immigration to Norway is not a recent phenomenon (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008), especially with the Jewish immigrants that came from Eastern Europe; however, beginning in the sixties onward the number of non-Western, non-White immigrants who have settled in the country has grown. According to the Statistisk sentralbyrå (Statistics Norway, see http://www.ssb.no/innvandring_en/) around 13.1 per cent of the population in Norway are immigrants (this group includes those Norwegians whose parents are immigrants). According to Phelps, Blakar, Carlquist, Nafstad, and Rand-Hendriksen (2012, p. 189) ‘Norway has been transformed from a relatively homogenous to an increasingly multicultural society due to work-related immigration, asylum seeking, and family reunification’. Many of these immigrants came from Pakistan, Turkey, Somalia, as well as a significant number from other African countries as well as South America. The east end of the Oslo area is where most immigrants live.

The increasing visibility of the non-white immigrants has prompted debates around national consciousness, citizenship, belonging and other concomitant attributes of identity in Europe.

Gullestad (2002, p. 45) argues that ‘the migrant presence is generally regarded as deeply problematic’, thus resulting in the rise of racism and xenophobia against foreigners. In Norway, identity boundaries and differences are emphasized with particular reference towards Muslims and non-whites being perceived as threat to Norwegian homogeneity and national identity, thus the racialization and emphasis on Norwegian ethnicity as a criteria of belonging (Eriksen, 2012; Gullestad, 2002; Phelps et al., 2012). National identity based on ethnicity and commonality of ancestry has been naturalized by far-right political rhetoric. In recent years, a noticeable momentum has gathered in the attacks on immigration and the multicultural society which continues to evolve in Norway by populist politicians including those considered mainstream.

The anti-immigrant discourse with its vitriol directed against Muslims seems to have encouraged extremists like Anders Behring Breivik to carry out such a heinous crime on 22 July 2011. He explained his actions by claiming that he is defending Norway in particular and Europe in general against a Muslim conspiracy that intends to overthrow Western civilization. Lybæk and Osler (2012) argue that Breivik’s action must be viewed as political. In the view of Eriksen (2012, p. 208) the 22 July attack was anchored on a certain ideological position promoted through right wing rhetoric which is xenophobic and racially charged. There is a history of racializing and the ethnification of identity difference in Norway (Gullestad, 2002, 2004). This practice which underscores Breivik’s action and the ideology of the far-right where he guzzled from threatens liberal principles of democracy and human rights. According to Lybæk and Osler (2012, p. 2): ‘Breivik’s actions can equally be seen ... as an attack on democracy itself, and on the fundamental principles of freedom, justice and the rule of law’, values around which the national Norwegian identity is built upon.

The Jewish experience in Norway during Second World War has been the result of racialization and ethnification of difference. ‘The ideas and images ... of anti-Semitism and the eugenics movement between the two world wars were all once influential in Norway’ (Gullestad, 2004, p. 187). The national Norwegian narrative laced around the resistance movement that became dominant in the post war period squeezed out the Norwegian Jewish experiences. The silencing or partial silencing of the narration of the Jewish experience in Norway I argue is mainly the result of residual anti-Semitism in Norwegian society.

1.3 Integrating the Norwegian Jewish narrative into the dominant master narrative

The post-war narrative of Norway's involvement the Second World War has been dominated by that of the Resistance Movement (Corell, 2011; Lenz, 2011b). The story of the heroics of Max Manus is embedded in the Norwegian psyche especially with the recent film screened in 2009 carrying his name which received favourable public acclaim (Bjerg, Lenz, & Thorstensen, 2011). Regardless of the dominant narrative of Norway's resistance to Nazi occupation, as presented in the Resistance Museum in Oslo, the other story, which the OHC exposes, presents a disturbing narrative of how Norway treated its minority citizens, notably the Jews during the Second World War.

The narrative displayed at the OHC proves that the dominant post-war Resistance story which the national identity at present generally identifies with is a sanitized one (Reitan, 2011). This narration enriches and broadens the post-war historical narrative by expanding and acknowledging a very difficult and painful memory in the national story of the Norwegian nation-state. It retrieves and corrects the distorted national identity which has pretended to represent all the peoples of this country.

The story of a substantial number of the Jewish population during the Second World War who were deported to Hitler's detention and extermination camps in Europe is part of Norway's national story which cannot be forgotten or discarded by the tyranny resulting from the hegemony of the post war dominant master-narrative. The persecution of Jews was intense and highly organized involving the Norwegian state apparatus especially the police force. Abrahamsen (1991, p. 8) maintains that a key factor 'in analyzing the fate of Norway's Jews was the attitude of the local population, which range from active sympathy to apathy, indifference, and direct hostility [...]' Many Jews were forced to escape to Sweden while others had to hide their identities or go underground. Their human rights and dignity were not recognized, notwithstanding that most Norwegian Jews were deeply integrated and assimilated in the society. As in most nation-states in Europe, the myth of a Jewish conspiracy and acceptance of racial eugenics (Gullestad, 2004) were popular perceptions which supported this persecution. Europeans of the pre-war period were conditioned through nationalistic fervour channelled via media, books and other means as well as government propaganda to view the Jews and other minorities as a threat to the harmony of the pristine

European society. These attitudes still persist in the discourse concerning immigrations, multiculturalism and human rights.

1.4 Scope and limitations

This study is restricted to one institution, the Oslo Holocaust Centre. It does not claim to portray the whole national story of Norway or to address all aspects of human rights and multiculturalism, either in the past or in the present. It is hoped however, that this thesis may contribute in the wider debates about human rights education and multiculturalism in contemporary Norway and beyond and to make a modest contribution to the role of museums in educating for human rights and diversity.

1.5 Structure and organization of thesis

This thesis is organized around **eight chapters**. The **first** chapter gives an overview and introduces the research statement. I introduce the competing narratives constructed around the post war national identity of Norway in museums. The theoretical underpinning and conceptual signposts of my thesis are outlined in **chapter 2**. The literature review around the debate and issues dealing with national identity construction through the museum follows in **chapter 3**. The chapter reviews the historical as well as the current practices of the museum institution and shows how it struggles to represent historical memory correctly through the incorporation of diversity and multicultural ideas. **Chapter 4** traces how the museum institution evolved in Norway and gives a brief account of how the OHC was established and what is its mandate. **Chapter 5** is concerned with the methods and methodology used during my empirical investigation. It discusses my research paradigm. **Chapter 6 and 7** presents my research findings and discussion whilst **chapter 8**, provides the concluding remarks and implications for future research.

CHAPTER 2: Theoretical Framework and brief mapping of key concepts

2.0 Theoretical framework

The theoretical underpinning of this dissertation is anchored on the critical pedagogical approach inspired by the late Brazilian educator (Freire, 1993 [1970]). The Freirean perspective emphasizes dialogue and problem-posing in education. Freire observed two main approaches to education which are diametrical opposites in that they produce different results to both the learner and the teacher. On the one hand there is a 'banking system' of education and on the other is the education approach that involves communication, dialogue and problem-posing.

In the banking approach 'education ... becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are depositories and the teacher is the depositor'(Freire, 1993 [1970], p. 53). Freire rejects the banking form of education which is uncritical and reveres the teacher whilst the student/learner passively absorbs the so-called knowledge being provided by the teacher. Instead he proposes the dialogical, problem-posing and communication approach to education which he maintains is transformative and liberates both the teacher and student from docility and passivity, it empowers learners and educators to intervene in process of their own becoming and humanization. As Freire (1993 [1970], p. 64) asserts:

In problem-posing education, people develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation.

The critical pedagogic approach to learning and teaching is a powerful tool in engaging in dialogue with history and collective memory which are made immediate through the museums display with the power of transformation towards accommodating and respecting as well as humanizing all citizens in all nation-states. With the 21st century museums aiming to be more representative of cultural diversity and looking towards a future where all citizens despite differences in culture, value systems, ethnicity are able to feel a sense of belonging, it is vital for museum visitors to be able to have '...the opportunity of confronting the traces'(Ahonen, 2005, p. 701) of the historic past presented to them. The museum and its space and the objects it presents to visitors are purposively constructed and projected to communicate a particular meaning. Collective memory is never a product of spontaneity, thus

the museum and its displays are artificial constructs with both hegemonic and political implications. That museums are the stuff of political manipulation affecting power relations within members of society is undisputed, hence B. Anderson (1991, p. 178) posits that ‘...museums, and the museumizing imagination, are both profoundly political.’ If we are to accept that an encounter with museum objects as an opening of a window into history and that history is as well a process of ‘...human learning and a human teaching toward liberation’ (Lissovoy, 2007, p. 444), then it is vital for the visitor be able to unpack the layers embedded in museum displays with critical discernment.

The critical pedagogy perceives reality as subjective and becoming. It sees humanity as dynamic, evolving and non-static. The educational role traditionally performed by the museum and other institutions of the state was the sculpting of a particular type of national identity which all citizens were expected to rally around. The new museum ideals and practice based on democratic values to include everyone in a relationship that does not enforce conformity but respect diversity of cultures and identities needs criticality, hope, independent reflective subjectivity to rupture the tyranny and monstrosity of unidirectional national identity narratives of history and collective memories.

The dialogue form of education as per critical pedagogy opens room for people to determine how they perceive reality and historical narratives. It provides learners and teachers’ empowerment and liberation from settled impositions of historical narratives that arbitrarily excludes and omits what the powerful deem undesirable. Critical pedagogy unsettles and interrogates settled dominant master narratives so that they become relevant for the present situation of human beings as well as help in the transformation of human becoming. It restores the truth from oblivion and humanizes the dehumanized.

Narratives are deeply interwoven with how history is understood and transmitted. The interpretation and the search for meaning through our encounters with stories are the stuff of history. Historical narratives have helped construct as well as deconstruct identities, cultures, citizenship and so on. This has been done through ‘museums, songs, and other forms ... [that] tell the stories of countless ... individuals...’(Osler & Zhu, 2011, p. 3). Narrative in the context of this review implies events or happenings of a certain period and the way they are storied, represented, communicated, taught, and transmitted to a varied audience. Both narratives and history writing are selective thus making them contestable. Narrative and

history can be perceived as grand implying in some cases that one story can overshadow other stories due to many factors such as political ideology of the powerful who presides over the affairs of society or the nation-state. Thus narratives must be viewed as multi-layered and complex. This implies that public institutions such as the museum must be spaces where critical discernment is practiced and promoted.

Thus in the light of the objectives of this dissertation which is to understand a museum's narrative in relation to human rights and multiculturalism and their linkages to national identity and its construction, it is believed that the dialogical, problem-posing approach will be helpful in engaging with visitor understandings and perceptions of the Oslo Holocaust Centre's permanent exhibition on the Norwegian Jewish Second World War experience. This theoretical framework helps to deconstruct as well as re-construct the narrative presented in view of its political as well as socio-cultural implications in contemporary Norway whose citizens are becoming more diverse in various ways. To proceed, I present a brief mapping of the key concepts I use in this thesis in order to give context.

2.1 Brief definitions of key concepts

It is in the context of a very intense and politically charged environment especially in Western countries that the debates on the concepts I try to provide a definition below is currently taking place. The definitions are made conscious that, there is a particular narrative insisting that immigrant minorities (read Muslims) are a security risk to the majority due to the incompatibility of their values with democracy, freedom and secularity. The definitions that follow are not exhaustive; they are fleeting and merely serve as guide posts or scaffolding for this thesis.

2.2 National consciousness and National Identity

In the on-going discourse on national identity and consciousness, definitions of these terms are fuzzy and contested; different meanings aplenty. For some national identity and national consciousness are conterminous to '...conceptual chimera not worthy of serious analytical pursuit'(Malešević, 2011, p. 272). Granted there may be a case for such a contention, these concepts are layered and have serious implications to people's lives, in that 'identity can be a source of richness and warmth as well as of violence and terror, and it would make little sense to treat identity as a general evil' (Sen, 2006, p. 4).

There are assumptions that the national consciousness maxim is invoked with the idea and feeling of belonging amongst the majority of a citizenry to a harmonious and homogeneous cultural unit with one shared identity.

Historically, individuals as well as collectives have had to craft ways of self-identification in contexts particular to their circumstances. Identification has many implications at different levels-individual and group. Identities as well are fundamentally psychological, social, cultural, political, and economical and the list goes on. At the individual level one needs to be able to identify oneself as opposed to others, this has a cognitive psychological effect in the way one survives and functions as a rational human being. Individual identity which is characteristically unique to the person is multifaceted. Individual identity does not exist in a vacuum. Self-identification at different levels are influenced by several variables including race or ethnicity, sex, culture, social status, territory, politics, religions as well as economic. At the level of the nation, identity formation is further complicated by a group's collective sense of belonging to a community sharing a common history, culture, myths, symbols, language, and so on as opposed to other communities. National identity thus notes Anthony Smith:

Therefore, we may conclude that, while the concepts of identity -individual, ethnic and national- have been recently inflated and over-used, we nevertheless require a clear and circumscribed use of these concepts as dependent variables or objects of explanation, and sometimes as intervening variables in a wider and more complex account, such as the formation of nations. Not only are they concepts that we cannot, and should not, forgo in our scholarly analyses. The sense of national identity, in particular, has become for many men and women (and not just for politicians and intellectuals) a kind of public good, a state of being to be sought and cultivated, preserved and transmitted, one that even merits self-sacrifice on the part of members of the national community.

(Smith, 2011, p. 231)

The increase in immigration as many have argued has challenged some of the essentializing features associated with national identity which portrays the concept with the certainty of a completed project. For some commentators national identity is an unfinished construct, it is always in a state of flux. According to Akman (2008, p. 187) societies made up of plural ethnicities have always existed in Norway and beyond implying that a more sophisticated

approach is needed to empower all citizens regardless of race or any other variable to be able to form a sense of belonging within the national communities they live. Critical education is needed to enable citizens of nation-states which are evidently diverse in terms of culture, race, and religion and so on, to learn about identity in order to be able to ‘...think about their own identities in political terms’ (Osler & Starkey, 2005, p. 85).

2.3 Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism, what it ought to mean and what it is in practice continues to be intensely contested and debated in academia, the media and within the wider public (Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010). In recent years the death of multiculturalism has been repeatedly announced very loudly by the Conservative leaders of Germany, France and the United Kingdom. As Markha Valenta (2011) writes in an article in *openDemocracy*³:

You always know something is up when the leaders of Germany, France and Britain are in happy agreement. Their most recent cheery confabulation is that multiculturalism in Europe has been a failure. In quick succession first Merkel, then Cameron, then Sarkozy seized the limelight and declared diversity’s demise. They stated this as a truism rather than as an argument. Equally striking is that these political leaders seem more relieved than troubled: as if, for a while, Western Europe had lost its bearings but now is regaining them. Diversity is out, they seem to say, and common sense back in. But of course, given the diversity of our societies, it is diversity that is common sense. Even as I say this, it is very much to be wondered if Europe, notably Germany and France (of all places), ever gave multiculturalism a real chance.

Such pronouncements have become the master narrative regardless of political persuasion. As Kymlicka observes ‘one hears much about the “rise and fall of multiculturalism”. Indeed, this has become a kind of master narrative, widely invoked by scholars, journalists, and policymakers alike to explain the evolution of contemporary debates about diversity’ (Kymlicka, 2012, p. 2). Notwithstanding, questions and doubt continues to be casted on the perceived demise of multiculturalism (Gilroy, 2004; Kymlicka, 2012).

³ Valenta, M. (2011). Multiculturalism and the politics of bad memories. *Open Democracy*. Retrieved from <http://www.opendemocracy.net/markha-valenta/multiculturalism-and-politics-of-bad-memories>

Multiculturalism and the policies it inspires some argue is the manifestation of human rights and democratic values geared towards addressing the nascent inequalities and injustices in Western societies as a result of diversity in various ways. 'Liberal multiculturalism rests on the assumption that policies of recognizing and accommodating ethnic diversity can expand human freedom, strengthen human rights, diminish ethnic and racial hierarchies, and deepen democracy' (Kymlicka, 2007, p. 18).

In another publication the same author further argues that 'multiculturalism is part of a larger human-rights revolution involving ethnic and racial diversity' (Kymlicka, 2012, p. 5). The German philosopher, Habermas (1998, p. 409) has argued that multiculturalism in the nation-state is possible when democratic citizenship translates enjoyment of socio-cultural rights beyond the rhetoric of the right to participate politically and other individual rights.

Indeed international human rights standards acknowledge the right of each individual to a cultural identity. The Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948), Article 27 secures the right for individuals to participate and enjoy without duress the cultural life of their community. The Charter for Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000), Article 22 is binding to all members to respect cultural, religious as well as language diversity. As Xanthaki (2010, p. 43) argues individual human rights take precedence over the right to culture with the option to opt out. My departure point in relation to the meaning and practice of multiculturalism within the nation-state particularly in context of Norway is that the '... nation... includes both unity and variety' (Kjeldstadli, 2008, p. 186).

2.4 Human rights and human rights education

Human rights as a global language has been appropriated by a wide range of people in spite of social class, culture, religion and so on to claim entitlements and struggle against oppression (Douzinas, 2000; Osler & Starkey, 2010). According to Osler and Starkey:

The emergence of demands for the full range of human rights and minorities challenges classic foundations of the nation-state. Indigenous peoples and minorities struggle both for rights of inclusion in society and the maintenance of their ethnic, cultural and linguistic distinctiveness...

(Osler & Starkey, 2010, p. 88)

The Universal Declaration Human Rights (1948) (UDHR) recognizes every individual's human rights without regard to creed, race, sex, status, nationality or where one lives. Human rights ideals strive to build solidarity, liberty, equality and respect for dignity amongst and between peoples of the world. The majority of independent countries around the world submit to the principles of the UDHR and are supposedly committed to guaranteeing fundamental freedoms to all individuals as well as groups. Human rights help in imagining justice and peace in the world as achievable ends. Human right principles provide tools for dialogue in multicultural. Thus the recommendation to human rights educators that young citizens need to know about human rights in order to appreciate the value of freedom, equality, social justice, and the right to cultural and individual identity. This is salient since education '...continues to have a key role in supporting nation-building policies built on myth of national homogeneity and cultural identity'(Osler & Starkey, 2010, p. 88).

Human rights education argues Flowers, Bernbaum, Rudelius-Palmer, and Tolman (2000) are clearly stated in UDHR and requires promotions by all institutions. The UDHR implores national institutions to teach and educate their citizens about human rights standards.

Human rights education is defined as:

Human rights education and training comprises all educational, training, information, awareness-raising and learning activities aimed at promoting universal respect for and observance of all human rights and fundamental freedoms and thus contributing, inter alia, to the prevention of human rights violations and abuses by providing persons with knowledge, skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behaviours, to empower them to contribute to the building and promotion of a universal culture of human rights. [UNDHRET, 19 Dec 2011: Article 2; 1] ⁴

The resolution further details the scope of HRE whilst emphasizing that it is a lifelong process. Human rights issues and violations cut across all societies whether they are democratic, totalitarian, or developing and so on (Tibbitts, 2002). Human rights education thus deals with different problems according to context. However, 'human right learning is necessarily focused on the individual' (Tibbitts, 2002, p. 161). Such focus on the individual is to cultivate a culture and the skills of accepting one's limitations and acknowledging them

⁴ See UN General Assembly Res 66/ 137 adopted 19 Dec 2011 on HRE
<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/467/04/PDF/N1146704.pdf?OpenElement>

whilst encouraging people to defend the freedoms of fellow individuals even if ones disagrees fundamentally with them. Human rights education contributes in the transformation of social and political arrangements for positive and progressive social cohesion.

2.5 Historical consciousness and collective memory

Historical myths and certainty of their truths have been mobilized in the name of a homogeneous national identity in ways that are very cynical in some situations. According to (Coakley, 2004, p. 531) politicians and others ‘...of the modern state devote particular attention to matters of history, especially in context where a political regime feels threatened.’ Historical consciousness and collective memory have grown in importance in recent years. These concepts have upset and deconstructed what history use to mean in that conclusions were arrived through scientific rigour and thus were the ultimate truths about the past. Whilst not disregarding the traditional methods of approaching history, historical consciousness which is intrinsically link to collective memory provides new directions of interpreting the past. According to Misztal (2003, p. 25) collective memory is defined: ‘...as the representation of the past, both the past shared by a group and the past that is collectively commemorated, that enacts and gives substance to the groups identity, its present conditions and its vision of the future.’

Historical consciousness is fundamental to people morally as well as emotionally (Karlsson, 2011). For Karlsson (2011, pp. 129-130): ‘It is a compass that assigns meaning to past events and directs us towards future projects. It is connected not only nor even primarily to scholarly historical interpretations, but to meanings, memories, metaphors, monuments and myths’. Historical consciousness humanizes the past in the sense that: ‘individual and collective understandings of the past, the cognitive and cultural factors that shape those understandings, as well as the relations of historical understandings to those of the present and the future’ (Seixas, 2004, p. 210) are to be considered along a single continuum.

2.6 Museum

The museum institution is deeply involved in identity formation and the narration of the nation’s history. The museum determines and constructs its exhibition based on what it wants to communicate, but what really is a museum. The museum is a space or a structure where items and objects are exhibited for the purposes of communicating certain stories to its visitors. Museums are mostly not for profit institutions. They have educative remits as well

as function as research centres⁵. They are also places where visitors go for pleasure. A more detailed discussion on the museum institution is provided in my literature review chapter.

⁵ See ICOM Statutes Article 3 (1) for a definition of the museum- <http://icom.museum/the-organisation/icom-statutes/3-definition-of-terms/#sommairecontent>

CHAPTER 3:

Literature review

3.0 Museums, nationalism and identity formation

This literature review identifies the key elements of the debate concerning the evolving role of the museum as an institution that participates in the shaping of national identity of the citizenry in nation-states. The museum's role is pertinent particularly with the increase in migration and its impact on cultures, religions, and ethnicity and so on. The point of departure of this chapter is the historical context of the museum as an authoritative and powerful institution in identity formation and nationalism. Heritage and social agency do impact on nationalism and identity formation thus warranting a short note. The second part of the chapter deals with what is called 'new' museology and its influence in the changed role of how museums operate and organize their structures and messages. The third part focuses on the link between museums, education and learning whilst the fourth section highlights aspects of culture and its relation with the museum. The last section is concerned with the relationship between museums, human rights education and Holocaust history education.

3.1 Power and authority of museums in historical context

According to Reeve and Woollard (2006, p. 5) up to 1960s museums and their audiences have had a relationship that was 'considered simple and one-dimensional; the museum was all-powerful and the uncontested authority'. As a powerful and uncontested authority the museum had far-reaching influence in authenticating the national identity of citizens in the nation-state through the homogenizing process of national cultural origins and myths (Barrett, 2011; Kratz & Karp, 2006; Macdonald, 2003, 2006; Trofanenko, 2008). As Knell (2011, p. 11) suggests: 'A good deal of the historical anchoring of national identity that has taken place in national museums has buried somewhere within a primordial sense of origin in folk culture'. Patriotic valour, cultural hegemony, and history are fused in the traditional public museum's narrative directed at making citizens feel a strong sense of belonging to a political community bounded by authentic history. As Ting (2008, p. 468) argues the museum serves as a conduit for 'the cultural construction of national identity [...]' National consciousness was appropriated through the museum:

[I]n... the public history museum, the inherent pedagogical purpose served is one that defines the nation through a history considered to be collectively supported by its citizenry. In the public history museum, various images and narratives of the past are marshalled in the name of the nation.

(Trofanenko, 2008, p. 267)

The museum evolved from the private sphere to the public arena during the rise of nationalism in Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Consequently, museums were caught up in the identity formation project of the period and became part of the state machinery and ‘institutions holding “symbolic power”, [...], shaping the ways in which information and symbolic content are produced and circulated in society’ (Ashley, 2005, p. 6). The nation-state’s power was such that its association with the museum institution ‘... left little room for the museum practices that questioned the authority of the museum. The public was to be educated; they were not to challenge the unidirectional transmission of knowledge and values’(Barrett, 2011, p. 57). Model citizens were the objective the state wanted to create with the museum as a conduit in the project. The museum institution thus had the tendency to assume the custodianship of the nation-state’s history, collective memory and heritage. ‘Evolutionary museums not only made new pasts visible; they also enrolled those pasts by mobilizing objects [...] for distinctive social and civic purposes’ (Tony Bennett, 2004, p. 189).

3.2 Museums and national heritage

The museum as a public institution has been a space that performs many different roles. Heritage is preserved in museum as well. Heritage entails a proud one as well as one that is more or less not desired. The museum narrated the nation’s historical heritage and linked the past to the present. ‘[H]eritage presents identity –which literally means sameness- as persisting over time. The cultural equation at work here is that being of the past confers the right-or even creates a demand- to continue in the future’(Macdonald, 2006, p. 11). However, heritage in some cases is not ideal to its inheritors, implying that it rather be forgotten or muted. The case of the resistance against the Nazi occupation of Norway is a desired heritage and a proud one which is embedded in the national consciousness of her citizens whilst what happened to Norwegian Jews has been a less desired heritage.

3.4 Museums as social agents

The museum has the power to influence social transformation and can act as a social agent that helps shape societal values (Sandell, 2002, 2007). Today’s museums therefore still contribute to the narration of the national history of nation-states with both political and social implications. The potential of the museum in shaping and constructing a particular narrative should not be underestimated. Representations of societies/nation-states in relation to its politics, culture, social configuration, economic development, technological innovation,

history and so on are popularized in the museum with a direct and immediate bearing on the identity of citizens. As Benedict B. Anderson (1991, p. 183) observed the museum provides 'instant recognizability via history'.

The nation-state, as a site where identities and citizenship are situated and negotiated, has had an intimate and mutating relationship with the museum. However, the museum in as much as it is a place where a seeming cultural homogeneity is created is also a complex and layered institution. The twenty-first century museum encompasses dialogue and argument concerning identity and representation. According to Kratz and Karp (2006, p. 3) the museum institution is a public space where different groups with different 'histories and values' are showcased and asserted. Subsequently, communities can also appropriate these created identities. Thus argues Rosenberg (2011) that the museum can potentially augment social and national cohesion among the citizenry. History museums and historic sites, in particular, can serve communities by stimulating dialogue on difficult issues, accurately representing all the people of a nation, and creating forums for discussion among groups with disparate opinions (Rosenberg, 2011, p. 115). Nevertheless, the museum may also serve to create other narratives of the nation-state, operating to exclude citizens whose ethnicities, cultures or religions are minoritised. In almost all museums certain national narratives dominate.

3.5 Changed role of museums in response to late twentieth century and early twenty-first realities

The complexity and layered texture of museums which had been acknowledged in recent decades witnessed a shift in relationship with its audiences. Notwithstanding its power and authority for various reasons anchoring on political ideology, societal evolution, cultural and economic realities the museum institution has had to reconfigure its role, function and what it represents to stay relevant in the twenty first century (Weil, 1999). A number of commentators including Barrett (2011) states that museums started to realign themselves with the new realities confronting citizens and the state in order to influence social change and fulfil 'their capacity to promote cross-cultural understanding, to tackle prejudice and intolerance and to foster respect for difference' (Sandell, 2007, p. 2).

For Reeve and Woollard (2006, p. 5) the transformation in the museum has been prompted by accepting the diversity of various groups constituting the public 'who are keen to articulate their needs and make their views known...' Diversity and multiculturalism as well as human rights (requiring activism and solidarity amongst citizens and beyond coupled with the

education for and about rights) have become part of the menu of democratic values which pluralist nation-states pride themselves in today's world forced the museum institution to endeavour to represent the true nature of citizens. Thus the museum's authoritative gaze has been interrupted (Trofanenko, 2006) and transformed. The issue confronting museums and other institutions of the nation-state is what constitutes this construction of national identity given that diversity of cultures and religious traditions are lived realities within the confines of its public space.

3.6 Museums and the 'new museology'

The idea of the 'new museology' (Vergo, 1989) is noted to have contributed to the transformation of the role of the museum. 'New museology' is defined as

...the study of museums, their history and underlying philosophy, the various ways in which they have, in the course of time, been established, their avowed or unspoken aims and policies, their educative or political or social role.

(Vergo, 1989, p. 1)

It is a field entailing theory and critical thinking involving all aspects of the museum. It takes into consideration subjectivity and meaning making of objects in the museum as well as the socio-cultural context in which museums operate. Museology addresses the museum audience and their interaction with displays, acknowledging this relationship as complex and multifaceted. In the new museology visitors are assumed to be diverse in their backgrounds, their encounters with displays and narratives within the museum space necessarily laced with a myriad of varying assumptions, beliefs, values, world-views and perceptions.

Within the context of new museology, Kratz and Karp (2006) see museums as profoundly protean structures, navigating opposing and disparate interests and objectives. In reflecting their adaptability and to mirror society in a more democratic manner, museums as 'sites of conscience' have been embraced. Sites of conscience are museums with a focus on the following elements:

- The interpretation of history, taking into consideration the specific museum site;
- Dialogue concerning important social issues of the day in a democratic manner based on values that are humanitarian in outlook;

- The participation and inclusion of the public on the issues which the site hopes to address.

(Sèvčenko, 2011, p. 116)

The above type of museums are mostly situated ‘on the sites of past human rights violations’ although they can be at sites where human rights are celebrated (Rosenberg, 2011, p. 119). For example the Oslo Holocaust Centre (OHC) is housed in the home of Quisling, the Norwegian Prime Minister during WW II, who spearheaded the deportation of Norwegian Jews to Germany. Though museums considered sites of conscience are growing in importance, they remain few and far between since they deal with undesirable histories and may potentially redefine national identities (Rosenberg, 2011, p. 120).

3.7 Museums, education and learning

The museum as a space where education and learning takes place has gained traction in the discourse and practice of the evolving role of this institution (Falk, Dierking, & Foutz, 2007; Golding, 2009; Hooper-Greenhill, 2007). Museums narrate the past in very complex ways to its audiences. As indicated, many museums seek to promote a specific (exclusionary) national identity through education and learning. Education has always been an element of the museum institution. The 19th and early 20th century museum with the state was geared to towards educating and shaping a model citizen (Barrett, 2011) a with nationalistic worldview at a time when nationalism was on the rise. The citizen was made to feel a sense of belonging to a nation glued together by a culturally coherent identity through a common history and collective memory. Notwithstanding T. Bennett, Trotter, and McAlear (1996, p. 1) reminds us that ‘museums are complex, many-sided institutions which serve the communities in which they are located in a number of ways’. The museum imbues in the citizen both young and old a sense of oneness and homogeneity of culture, politics, and heritage by the ‘... offer [of] a public and official version of history... through which a particular set of meanings is organized’ (ibid).

The new educational focus of the museum is generally influenced by a pedagogical approach which encourages critical dialogue with exhibitions. Freire’s critical pedagogy further developed a number of other educators help to unpeel the many layers surrounding narratives visitors encounter in the museum. According to Marcus and Levine (2011) there are three important educational and learning possibilities the museum offers:

- a) The museum space engages students and other visitors' in ways that the school or other institutions of learning do not offer. The particularity of the educational programmes available in museums can potentially improve the critical historical thinking abilities of young students.
- b) Museum visits gives visitors the chance to understand the reasons behind how and why the displays they encounter are subject to manipulations (either politically or otherwise) and the specific agendas which the institution wants to communicate.
- c) Museums are resources for lifelong learning since most people especially students have only fleeting experiences of history education beyond school.

Thus through critical learning and education provided by museums dominant master narratives are open to challenge.

3.8 Museums and cultural diversity

The museum institution is a 'cultural and educational institution within the greater fabric of society'(G. Anderson, 2004, p. 1) with an authoritative role impacting citizens' self-perceptions. While displays are traditionally assumed to be objective (Knell, 2011) it is clear that critical observation reveals that such objectivity is, in fact, illusory especially with the noted element of temporality of national narratives in public museums (Macdonald, 2003). Furthermore, objectivity becomes a dubious proposition if it is accepted that national identity is a project that is always in the making.

Due to migration citizenship in most countries has encountered profound changes (Osler & Starkey, 2005). Homogeneity of national and cultural identity is no more a given. The multicultural society is a reality though certain politicians have declared again and again its demise. The museum, like most societal institutions, has to address the multicultural reality of the nation-state. Representing the diversity of a polymorphous citizenry is challenging for various reasons, especially with varied social and cultural groups demanding proper and true representations of their identities and histories. Notwithstanding challenges, the role of the museum in influencing national identity can enable 'a process of learning and accommodation' (Jones, 2010, p. xxiv) in relation to culture, and relinquishing of past attempts to homogenise identity. Considering diversity in the museum as an opportunity can 'play a positive role in enhancing the freedom even of those who are not directly involved' (Sen, 2006, p. 115). In a globalised world, human rights ideals have supported processes of democratization in museums, as in all societal institutions.

The right to cultural identity is a universal human right which all citizens are entitled to in plural societies. It is thus incumbent on all governments who ratified international treaties pertaining to culture and religious rights to make sure all citizens as well non-citizens under their jurisdiction have the space and right to manifest their cultural and religious identities. Article 15 (1) (a) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) guarantees all individuals the right to participate in cultural life. Furthermore, in regards to the rights of the child from a minority group to cultural and religious identity in the multicultural nation-state Art 30 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) guarantees cultural and religious rights to children from minorities whilst Art 29 (1) (c) affirms the child's education to be geared to respecting his or her cultural values and that of the parents. The education of the child must also be directed towards respecting the national values of the country where he or she is living. However, the right to a culture does not trump individuals to be allowed the possibility and freedom to opt out of cultures and traditions which they no longer wish to identify with. The importance of choice and freedom in relation to culture and tradition cannot be overemphasized in a plural and democratic society. As argued by Sen (2006, p. 115) :

...cultural freedom has to be distinguished from the celebration of every form of cultural inheritance, irrespective of whether the persons involved would choose those particular practices given the opportunity of critical scrutiny and an adequate knowledge of other options and of the choices that actually exist.

Critical approaches to museum narratives can enable new cultural representations. Golding (2009, p. 2) suggests ' the meaning of certain pernicious ideas about 'other' peoples and their cultures,...can change when they are questioned in between locations, at the frontier of traditional disciplinary boundaries'. She goes to assert museums can contribute to understanding between and amongst cultures as well as foster social cohesion if they are ready to embrace criticality and openness.

The societal function and role of the museum continues to be re-configured. The critical pedagogical and educational approaches museums have adopted according to Hooper-Greenhill (2007, p. 2) makes their role in society more pronounced. Moreover, the link between education and culture has 'opened up questions of ... subjectivity, meaning and

identity ...’ Museums will continue to encounter various responses to their messages from an audience that is increasingly discerning, with complex needs and disparate desires (Sandell, 2007, p. 67). Indeed, the learning opportunities provided by the museum is limitless, less confined, more directed to the individual, informal and open to divergent interpretations and responses (Hooper-Greenhill, 2007, pp. 4-5).

In the paradigm shift noted in recent years on museum practice, education and learning are no more perceived as static and requiring:

mastery of large bodies of knowledge, [rather] it is about producing people who, in a fluid and changing society, know how to learn, and who have strong self-identities. And putting things out on display for visitors to learn through looking is no longer enough to achieve the educational purposes of museums.

(Hooper-Greenhill, 2007, p. 13)

The multicultural reality of society calls for democratic, inclusive and pluralistic narratives of the nation-state’s heritage, history and collective memory to be anchored in the museum institution’s educational remit.

3.9 Museums, Human rights education and Holocaust history education

Museums as mentioned above have evolved their practices and philosophies in order to be responsive and relevant to their visitors who are increasingly becoming more diverse. They have also embraced issues of human rights and the education for and about it. Human rights museums such as the Osaka Human Rights Museum (Tai, 2010) are growing around the world and contributing immensely to human rights education. Human rights education and what and how it is supposed to be disseminated is stated in the preamble of the UDHR 1948 (Flowers et al., 2000) as well as in other articles in the declaration. Human Rights Education (HRE) imbues respect for human dignity and understanding between individuals. It entails the right to education as well as the right to be taught about one’s rights. Furthermore, as Tibbitts (2002) maintains it involves advocacy and fellowship. HRE for some commentators is as well about multicultural education. In fact Tai (2010, p. 784) argues, ‘[T]he use of the rhetoric of human rights in the field of multicultural education is of particular importance to countries’ who exclude those who are not part of their citizens yet live there.

For Levy and Sznajder (2004) human rights principles are directly infused with the memory of the Holocaust. The Holocaust provides the moral bases of human rights principles. As Salmons (2003, pp. 149-140) states:

For many educators, a key motivation for teaching about the Holocaust is that it can sensitise young people to examples of injustice, persecution, racism, anti-Semitism and other forms of hatred in the world today. The Holocaust is seen as a moral touchstone, a paradigm of evil, and it is hoped that in learning lessons of this terrible past, young people might be inspired to work harder for a fairer, more tolerant society. One that sees strength in diversity, values multiculturalism and combats racism.

Museums commemorating the suffering of human beings and highlighting human rights abuses across a wide range continues to make their presents felt through the education for a culture of human rights (Duffy, 2001, p. 10). Furthermore, for Purbrick (2011) museums are among the educational institutions recognized by organizations such as the UN, as places where human rights education should be performed. Museums memorialising the Jewish Holocaust educate their visitors about human rights, the dangers of racism and exclusionary politics. Learning and teaching about the Holocaust in the view of Short and Reed (2004, p. 2) 'is to help secure the future against further violations of human rights whether based on ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation or disability'. Memorial museums providing education about difficult and painful memories are assumed to have 'pedagogy [with] weightier gravitas' (Williams, 2007, p. 190).

Caution is required in not confusing moral lessons with moralizing (Eckmann, 2010) to the detriment of having enough knowledge of history. It is important to thoroughly understand the history of the Holocaust before drawing lessons from it. Holocaust education is a tool for human rights education through its scope and extent which must be considered at all times. According to Eckmann (2010, p. 15) Holocaust education and human rights education have their anchors tethered on the following four characteristics:

- The importance of learning about historical facts and 'processes' that lead to the Holocaust.
- 'the history of memory, and the diversity of historical narratives'
- The urgency of addressing contemporary human rights abuses in society and 'in our own national contexts'.

- The need for reflection on national pasts and the deconstruction of ‘national myths about ... history that are present in our own countries’

These points are salient in the process of this dissertation.

CHAPTER 4: The museum institution in Norway, The Oslo Holocaust Centre

4.1 The museum institution in Norway

Museums and their exhibitions have always played a significant part in the construction of national identity and ascertaining the national consciousness of the citizenry in the nation-state as already noted. National history is embedded in the narration of museums especially those that deal with memory and heritage. This directly impacts on national consciousness and nationhood as affirmed by Knell (2011, p. 8) when he writes; ‘... in the national museum no subject is more central to the construction of the nation than history ...’ The Norwegian state’s relation with the museum in forming the identity of citizens has been going on for a long time. Norway has utilized historical myth all along in the formation of its national identity. ‘Museums displays are especially powerful memory sites since they enable the connection between individual and cultural memory. This process is particularly salient in the case of displays unfolding narratives of the nation and its past’(Varutti, 2010, p. 747). The Norwegian state deliberately deployed its machinery assisted by academia to extend its reach to the population in her endeavour to construct a national identity through the museum (Amundsen, 2011; Aske, 2008). The political climate of the early nineteenth century galvanized a romantic cultural movement as Norwegians sought to define and express a distinct national character. As noted the:

... Collection of immaterial and material cultural heritage was followed by academic work, and interpretation of the national treasure was orientated just as much towards the present and the future, as to the past. Folk tradition was mediated in a new way and with new explanations, contributing to the notion of identity and national fellowship. Museums were important institutions in the nation-building, as vehicles for the encouraging of national values and identity in the aftermath of 1814.

(Aske, 2008, p. 184)

The appropriation of Norwegian folk culture and its romantic past, the depicting of the peasant and farmer as genuinely representative was visible in the institutionalization of the museum in the nation building project of Norway.

The growth of the museum institution in Norway has to be contextualized and situated within the Scandinavian collective and how each country have utilized the past in fostering cultural

and national identity. Not to sound repetitive, the accompaniment by the museum in the project of establishing an authentic cultural and national identity that began 1814 gathered pace and gained vigour when Norwegians attained full independence in 1905. The young country exuberantly became more determined to construct a distinct and unique identity different from their Scandinavian neighbours to the extent that: '[I]n 1910, the Norwegian Central Bureau of Statistics claimed that Swedes and Danes constituted separate and different races, both the cultural and the biological origins being decisive' (Kjeldstadli, 2008, p. 176). However, Hillström (2010) insists that the nationalism of the nineteenth which spur the proliferation of museums maybe an exaggeration in context of the folk culture museum. She reminds us of the significance of how this genre of museums and there development in both Sweden and Norway were anchored on a shared cultural identity of 'Scandinavianism' in which 'the concept of "nation" as people and culture ... [was not] subordinated to the concept of "nation" as state and political territory' (Hillström, 2010, p. 605).

The pretence of 'naturalness' pertaining to Norwegian national identity is in reality a fluid and never ending reinvention of the nation-building identity project (Eriksen, 1993). The ongoing reinvention or the negotiation of Norwegian national identity was evident as in most nation-states in Western Europe following the Second World War according to (Reitan, 2011, pp. 64-65) especially in how 'national epos' were constructed around patriotic valour of resistance during the war period. In the imagined identity constituting 'Norwegian-ness' and its rightful claimants, is certainly a complex issue, given the different kind of immigrants with different racial hue who had in recent years became part of the citizenry in Norway (Vassenden, 2010). Representing a multicultural and diverse Norway is a task museums in the country have been engaged for a while. This task is a direct result of Norwegian state policy (Bøe, 2008). As (Møller & Einarsen, 2008, p. 140) recalls Norwegian government requires 'museums ... to become reflective agents for society, mirrors in which modern society's diversity is reflected ...'

The museum authenticated the post-war national meta-narratives through their displays albeit conveniently omitting a vast array of '... leftovers of history ... and stories that do not become part of institutionalized memory or that are neglected or erased by official historiography' (Vervaet, 2011, p. 302). However, the so-called leftovers neglected by national historical grand narratives are being uplifted and forms a rich counter narrative to the institutionalized and official stories (Vervaet, 2011). These counter narratives help in

breaking the silences and partial silences which in some cases hide traumatic events which may be a source of shame to the nation-state yet to others (minorities in the state) an important part of national history and memory, constitutive elements of their identity. As Akman argues:

It is questionable whether the cultural heritage of ... the national minorities and other minorities in Norway are sufficiently represented in Norwegian museums. Even if attitudes to minorities' cultural heritage have changed, most are still not part of the "grand Norwegian narrative".

(Akman, 2008, p. 187)

The construction of national identity in the post Second World War era narratives laced around patriotic virtues of resistance of foreign occupiers notably the Nazis have already been noted. However, if historical narratives have been deployed in the museum for the purposes of ordering society in a certain way, it has in equal measure been useful in puncturing the official version. History in its long and distant span in the evolution of human beings has witnessed narratives both individually and collectively 'used to powerful effect for justice and human rights' (Osler & Zhu, 2011, p. 3). Thus the museum can go a long way to create social cohesion in societies marked with cultural and other differences through education (Rosenberg, 2011). By publicly exhibiting a group's history honestly (particularly minority groups), the museum institution, has the potential of changing perceptions of these groups being viewed as strangers. Whence making all citizens feel included.

4.2 Norway's 'national master narrative' of the post-war history

The travails of the Second World War occupy a very conspicuous part in the post war narration of Norway's history and collective memory (Bruland, 2011). Based on the work of prominent cultural historians, Bruland (2011, p. 134) notes that proper historical analysis was ignored in order to create a national myth 'about Norway's World War II experiences'. Norway as the victim of occupation was the grand narrative that has been favoured until the 1990s. The patriotic resistance by ordinary Norwegian citizens against a foreign invader characterizes its post war national identity, yet the resistance involved a cross-section of its population including Jews. According to Mendelsohn (1991, p. 5): 'Several Jews were included in Norwegian units fighting the Germans [...]'. Regardless, the narration of the war in Norway in its aftermath was dichotomized in terms of 'us' the victimized Norwegians against 'our' enemies the Nazi occupiers (Corell, 2011; Levin, 2010). For Corell (2011, p.

102): 'National histories can be read as narratives about a community of 'us' and 'our' enemies or opponents'. The story of how Norwegian Jews were treated was hardly mentioned in school curriculums or if it got mentioned it was in a very general and different context. In universities as well the Holocaust got faint attention by academics which was further reflected in public knowledge (Bruland, 2011). In the powerful and dominant mythical grand Norwegian narrative writes Bruland (2011, p. 134):

...the Jews have little or no place in Norway's historical memory. Only a small number of monuments are dedicated to the fate of Norway's Jews and few anniversaries are marked. In fact, until recently the fate of Norway's Jews was absent from Norwegian national memory, as if the Jews were not part of Norwegian society at all.

In the context of the post war period of national recovery, for many Norwegians the idea of acknowledging and accepting that Nazi crimes affected more than one set of victims was a difficult proposition. According to Reitan (2011, p. 64): 'In a national, consolidating process of reconstruction, there was no room for the two prisoner categories in Norway that fell victims to the Nazi genocidal policy.' Rallying around the resistance movement for the furtherance of the national identity project seemed logical. Thus the Jewish story was virtually scripted out of the nation's collective memory and history. As (Lenz, 2011b) put it, the dichotomous nature of the post war narrative based on the resistance by Norwegian patriots against an occupying regime developed swiftly after the war. She writes:

This interpretative pattern informed historical research, public memory culture and history teaching for decades. Within this framework, by far the most interest was directed towards the resistance movement on the one hand and the general population's rejection against attempts to Nazify Norwegian society, [...]. The Norwegian Resistance Museum ... can be regarded as a materialization of what could be called a "national master narrative" [...]. Moreover, power relations in a contemporary society are shaped by the positions that this narrative ascribes to individuals and groups.

(Lenz, 2011b, p. 258)

The reason for the swiftness of the dichotomy in the post war narrative and why Norway's national identity has been constructed around the resistance to German occupation and materialized through the Norwegian Resistance Museum was that '...many politicians and representatives in public organizations in post-war Norway were veterans. There was a clear connection between the authority to define the past and the authority to define present-day politics' (Lenz, 2011a, p. 141). However, upon further interrogation '...the "master-narrative" of the resistance, which claimed to cover the experiences of the broad majority of citizens and which everyone apparently could identify, contained lacunae' (Lenz, 2011a, p. 141).

The missing lacunae apparent to many critical observers of the dominant narrative of the resistance which is displayed at the Resistance Museum and history books began to gain prominence during the 1980s and 1990s. The reason was partly due to a generation shift during this period both in political ideology and academic scholarship occurred in Norway. It must be noted that at the period Norwegians started interrogating the grand narrative perpetuated around their Second World War experience was the same time when the Holocaust became central in the narratives of most Western European countries as well as the United States coming to terms with the reality of this period (Novick, 1999; Reitan, 2011). As Reitan (2011, p. 70) argues : 'The gradual incorporation of the Holocaust in the profiling of the new Norwegian memorial institutions can obviously be seen in light of international historio-cultural movements.'

Many of the new generation of scholars were born much after the end of the war. They were less emotionally attached to the war myths and felt that Norway's real involvement in the Second World War deserved a more rigorous and nuance representation than the one told by the official dominant master narrative. These new crop of academics and politicians not to mention social commentators wanted to know what was the experiences of those members of the Norwegian society who were culturally as well as ethnically different from the majority yet considered citizens. In actual fact the case of the Norwegian Jews gaining prominence was to a certain extend forced upon the authorities reluctantly.

The 50th anniversary of the end of Nazi occupation of Norway was thoroughly covered the by the media. During this period the Norwegian financial journalist Bjørn Westlie:

[...] decided to investigate the fate of Norwegian Jews, because he found that the story of their arrests and confiscation of their property was largely unknown. He discovered that not only were Jews deported and killed, many Norwegians, not all of them Nazis, had profited at the Jews' expense.

(Sass & Abrahamsen, 2003, p. 92)

The 27 May 1995 article garnered interest beyond Norway's borders. The international media gave the article a wide readership and forced the Norwegian government through an appointed committee called Skarpnes Committee⁶ of experts to investigate Westlie's claims (Reitan, 2011). Thus the Jewish experience in Norway became a subject of heightened enquiry. The Skarpnes Committee ended divided and produced two reports at the end of its mandate. A report produced by two dissenters who formed a minority within the committee Bjarte Bruland and Berit Reisel. The authors of the minority report were more interested with the moral dimension of the horrible Jewish experience in Norway during the Second World War (Sass & Abrahamsen, 2003). The Norwegian government accepted the minority report and adopted its recommendations.

The Norwegian government accepted moral responsibility and the financial ruin of her Jewish citizens, which had been praised by both the Israeli state and the World Jewish Congress as a model for others to emulate (Sass & Abrahamsen, 2003, p. 93). The truth of what really happened to the Jews in Norway is preserved through the creation of the Centre for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities in Oslo (which is called interchangeably in this thesis the Oslo Holocaust Centre or museum) whose financing came from the restitution paid by the state (Corell, 2011; Reitan, 2011; Sass & Abrahamsen, 2003).

4.3 Re-negotiating Norway's shared history and collective memory: The Oslo Holocaust Centre, multiculturalism and human rights education

According to Purbrick (2011, p. 186) the museum especially those where past atrocities are memorialized has now an assigned 'historical reparation' role through the discourse of human rights which now forms part of the educational objective it aims to perform. The Oslo Holocaust Centre coming into existence provides an opening for Norway to expand its post war narrative to reflect the true picture of what happened during the Second World War. Using the metaphor of negotiation following on Sem (2009) and others, the OHC might be

⁶Skarpnes Committee Report with English Summary [pp 164-172] is available on this link <http://www.regjeringen.no/Rpub/NOU/19971997/022/PDFA/NOU199719970022000DDDPDFA.pdf>

seen as Norway's own way of re-negotiating its painful past and making its national narrative more inclusive. As noted above seeing the true history of a people exhibited in the museum goes a long way in creating social cohesion and understanding among communities in the nation-state. The OHC existence can be viewed as 'to offer redress to peoples [Norwegian Jews] whose rights were not recognized at some point in the past, through representations of the consequences of such a denial of humanity' (Purbrick, 2011, p. 170).

4.4 The OHC's exhibition (Mandate and Description)

The interest of the Centre are comprised of two fields; (A) the history of the Holocaust in Norway is at the core of its activities as well as issues of anti-Semitism both current and historical are studied. Genocide and human rights themes are of interest in the OHC's research and education activities. (B) Religious minorities and other Norwegian minorities are part of the focus of the Centre's research due to the fact that these groups and their situation both current and past have not been adequately included in the debate within a multicultural society such as Norway (<http://www.hlsenteret.no/english/about/index.html>).

The OHC is located along other museums in the leafy neighbourhood of Bygdøy in the West End of Oslo. The museum is housed at Villa Grande, the former residence of Vidkun Quisling, Prime Minister of Norway who collaborated with the Nazis during war period. The exhibition on the Holocaust at the Centre uses images, documents with written text, a black and white film of the ship the *Danau* at the Oslo harbour where Jews were sent away to their murder.

The visitor encounters the film of the ship first, and then he or she is introduced to the photos and text of racial hygiene ideas prevalent in Norway and Europe during the first half of the 20th century. The visitor is then presented with the various groups that suffered under the Nazi discrimination policies. The other parts of the exhibition include clips where one can view and listen to personal stories of survivors as well as a room where names of those Norwegian Jews who perished are written on the wall. There is an area also where temporary exhibits of recent and on-going genocides are displayed.

CHAPTER 5:

Research Methodology

5.0 Interpretive paradigm within research

In this chapter I introduce and discuss the methodology and strategies used in the process of carrying out the research for my thesis. I present the research paradigm and the philosophical foundations undergirding the methodological approaches I choose. The tools developed in the journey towards realizing the goal, objective and ultimately to answer the question posed in the research is highlighted. I also reflect on the limitations of this study. I begin by reintroducing my key research question and objectives as outlined in chapter one:

How is the Oslo Holocaust Museum contributing to the narrative of the national story of Norway in relation to human rights and multiculturalism?

Specific Objectives

- To **identify** issues of human rights and multiculturalism in what is being narrated by the Oslo Holocaust Museum
- To **analyse** the narrative the museum is projecting and promoting and how it is being received/understood by foreign visitors in particular.
- To **evaluate** the potential educational value of the holocaust centre in terms of human rights and multicultural education.

To answer my question and achieve the stated objectives, I adopted the case study approach, using the Oslo Holocaust Centre (OHC) as my research site. During my fieldwork I used a range of research methods, including, interviews with key OHC personnel; interviews with visitors to the centre; observation; examination of key documents relating to the centre's establishment; and an examination of the exhibition itself. I sought to achieve reflexivity by the keeping of a research diary and through a series of conversations about these experiences with my supervisor, mentors at the Falstadsenteret (appointed as a result of my winning a Falstad scholarship in the autumn of 2011). It is argued that:

...the use of a research diary was grounded in the epistemological position of social constructionism and the need for reflexivity in research. Action does not occur in a social vacuum, therefore we need to take account of the wider context or social embeddedness of human action in order to gain a full understanding. This is equally applicable to the research situation as it is to everyday life. Given that the research situation is itself a social encounter, we thus need to reflect upon the range of factors which impact upon the interpretations gathered. [...] The research diary is one simple

and easy to use tool which can significantly help researchers achieve these aims and become more reflexive.

(Nadin & Cassell, 2006, p. 216)

Research diaries have become particularly important for qualitative researchers especially for a novice like me. It provides guidance for the researcher to reflect on her actions or inactions so as to learn to improve. In what follows I elaborate on the process of my research.

5.1 Selecting an interpretivist approach

In the world of the social sciences, social reality is studied in context of two established epistemic traditions. These traditions are the positivist and interpretivist paradigms (Basit, 2010; Cohen, Manion, Morrison, & Bell, 2011). The researcher coming from a positivist's worldview is interested in statistics, and generally in measurable variables under controlled situations guided by a prior deductive theory. The positivist perspective dominated social research until about half a century ago when it came under attack for amongst other things its inability to capture other elements such as power relations, politics, the researcher's biases and the subjectivity of the researched. These latter elements were central to my study and therefore this study draws on the interpretivists' tradition. Moreover, I choose the interpretivist approach conscious of the 'mechanistic and reductionist view of nature, which, by definition, defines life in measurable terms rather than inner experience, and excludes notions of choice, freedom, individuality and moral responsibility ...'(Cohen et al., 2011, p. 14).

Interpretivists believe social reality is constructed and not something out there standing independently to be discovered. This paradigm acknowledges that human behaviour is very important in research and seeks understanding of this behaviour through rigorous in-depth study. It engages the particular as well the abstract. This perspective holds that social reality carries meanings for human beings and that that their actions are meaningful (Bryman, 2004; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008). Within this perspective context is important in the phenomena studied. The researcher accepts the complexities associated with understanding human behaviour and acknowledges that their own positionality can affect the research investigation. Interpretivists accept and seek to acknowledge their own biases as well as that of those of research participants. The shared experience of the researcher and his or her informants are equally valuable for understanding reality. In what is noted as the 'double hermeneutic' attributed to the English social theorists Anthony Giddens as well as his German counterpart

Jurgen Habermas interpretive researchers ‘interpret a world that is already interpreted by the research participant’ (Basit, 2010, p. 2). Research validity is internal in the interpretivist as opposed to external validation which is vital to the positivists.

5.2 Research strategy

The next section outlines the methodology used in this thesis. All research needs to develop a strategy that is coherent, relevant and enhance rigor in data gathering and analysis. A research strategy is meant to provide focus and direction all through the empirical process of acquiring and analysing data. According to (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 35) it: ‘comprises a bundle of skills, assumptions, and practices that the researcher employs as he or she moves from paradigm to the empirical world. Strategies of inquiry put paradigms of interpretation into motion’.

In choosing a qualitative methodology I endeavoured to understand how visitors to the centre encounter the museum narrative. Sandell (2007, pp. 197-198) maintains: ‘Rather than using data to establish directly causal relationships between, for example, a museum exhibition and the reactions of the audience, a qualitative approach will generate rich, dense and deep data which can be analysed and interpreted in a holistic way and which may offer contextualized, nuanced and multi-layered interpretations.’

5.3 Choice and justification of case study method, site and data sources

Tight (2010, p. 331) argues that researchers ‘...could view case study as a method, approach, style, strategy or design’. It can be conceived of in relation to a wide, but differing, range of other social research methods, approaches, styles, strategies or designs. Creswell (2008, p. 476) describes a case study as a deep inquiry of a ‘bounded system’ which involves data gathering which should be highly comprehensive as well as elaborate.. The case study strategy is particularly efficient in its ability to portray ‘...real people in a real social situation by means of vivid accounts of events, feelings and perceptions’ (Basit, 2010, p. 19). The case study tries to grasp in detail and document all what it going on during the research process. The case study approach has been known to be ideal for the single and lone graduate student researcher.

The objective of my thesis is to understand how and why a museum’s narrative can be a source of national consciousness in a multicultural society such as Norway where human rights and democracy are values seen as the bed rock of its society. Thus it is logical I

employed the case study strategy to gain an in-depth understanding of people's interpretation of the Oslo Holocaust Centre's (OHC) exhibition.

5.4 Access, data gathering and analysis

Issues of access to research site, confidentiality, informed consent, power-relation, representation up to the reporting of the results can be quite sensitive for the researcher. If not handled properly, the validity or reliability of research results could be seriously affected (Basit, 2010; Chambliss & Schutt, 2003; Cohen et al., 2011; Creswell, 2008; Osler, 2010). Harm to participants can occur if research is handled haphazardly.

5.4.0 Access

Researchers must go through formal channels in some cases to gain access to sites, thus they must request permission through writing or other means. This means one has to find out who to contact and how and when to make such contacts. In many cases a project proposal which must somehow be of interest to the organization must be submitted. After all, it is not but a favour one is requesting, nothing more. The researcher's intentions must be made abundantly clear and all necessary information must be made available to participants (Cohen et al., 2011).

Access to the research site was relatively easy for me. Having identified who to contact, I emailed my research proposal to the Centre's management followed by telephone calls. The Administrative Director accepted my request to carry out my research the OHC (**Appendix III**). I was invited to visit the Centre to discuss in detail what I intended to do. I was then given authorisation to proceed with my research and all relevant staff were informed about my presence at the OHC. I was allowed access everywhere and I did not need to pay any entrance fees during the days I was at the Centre.

5.4.1 Observation

Having successfully negotiated access, I visited the OHC to make observations and familiarize myself once again with the museum settings (in terms of logistics and protocols) and get acquainted with staff members. I thought this vital for preparing me for the next step of the data gathering process – that is the interviewing stage. I utilized some time to observe how visitors to the OHC interacted and used their time within the exhibition space. Taking the role of a participant observer was significant because it gave me some idea of how visitors behave in the museum environment, how much time they spent on the displays and which particular one catches their interest most. Chambliss and Schutt (2003, p. 165) maintain that

participant observation is situated along a continuum of different roles, ranging from the researcher being completely and overtly immersed among the researched to being a covert observant or the mixing of both. The observation gathering has its advantages and helps enrich data triangulation. The observer must be well informed and prepared before endeavouring to attempt this method of data gathering (Basit, 2010, p. 120). A good observer needs to be able to be relied upon and trusted by informants thus building and maintaining relations is quite vital. To be able to collect data in situ at the OHC ‘gave me a sense of the extent to which comments made by interviewees might be typical or atypical of visitor responses in general’ (Sandell, 2007, p. 198).

Qualitative case study researchers, including museum researchers, have tended to gather information mainly through observation and interviews as in the research on visitor perceptions Sandell (2007) carried out at the Anne Frank House in the Netherlands and St Mungo’s Museum of Religious Life and Art in Scotland. I follow on Sandell in choosing the case study approach.

5.4.2 Interviews

According to Kvale (2007, p. 1): ‘If you want to know how people understand their world and their lives, why not talk with them?’ Interviewing is thus about having a conversation to gain insights about people’s experiences and how they interpret and create meanings. The research interview also serves a somewhat different purpose, to gather relevant data aimed at understanding a specific concern the researcher is investigating (Basit, 2010; Kvale, 2007). I was inspired by the preceding considerations to employ the interview approach as my main strategy to gather data.

Thus, I conducted interviews at the Oslo Holocaust Centre with visitors to its permanent exhibition concerning the Jewish Holocaust in Norway during the Second World War in the summer of 2011. These interviews took place between the dates of 12th July to 21st July. During the month of August 2011, I as well interviewed members of staff of the OHC, including a former staff of the Centre who was recommended to me. Staff interviewed worked in different departments, including education and research. The major aim of the interviews were to find out how visitors perceive and make-meaning from the narrative of the OHC presented to them in relation to Norway’s post-war dominant master-narrative of history and

memory of its Second World War experience and how this is implicated in the construction of national identity and consciousness.

The interviews were carried out in English and the questions were semi-structured. The choice of using the semi-structured approach has its advantages and limitations. In other to have open discussion, using semi-structured questioning gives flexibility to nudge respondents to freely share their interpretations and perspectives. However, it must be acknowledged that sometimes the semi-structured approach to interviewing can inadvertently sway towards leading one's interviewee in a manner they might not have intended, which I believe had occurred few times during my interviews with visitors at the OHC. In total 20 visitors (**see tables 1 & 2 below**) were interviewed and 7 staff members. The visitor interviews lasted approximately about 10 minutes whilst staff interviews were between t 20 to 30 minutes.

5.4.3 Visitor interviews

I find it important to note that the interviewees I encountered in my research at the OHC were mainly middle age; middle class foreign visitors from Western Europe, Canada and the United States (**tables 1 & 2**). They were mostly white people and some of them had Jewish heritage. Some of these foreign nationals specifically from the US described their nationality as Norwegian because their parents or grandparents emigrated during an earlier period.

All the interviews with the visitors took place around the reception area on their way out after they have been through the displays. All interviewees I approached participated out of their own volition and were informed about the purposes of the research. I began all my interviews by reading out to the interviewee the reasons why I was having a conversation (**see appendix I**) with them and that their privacy and confidentiality were assured. No visitor was asked their name, thus no one could be identified. The interviews were tape recorded with no objection from participants.

Table 1: Visitor Interviews

Visitor interviews				
Interviewee #	Age	Sex	Nationality	Identity/Self-Identifier
1	22	M	US Citizen	White
2	64	F	US Citizen	White
3	23	M	Irish	White
4	36	F	US Citizen	White
5	56	M	Canadian	White/Jewish
6	19	M	Dutch	White
7	22	M	Portuguese	Black
8	64	M	US Citizen	White/Jewish
9	62	M	British	White/Scottish
10	47	F	German	White
11	16	M	Welsh	White
12	59	F	German	White
13	59	M	Irish	White
14	64	M	US Citizen	White
15	60	M	Norwegian	White
16	35	M	Hong Kong	Chinese
17	39	M	British	White
18	60	M	US/originally Norwegian	White/Jewish
19	37	F	Swedish	White
20	24	F	Finnish	White

Whilst my targets were foreign visitors to Norway as explained in chapter 1, I however, interviewed a Norwegian gentleman who was with foreign visitors he was accompanying to the Centre. When I approach a potential interviewee, I asked whether they spoke English or not since it was the language I was studying in. This was perhaps the only criteria in choosing whom I interviewed. The period I carried out interviews was in the summer period when most visitors to OHC are tourists visiting Norway.

5.4.4 Staff interviews

I had initially planned to interview key staff members of the executive and education of the Centre whom I have already identified. This would have meant that I will just do 3 interviews, however as a novice researcher the number snowballed to 7 through interviewees recommending colleagues. The idea of interviewing staff from the education department I believe serves my purposes in understanding issues of human rights education and multiculturalism since the department engages in opening dialogue and understanding through the pedagogical task they pose on visitors to critically appreciate the narrative of the

exhibition. As in the visitor interview I prepared a schedule which was accepted by all staff (Appendix II).

Table 2: Staff Interviews

Staff interviews	
Interviewee #	Department
1	Education
2	Executive
3	Research
4	Research
5	Research
6	Library
7	Ex

I choose semi-structured open-ended questioning with the staff so as to be able to keep focus and depth on my key research questions. I did get informed consent from staff members and I did state at the beginning of interviews that I will always do my utmost to maintain confidentiality. However, I think given the small size of the organization it might be that staff who read this thesis may be able to identify their colleagues. I have endeavoured to maintain anonymity of my staff informants by using number identification.

5.5 Data Analysis

Bricolage meaning free use of any technique that proves effective in the quest of making sense of data is adopted in my analysis Kvale (2007, p. 115). Indeed, an amalgam of narrative analysis, categories and using direct quotations from the answers of participants forms the basis of the findings and discussion section of my thesis.

I started my analysis during the fieldwork. At the end of each interview the tape was played again so as to reflect upon the encounter. Notes were written down based upon my reflections on the interviews. All my interviews have been transcribed, coded and analysed, searching for emergent themes. I did not use any computer programme for coding. I sat down with different coloured pens and highlighted the themes that appeared repeatedly in the interview transcripts. I saw a pattern developing which I then condense into main themes. For example one of the themes I noticed was the maxim of ‘never again’ in relation to the Second World War Holocaust. It appeared in most of the responses from the visitor interviews. The themes I identified, I think are significantly linked with my research questions and objectives. I elaborate on them in the findings chapter.

5.6 Ethical considerations and reflexivity

In this section, I reflect on some of the ethical issues that confronted me whilst conducting my investigation. Ethics in research enhances reliability. Observing ethical rules makes research results trustworthy and respectable. There are ethical issues that need to be observed at various stages of research. As I noted in the introduction of this chapter, I kept a research diary throughout the research process. I will reflect on some of my entries for the purpose of reflexivity so as to understand the interpretations of my data.

5.6.1 Reflection on access to site

The first ethical issue I needed to deal with after having my research proposal accepted by the authorities of the Master in Human Rights and Multiculturalism at Buskerud University College (HIBU) was to access to my chosen research site. It is sometimes virtually impossible to gain access to the sample one intends to research (Basil, 2010, p. 59). If approach wrongly one might not even have the possibility to proceed. It can mean the end of the whole process before even one gets started. My first attempt to gain access through an email to the head of the education section was not successful. This was because the person I address my mail was on leave. I eventually was helped by the reception staff of the OHC when I placed a call to inquire about who to contact. They told me that the right person to contact was the Administrative Director. When I mailed Director, he swiftly replied granting my request. Maintaining such access is perhaps more difficult. Using the metaphor of the 'gatekeeper' Osler (2010, p. 45) writes;

...there are various rings of gatekeepers with whom researchers have to negotiate. The sets of gatekeepers operate like those who used to guard the entrances to medieval castles: researchers must pass through the outer gates before accessing further concentric circles of the castle's defences.

Thus after passing through the main gatekeeper, I became increasingly aware of the ethical conundrum that accompanies the kind of research I was doing so I took the greatest care to make sure at all time I adhere to the academic principles and standards governing master student research as required by my college and in Norway in general. For example during my research I spent most of my time at the reception area of OHC in order to be able to have interviews with visitors. This meant that I was constantly in the space of the receptionists, I

made sure at no point that I was interfering with their job. Actually my relationship with whoever was on duty at the reception was very cordial and they all made me feel at home.

5.6.2 *Informed consent and confidentiality*

Research especially of the qualitative nature that deals with perceptions and opinions is highly delicate. Thus care must be taken in dealing with subjects and sources of information in terms of informed consent, confidentiality, respect and representation.

The issue of informed consent is perhaps one of the most fundamental and vital ethical principles researchers have to grapple with. Informed consent implies participants voluntarily accepting to take part in a piece of research following disclosure of all necessary information (written or verbal) by the researcher concerning his or her investigation (Sanderson, 2010, p. 51). It is an on-going process during research which is open for negotiation especially if participants wish to opt out. This is specifically due to the qualitative nature of the interpretivist paradigm that considers subjectivity and positionality as important in research. Informed consent also encourages participants to collaborate with the researcher (Houghton, Casey, Shaw, & Murphy, 2010, p. 16).

In my case all my participants voluntarily consented to be interviewed after having been informed about the purposes of my research. I had a prepared protocol and a letter from the administration of the Centre explaining my research (**Appendix III**). I showed this letter to those visitors who accepted to be interviewed and I verbally informed them again that the information was strictly intended for my thesis and that I will do all that was possible to maintain their privacy and anonymity. The staff of the Centre whom I interviewed as well gave consent voluntarily. All throughout my research interviews and observations at the OHC, I was careful not to raise any concerns from my informants and worked hard to the best of my ability that I was not doing anything unethical.

Informed consent directly latches on confidentiality and anonymity. Some data may be very sensitive and can cause harm to those who are making it available to the researcher, thus confidentiality is paramount. As a researcher I have the power to control how I represent the views of my informants particularly when presenting my findings. I have given assurances to my informants that I will do my utmost to be as accurate as possible in what I report in my thesis.

With the visitor interviewees, I sought to maintain confidentiality and anonymity by not taking any names in which case none of them can be identified. For the staff, as I noted above it may be possible for them to identify each other due to the size of the organisation which is not that big, however I represent each with a number in the endeavour to attain confidentiality. This admittedly provides limited anonymity. It is vital that,

...the process of giving informed consent involves ensuring that research subjects understand guarantees of anonymity and confidentiality, and the limits to such guarantees. In a number of research contexts it may be difficult to guarantee anonymity, for example, if the research subjects are members of small groups...

(Osler, 2010, p. 30)

I will now give my reflections concerning my interview process.

5.6.3 Reflections, Reflexivity and the actual interview process and circumstance

A credible, reliable, valid and repeatable piece of research must deal with issues of reflexivity (Cohen et al., 2011; Ryan, 2004). All researchers are influenced by a perspective and this impact in one form or the other on one's investigation. Accepting one's biases gives authenticity and enhances credibility. 'Highly reflexive researchers will be acutely aware of the ways in which their selectivity, perceptions, background and inductive processes and paradigms shape the research' (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 225). Noting the different levels of reflexivity, I understand the term in context of the researcher's relationship with his research activities, environment and participants. It comprises his actions or inactions. The objective of being reflexive is to learn from experience or from an on-going process to improve and develop oneself. As Hellowell (2006, p. 483) notes it is about self-scrutiny which is not that easy.

In hindsight, looking at my data and diary I believe there is room for improvement. Firstly, I think the number of people interviewed both for the staff and visitors were way too much. At a certain point I should have realised that research saturation has occurred. However, being a novice I may have been over enthusiastic and excited with talking to people and just kept going. I should have had more focus on my data during the process. Notwithstanding I have learned a lot more about interviewing and did enjoy myself.

I had an interesting encounter with a visitor whom I interviewed which I noted in my diary. This encounter made me to further reflect on identity and circumstance. As noted above all my visitor interviews took place around the reception area, thus on this occasion I was sitting and hoped to encounter visitors willing to be interviewed. At some point a couple arrived intending to go through the exhibition. For some reason the receptionist on duty mistook them to be non-Norwegians and spoke English to them. The gentleman answered back in Norwegian. It happened that he was born in Norway and his parents were Holocaust survivors. He immigrated to the US where he has lived for more than three decades. He left Norway when he was thirty years. The interesting thing is that after being mistook to be non-Norwegian he turned and asked me if I was the security person even though I was not wearing anything that may identify me as such. He looked surprised when I told him that I was a master student doing research at the Centre.

According to Hellawell (2006, p. 492) students are considerate of where ‘ their research... falls on a series of insider-outsider continua is one way of guiding students into what is often the secret garden of reflexivity’. I view myself as an outsider (though after seven years of residence I can claim a certain level of insider knowledge) within Norwegian society in terms of culture, ethnicity and national identity. Thus I approached my thesis from the perspective of a non-citizen and from an immigrant’s point of view. I am aware that this affects how I perceive the reality I was investigating. I am ideologically sympathetic to a form of citizenship identity that acknowledges cultural and other differences as assets rather than threat. Thus I empathise with the minority whose identity and values are constantly under scrutiny from the state and the dominant culture of the majority. During my investigation I found myself emotionally moved by the Jewish story in Norway which I think has some resonance to present situation of immigrants like myself.

CHAPTER 6: Findings and discussion-perceptions of Norway's past

The findings and discussions of my thesis are presented in two parts, chapter six and seven. This chapter outlines the first part, concentrating on how participant responses to the OHC's exhibition broaden their understanding of a culturally diverse Norway in the past, whilst the second part of the analysis which is the next chapter looks into the present situation.

6.0 OHC's representation of diversity and human rights in Norway's past: Visitor perceptions

This chapter discusses how the OHC presents Norway's past diversity. It considers how the exhibition presents past cultural diversity and how it addresses negative societal responses to diversity and their impact on the human rights of Jewish Norwegian citizens. To what extent does the OHC illuminate issues of discrimination, racism, and stigmatization in Norway in the past? How was national identity, cultural and racial diversity addressed? And finally how was diversity and cultural difference seen; as threat to national identity and /or an asset? I show how these questions link to my original research question and objectives as outlined in chapter 1 (p.3).

The categories were arrived at by repeated listening to the recorded interviews and several readings of the transcribed notes of the interviews which were then coded. As the bricolage mode of analysis allows, I engage in narrative analysis of the text to 'give the added dimension of realism, authenticity, humanity, personality, emotions, views and values in a situation, and the researcher must ensure that these are featured in the narratives that have been constructed'(Cohen et al., 2011, p. 553) to present respondents realities. The humanizing process of history, as allowed by the problem-posing approach to learning, makes it possible a critical understanding of my interviewees' perceptions of the OHC's exhibition.

6.1 Categories and themes

A number of emergent themes arise from the interview data. The questions I posed to respondents can be found in (**Appendix I**). I covered motivation for visiting; perceptions and interpretations of the exhibition; exhibition messages to visitors; impressions of past human rights and diversity in Norway. Staff interviews were more open-ended and in-depth. The questions were themed around the relationship between the OHC's narrative on the current Norwegian discourse on human rights and multiculturalism and whether and how the exhibition is influencing a new Norwegian national consciousness. My questionnaire themes

allowed me to identify categories that can be viewed as confirming or challenging some of the perceived assumptions and claims concerning national identity constructs in what it means to be Norwegian. I discuss the themes under particular sub-headings below.

6.2 Motivation for visit and the visitors own identity

The processes of capturing or measuring visitor motivations and experiences in museums are complex since they involve personal as well as social factors. Museum visits are prompted by factors that include emotions, identity based, ,personal and socio-cultural and so on (Cameron, 2003; Falk, 2009; Rounds, 2006). According to Coffee (2007, pp. 379-380) who draws from theories developed by Vygotsky on the processes of social practice, peoples' visits to museums are part of a 'social experience' shared contextually with others. The dialogic element that visitors encounter with museum exhibitions is mediated by their socially textured experiences and identities and may reaffirm existing outlooks or help in the construction of new ones. Indeed, Soren (2009, p. 235) discusses how people 'can create and transform their museum experiences into knowledge, skills, values, emotions, beliefs and senses'.

Falk (2009, p. 64) identified five sets of visitor characteristics among museums visitors: Explorer; Facilitator; Experience seeker; Professional/Hobbyist; and Recharger. OHC visitors came with different perspectives and expectations. Some had prior knowledge of the subject matter, whilst others visited out of curiosity. For Sandell (2007, p. 71) '... although the ways in which visitors might engage with exhibitions are wide-ranging, uneven and unpredictable, they are not entirely unpatterned.' According to Cameron (2003) museum spaces and exhibitions have the potential to engage emotions and opinions. These emotions may be linked to traumatic histories which have implications for one's cultural or national identity.

Thus the assertion that:

[N]o one comes to a museum as a blank slate, as a raw beginner at identity work. But neither does anyone come with his or her identity work completed for all time. Everyone is always in the process of doing maintenance work on existing identities while simultaneously laying the groundwork for future changes in identity.

(Rounds, 2006, p. 138)

Among my respondents I observed an emotional element in the way some narrated their encounter with the exhibition, particularly those with Jewish identity. When I asked what motivated them to come to see the exhibition, these respondents referred to identity, (cultural and individual) among the reasons for their visit:

We have been following the different Holocaust memorials in different countries and of being Jewish heritage that's what we want to learn. (Interview #5, 14.07.2011)

A family of Portuguese visitors who said they originated from Angola in Africa explained their minority status in their present location motivated them to visit the exhibition. They said:

We are a minority in Portugal. We can actually relate to them [the Jews] somehow. (Interview #7, 15.07.2011)

A US visitor of Jewish heritage noted: '[I am]...always curious and interested when I visit a country [to know] of their responsibility and how they helped and didn't help during the Second World' (Interview #, 15. 07.2011), confirming that his Jewish heritage underpinned his visit.

A visitor from Germany explained that the exhibition represented part of her German identity. Her grandparents and her father (a soldier during the Second World War) meant she felt she was in some way implicated in the narrative. She stated:

I am German; it is part of my history. I didn't know much about the connection between Norway and Germany (Interview # 12, 18. 07. 2011)

The identity of the individual is a very strong and determining element for one's inspiration to go see museum exhibitions. The responses noted above attest to this reality.

6.3 Cultural diversity and its negative impact on Norwegian national identity in the past

The diversity of cultures and peoples of Norway which has been a reality since it came into existence created apprehension and resentment among some sections of the majority population. The minorities in Norway have historically been discriminated against and stigmatized. This reality is made obvious by the OHC's narrative. Discriminatory attitudes, racist practices and eugenics were all discussed by both visitor and staff respondents. According to Essed (1991, p. 2) racism and other discriminatory practices are not restricted to ideological stances, but are routinized in everyday encounters. For Marko Valenta (2009) Norwegian citizens with immigrant backgrounds commonly stigmatized and discredited by the majority are forced to negotiate alternative identity frames in order to survive with dignity. Discriminatory policies and legal frameworks against minorities who do not share the

dominant cultures or religion ‘have a negative effect on minority identities and rights’ (Otele & Latrache, 2011, p. 200). This was the case with the Norwegian Jews and minorities such as the Sami indigenes as well as the Roma people who in some cases had to hide their identity for fear of persecution.

Some of the interviewees were able to see a direct link between state and institutional discriminatory practices in the war period and how this resulted in Norwegian citizens of Jewish heritage being denied their rights and freedoms. A US respondent (Interview #8, 15.07.2011) who identified himself as a Jew interprets his encounter with the exhibition as a story of unequal treatment of citizens due to racial discrimination and cultural stigmatization. He laments ‘the horrors of racial inequality’ resulting in the ‘butchery’ of Norwegian Jews during the war. The extent to which Norway was implicated in the Jewish Holocaust through state policies and institutions, such as the police, shocked many visitors:

I don't think I had as much knowledge about its [that is Norway's] involvement with the Holocaust and the occupation so it was interesting to hear the connections and also how involved some of the locals were. They kept pointing out that often the local police were acting on their own, which I wouldn't have anticipated. (Interview # 4, 14.07.2011)

Another one stated:

I found the part of collaboration of the Norwegians to the extermination troubling (Interview # 5, 14.07.2011)

Official state policy and the collaboration by some Norwegians with the Nazi occupiers continued to engage my interviewees as this respondent observed:

...I was aware of the genocide during the war time but I didn't know about policies prior to the war breaking out. And also a little bit surprised by some of the policies of the Norwegian government at the time It is mindboggling. Again it is about the policies, the confiscation of properties, that kind of stuff.....Most of my information on Norway would have centred on that they had a very strong resistance movement to the Germans, which I believe they had but I didn't realize that there was a section of the population that collaborated quite so strongly with Nazis [...]. (Interview #13, 18.08.201)

Furthermore the scope and depth of the involvement by Norwegian authorities and some sections of the population who assisted in the near annihilation of fellow citizens shocked some visitors:

...Just the scope. The number of people that were involved and the relative lack of information that was available to the rest of world that this was occurring. For me it was more the focus on Norway's involvement in the Holocaust. Having a sense of the broader tragedy, it was brought home that this specific country was involved. (Interview #14, 18.07.2011)

The following responses express how disturbing it is for respondents to see that small differences were used to justify discrimination against others:

Well, there is not much in Norway. To my perspective it always seems pretty vanilla, pretty similar but when you look more closely there is much more. I was surprised by the intolerance and this based on very minor physical differences, we have a tendency out of fear to separate ourselves from others for no reason. ... a small number of ethnically diverse people could stand out in a population, they would somehow be identified and that people knew that they were kind of different. (Interview # 14, 18.07.2011)

...I think that the difficulty perhaps I have seen in impressing people is how easy it is to become vicious and violent and murderous and how people can be grouped together and led like sheep and to do harmful and terrible things and how easy that can be. I think that it should be somehow portrayed. (Interview # 5, 14.07.2011)

Stigmatization, racial thinking and aspects of the history of eugenics in Norway were highlighted in some staff interviews.

[...] we are trying to link the atrocities committed in the past with the present challenges although we know very well that the Shoah was so enormous that it is difficult to compare with most events after the Second World War [...]. So I think the lessons we can draw is that if you have processes of collective stigmatization of groups of people and if you are cultivating prejudice and if you are humiliating groups of people, there is a danger that it can end up in terrible situations (Informant # 2, 17.09.2011)

*What is interesting when it comes to the exhibition [...] is that they put it into the framework of racial thinking. So I think the introductory loop which you get when you enter the exhibition is very interesting because there you visually step at the Oslo Quay where the **Danau** [name of ship that transported Norwegian Jews from Oslo to their death at the hands of the Nazis] left but then you are taken to the European*

dimension and to the different dimensions of racial thinking ... that it was [also] the persecution of Slavic prisoners of war, of homosexuals, of Gypsies and Roma people and so on. [...] It traces back racial thinking in the Norwegian history, not only related to the Nazi [occupation] but to the pre-war history, the eugenics for example and the whole thinking of purity... (Informant # 7, 24.08.2011)

6.4 Human rights and never again

Human rights for nation-states such as Norway have been appropriated as a constitutive part of a contemporary sanitized national identity. However, the historical evidence the OHC provides shows that this has not been always the case. Several informants thought the most significant message communicated by the exhibition was that mankind must not allow such a devastating occurrence such as the Holocaust against the Jews and other minorities to ever happen again. ‘Never again’ is a theme regularly associated with the unprecedented human rights violations of this period, ‘Never again’ has been theorized as legitimizing the ideals and practice of human rights, and holding the memory of the Holocaust in the national consciousness and narratives of most post war Western nation-states (Levy & Sznajder, 2004). Human rights and its denial to a section of the Norwegian citizenry during the war engaged a number of my interviewees at the OHC. Human rights as concept and practice are directly linked with the Second World War experiences of Jewish people and other minorities. Thus a young Irish visitor invoked the ‘never again’ mantra, stressing the absence of freedom and dignity of Norwegian Jews during the Second World War:

I suppose it shows maybe what the Norwegian state didn't do correctly at the time, maybe just remind people that [some] people weren't treated very well. Maybe this should never happen again. I suppose it is part of history that might be kind of swept away. ... Maybe people are ashamed of it and I suppose it is good to publicize it. (Interview # 3, 14.07.2011)

The following comments noting the absence of human rights and dignity for Norwegian Jews were made by a Canadian Jew, a German woman, a Welsh college student, a couple from the United States and a Scottish man respectively:

I didn't learn much about human rights today. In the past apparently there were human rights and it was fairly equal but it felt apart pretty quickly. But I don't know what it tells today. (Interview #5, 14.07.2011)

Yeah! It tells that human rights had been not....I'm trying to find the right words... had not been recognized really. (Interview # 10, 15.08.2011)

It is like hard hitting. Like you see people, how they had no human rights at all, it's been taken away. Like other people are sub-human. (Interview # 11, 18.07.2011)

I didn't know anything about human rights in Norway; my belief was that it was democratic. I was very much surprised by the persecution of the Jews. (Interview #14, 18.07.2011)

Um, yeah! Actually, I think that was it [human rights] when I saw how the measurements were taken of people's noses and how degrading it must have been and the stripy clothes they were given. That was a human rights issue that really struck me. ... You can see from the people's faces how dehumanizing it must have been. (Interview #17, 21.07.2011)

6.5 Analysis and discussion

In this analysis I reflect on how visitors perceive the OHC presentation of Norway's past diversity, the negative societal responses to cultural diversity and its impact on the human rights of Jewish Norwegian citizens.

In recent decades many historians and other commentators have noted the changing tide in how museum narratives have evolved in trying to accommodate 'moral messages and research based narratives' and the way these phenomena have in forming historical awareness and consciousness (Stugu, 2011, p. 189). Now the narration of the past is more complex and nuanced. The past has been opened up to more sophisticated scrutiny. The taken for granted truths of grand narratives woven around uncritical patriotism and ultra-nationalism have been turned on its head. Though grand narratives of the nation's valour still persist in some historical museums, the new philosophy and practices of the institution have incorporated themes of human rights as well as trying to include narratives that were hitherto neglected and written out of national stories. As such the difficult past of most nations have been confronted, forcing citizens to come to terms with the complex nature of their histories.

Aspects of cultural diversity and difference are shown by the new museum narratives to have been problematic in the past in nations such as Norway. Citizens who did not fit the majority identities were discriminated and castigated. The OHC narrates this part of Norway's past quite well. The visitors I interviewed were able to identify these issues. Norwegian Jewish citizens suffered from discrimination, racism, and stigmatization due to their cultural and other peculiarities.

The realization of the Second World War Jewish experience in Norway in the museum institution completes the story of the nation-state. It situates the national story in its real context. The Centre shows that Norway has always been a diverse society and has had issues with accepting minority cultures. The Centre as noted on its website aims to reflect the need for a sustained awareness of the Holocaust in Norway as well as building knowledge on religious minorities. The OHC can positively influence the discourse about multiculturalism and human rights through the Jewish story. The representation of all citizens in institutions that shape identity spurs unity and encourages a feeling of belonging among all citizens regardless of physical appearance or cultural practices. The overt and deliberate reflection of the true history of Norway without omitting the difficult bits makes the citizens more historically aware.

The correct historical narrative in relation to the fate of the Norwegian Jews during the Second World War in Norway requires personal reflection. The OHC's exhibition engages visitors in a reflective dialogic with the narrative it provides which hopefully can impact on attitudinal change in relation to Norwegian national consciousness, collective memory and history. The Oslo Holocaust Centre's endeavour to build historical and cultural awareness inculcates inclusivity and social cohesion amongst citizen. The next chapter looks at what the OHC say about Norway in terms of, social cohesion and inclusion of minority citizens today.

CHAPTER 7:

What does the OHC say about Norway, social cohesion and inclusion of minority citizens today?- Visitor perceptions

In this chapter I show how my respondents construe the museum exhibition in terms of social cohesion and inclusion in Norway today. I consider whether it is possible to glean from their responses what the OHC's exhibition has to say about social cohesion and inclusion in Norway today. To answer this puzzle, I first examine how the exhibition engages visitors with the narrative it presents. It considers the OHC mandate and purpose and juxtaposes it with visitor perceptions. The OHC's objectives, as noted in Chapter 3, is first to educate visitors about the Holocaust in Norway and, secondly, to provide a space where religious minorities, their situation, contribution and role in a multicultural Norway are critically debated and studied.

Museums, like most public institutions in Norway, are beseeched through state policy to make sure they reflect and mirror today's societal multicultural reality (Møller & Einarsen, 2008). This policy is premised on the belief that: 'Museums, through engaging with their audiences ..., helping to define a cohesive identity, and discussing painful moments of a country's past, can contribute to social cohesion' (Rosenberg, 2011, p. 126). Social cohesion and inclusion of all citizens regardless of culture, race, disability and sexual orientation is a conscious and deliberate measure to make society more representative, fair and democratic. Social cohesion, with its myriad of meanings, implies among other things a process or means to achieve a vision or end in anticipation of creating harmony between groups and cultures as well as amongst individuals. In a situation where social cohesion obtains, members of society share certain common values and identity. Social cohesion bears upon economic, political and institutional access to all members of society as well. According to Jensen (2011, p. 144) the concept can be characterized as: 1) belonging, 2) inclusion, 3) participation, 4) recognition, and 5) legitimacy. By dint of its character, the museum institution is culturally tarred, thus its pivotal power in '...the construction of a coherent historical national discourse that reinforces a sense of collective identity and social cohesion through common understandings [...]' (Rivera-Orraca, 2009, p. 32). However, criticality is paramount in the process of realizing social cohesion policies, since imbalances in power relations threaten to marginalize some social actors. . Furthermore, a social cohesion discourse may be used by politicians as an instrument to impose assimilationist and integrationist policies. Nevertheless, more

progressive social cohesion measures which guarantee peoples' human rights, can promote justice and democratic values whilst respecting the diversity of the citizenry of the nation-state.

A number of authors (Osler & Zhu, 2011; Purbrick, 2011; Sandell, 2002, 2007) have explored the museum's role in addressing social inequality, prejudice and exclusion by serving as a stage or space where human rights issues are discussed and promoted. According to Purbrick,

From their very inception museums were used to express rights and it should be no surprise that they continue to be used to define them. *The imperative ... is to offer some redress to peoples whose rights were not recognised at some point in the past, through representations of the consequences of such a denial of humanity. [...]* Although the interest in human rights is very recent, it seems a logical continuation of the desire to create inclusive museum spaces where cultural differences are equally valued. *The representation of human rights is an act of inclusion.* It may even appear to complete the museum's Enlightenment project: finally, all people are citizens. What were once the rights of a few individuals, European men of property, now belong to the rest of the world. [Italics added]

(Purbrick, 2011, pp. 169-170)

Drawing on interviewee data, I now show how the exhibition complicates the popular post-war narratives of Norway which placed emphasis on the nation's status as a victim and on the patriotic resistance it mounted against the Nazi occupation. It is vital that visitors perceive the OHC's exhibition as reflecting a desire for social inclusion by promoting discussion of a difficult period of Norway's history when practices of racism and other types of discrimination resulted in the death and deportation of many people, especially the Jews.

7.1 Present narratives of Norway's collective memory, historical consciousness, and Holocaust education in lieu of social cohesion

The present narrative of Norway's collective memory and history concerning its involvement in the Second World War significantly changed following the end of the Cold War in the 1990s. This Second World War experience is now interpreted in much more sophisticated ways than before. Bjerg et al. (2011, p. 8) argue that the history of the Second World War in Norway and beyond and how such experience is used today poses '...new challenges and possibilities for history teaching.' The long silence or partial silences of the horrible story of

the experiences of Norwegian Jews and other minorities have become better known. As Døving and Schwaller (2010, p. 19) maintain, it is a clear indication of changing attitudes in historical consciousness in itself by including minority citizens in the rewriting of the Norwegian national story. They suggest this is directly a result of a more honest perspective in the context of today's multicultural Norwegian society. This so-called honest approach implies more than one perspective of interpreting history, thus the inclusion of memory (collective and individual) in the understanding of this past and its uses to the present generations. The argument is that:

Claims for rehabilitation or reparation are most often based on memories. Memories of past injustices tend to be passed from generation to generation and affect vernacular historical consciousness. As soon as a minority succeeds in acquiring power, public spaces open to foster the memories. Historical identities become reinforced through narratives of victimization. Eventually public apologies are presented and monuments challenging the hegemonic identity are raised.

(Ahonen, 2005, p. 705)

The significance of historical consciousness in relation to identity, social cohesion and so on may be understood as follows:

Historical consciousness is actively used for the elaboration and qualification of fundamental questions about human life and society. These questions often give rise to reflections on continuity and change, essence and appearance and necessity and contingency which transcend established temporal boundaries. Among them are identity issues of who "we" and who "they" are, [...], good and evil, and politico-ideological questions related to phenomena such as justice and injustice or power and powerlessness.

(Karlsson, 2011, p. 135)

Holocaust education has made it possible to raise questions concerning scientific certainty which were traditionally linked with the writing and understanding of history. The unparalleled importance of the Holocaust in the violation of peoples by fellow citizens makes it imperative for all to seek moral education from it which cannot be trammelled by nationalistic rhetoric. The modern world is morally interdependent with lessons that can be learned from this dark period of human existence. Commentators like Eckmann (2010)

makes the case for knowledge of history which is important before attempting to take lessons from the past. She sees Holocaust education as a tool for human rights education, whose scope and extent must always be considered.

7.1.0 An inclusive narrative

For some respondents the exhibition's narrative is an attempt to include all citizens in Norwegian society as equals and to promote a cohesive and inclusive society. In other words, the facts and lessons of history taught through the Centre's narration of the Jewish experience in Norway is simply a Norwegian national story which needs to be exposed and disseminated. Remembering the Holocaust and internalizing its moral implications is important in stemming out discrimination and racial prejudice against a minority, forcing visitors to think of what brings us together rather than what divides us. A US visitor emphasizes the importance in making people to be aware of what happened in history so that they can stand up and assist each other against human rights abuses and violations. He maintains the message conveyed to future generations by Centre is to:

...To not only be aware but when you see something isn't right that you speak up and notify individuals that can assist with help. Yeah! Again, it is about historical perspective, never forget that these things can repeat themselves if we allowed it to be repeated. (Interview #14, 18.7.2011)

For some visitors, the potency of history as a source from which references are constantly available to support peaceful coexistence and respect for human rights and solidarity in context of diversity the main message the OHC is putting out. This was a strong theme running through most interviews:

Don't turn your back on history. You can't forget what happened. Absolutely no way that this should be cast over as an event that happened hundreds of years ago, this happened really recently. From my perspective one of the things that really came out sadly is when you look at the number of the dead, when you look at their ages, you realize this isn't something like soldiers dying in battle, this is civilization, it is about families, you realize no way this should be ignored. It is terrible. (Interview # 17, 21.07.2011)

A German visitor again noted the need not to forget history:

Don't forget what happened in Norway and in Germany...for the youth. For me I haven't lived in that time...it is important for me, the youth and everybody not to forget what happened. (Interview # 12, 18.07.2011)

Holocaust education gives possibilities to unpack dominant national myths and history. The narrative of the OHC is implicated in the Holocaust education process in Norway and beyond. It exposes another aspect of the Norwegian collective memory and history to visitors such as students.

The educational tasks given to young student visitors aims at creating critical reflections and consciousness is to empower a nuanced, skilled interpretation of national history and memory. One OHC staff member indicated s how critical reflection on the post war narrative of Norway's Holocaust experience is operationalized through activities designed for Norwegian high school students with diverse cultural and religious identities. The activities focuses on the purpose of the Centre's existence and how it is addressing issues of human rights and multiculturalism in Norway today. Having noted the definitional complexity of the concepts of human rights and multiculturalism he states:

... It is a very difficult task to teach itwe do not directly address human rights but we try to look at different regimes and different consequences of injustice and to address the question of what had happened in dictatorships where the rule of law has been absent. Like, we also have human rights groups, pupils studying, you know in high school. They have the possibility to choose human rights and politics. ... And, then we try to be more explicit about human rights and the rule of law, we try to frame some task in that direction. So then we address historically of course at high school level the way that human rights came about in the aftermath of WWII. [...]

If we define multiculturalism or just the multicultural society as one where people with different backgrounds, different pasts, different family stories, family stories from different cultures, and also with different conceptions of what is good or maybe what is right, then again we address the negative ways of mistreating minorities and try to present this act of modern thinking about, like how to achieve utopia, that if you just get rid of those who are not similar to yourself you have the perfect world, we try to show the horrendous consequences of this line of thinking. [...] we try to make tasks or assignments to the pupils that are very open ...so that they can try to define the stories they want to tell from the exhibition in order not to impose some kind of narrative on especially students with minority backgrounds, also of course the general [non-migrant] pupils. So we have two ways of actually addressing multiculturalism that is first to talk about discrimination and persecution of minorities in European

history and the second is to have assignments and task that are open and not necessarily related to the understanding of Norwegian or European master narrative about the holocaust. (Informant # 1, 08.08. 2011)

Furthermore, the post war narrative of Norway's history of the war period, one that according to Bjerg et al. (2011) 'seems to represent ...the positive aspects of the occupation history, those aspects easy to identify and to cope with' are not tenable anymore. Reflexivity and scrutiny is stressed, according to the comments of the following staff member. He states:

... making it clear to younger people that Norwegian history is full of both perpetrators and victims as well as helpers, by-standers and that [...] these facts and experiences are part of being Norwegian. You had many young Norwegian men volunteering to fight for Nazi Germany. You had a lot of police officers arresting Norwegian Jews that you also had a lot of Norwegian Jews who couldn't at all escape because they didn't have any place else to go than Norway because this was their home, so where to go, I mean how can you make a run for it when this is all you know. So those stories might change some parts of the national historical consciousness about Norway. (Informant # 1, 08.08. 2011)

The visitors and staff informants perceive the OHC to be teaching about aspects of Norwegian Second World War stories previously neglected. This implies a desire for social cohesion and inclusion. The museum, by injecting another historical narration in the master narrative of the Norwegian Second World War story, attempts to address a collective national failing. 'By dealing with traumas or difficult and painful facts, museums open the possibility of different versions of history...' (Rivera-Orraca, 2009, pp. 35-36). Citizens' stories left out from the dominant narratives are now publicly visible through the museum.

7.2 Norway imagined as nation of fjords, natural beauty: a 'peace nation' that is coming to terms with its difficult past

Many visitors view the OHC as a manifestation of the nation-state's characteristic peacefulness and tolerance, characteristics developed in recent decades. Engaging with the exhibition in terms of Norway's identity as a peace nation however, was viewed in relation to a complex and troubled past. In this respect the OHC represents, in the eyes of these visitors, a nation coming to terms with, its multicultural present. A summer school attendee on the Oslo University peace and conflict programme from the US explains that the OHC's message is in context of Norway's national identity as a peace nation:

We are learning about...Norway as a peace building nation....so learning about its past and how although it is a peace building nation it had periods of...turmoil I

guess...and her own holocaust. So learning about that and seeing the unevenness in its history is fascinating. (Interview # 1, 12.7.2011)

He goes on to note that Norway hasn't been a utopia in terms of the human rights of some of its citizens in the past, as opposed to the present peace-maker characteristics it promotes. He understands that such characterization is complicated and thus must be critically assessed. He observes that:

'Ah! That Norway isn't a utopia and there are issues here still and it had a history of issues.' (Interview # 1, 12.7.2011)

Norway's natural beauty, with its fjords and rugged landscape and how this constitute some elements of being Norwegian was highlighted in few responses I got when I asked my informants how they perceived the country prior to visiting. Some informants insisted that their encounter with the OHC exhibition have not altered their view of Norway.

Nice, clean and hilly (Interview #11, 18.07.2011)

I think it is a very peaceful country and very clean. I think in a sense is very remote because it in the northern part of Europe. It is just peaceful. (Interview #16, 21.07.2011)

The idea of Norway's capacity to deal with a difficult part of its past was mentioned by some as manifest in the following response:

...Norway certainly remembers and wants to uphold some difficult parts of her history and clean their own story with racial hatred or prejudice and they really trying to show that education is an important value of the Norwegian culture and we should learn about this so that we don't repeat it. (Interview # 2, 12.07.2012)

The OHC's exhibition exposing the catastrophic experience of Norwegian Jews in the past for some visitors is a way of dealing with prejudice and racism in present day Norway especially given that the country is characterized as a peace nation [which the Norwegians are proud of], where democracy, human rights and equality are cherished. .

7.3 The future narration of Norway's Second War experience

In noting the contemporary context of recent and current conflicts -either latent or otherwise- issuing from identity politics and nationalism, some of the staff interviewed maintained that in the case of Norway, the existence of the OHC has complicated the future writing and study of the national story of the country pertaining to its Second World War experiences.

For some of the staff interviewed there cannot be any more silences or partial silences on the Jewish Holocaust in Norway in the future narration of the nation-state's collective history and memory. The future narration of the national story is legitimized by including both the good and difficult areas of the nation's history. In their view, the OHC's exhibition on the experiences of the Jews has contributed in profoundly transforming historical consciousness and collective memory amongst many Norwegians as well as foreign observers of this country's history. The 'grey zones' of Norway's Second World War history cannot be ignored anymore.

In Informant # 2 (17.09.2011) states:

I think the dominant way of treating difficult, painful and traumatic events in the Norwegian history until the end of the 1990s was to put it aside, somehow to neglect it, to taboo it and to marginalize it. So there were several processes leading in the direction of making an end to this way of coping or trying to or not coping with the past and this Centre and several other institutions in the Norwegian society have contributed, I would say to a profound transformation of historical consciousness. So now it is impossible to write, to think about Norwegian history without taking into account also the most painful events, it is just impossible because this Centre ... and it has been so well received by a great audience, by the leading journalists in every sector of the mass media. It is just impossible, you can't get around these painful events, you have to cope with it, you have to struggle with it and you have to confront it...So we are doing exactly the opposite of what I saw in a document in the Holocaust Museum in Washington, that somehow the exhibition was meant to...mmm what is the exact expression, to promote American values. We go exactly the other way round, strongly based on the thinking of universal human rights. On those bases we attack every part of Norwegian history, not leaving any stone untouched.

However, according to a Jewish visitor from Canada, what was missing in the exhibition was a clear link between what happened in the past in Norway and the present situation in context of an increasingly evident multicultural, multi-ethnic nation-state. He insists that:

I think it should look into the present and how Norway is dealing with what happened and how it is heading into the future and how it is handling minorities and what did it learn from this whole experience. (Interview # 5, 14.07.2011)

A response from a Jewish man, originally from Norway but now a US citizen, interprets the exhibition as a message in terms of why we should show tolerance to our fellow human beings. For him, what happened to the Jews must not be forgotten whether in Norway or

elsewhere. He maintains that people should stand-up to totalitarianism regardless of political persuasion, yet he is concerned that human beings have not learned much from history, given that genocides are still taking place around the world. He states:

... I am a son of [Norwegian Jews] Holocaust survivors. My mother survived Auschwitz and my father escaped to Sweden from Norway and for me it is very easy to relate [to the exhibition]. For the next generation it is history, something you read in books. Like I said in the beginning, people have to be educated in the sensitivity towards intolerance and totalitarian regimes and as I said before we have seen fifty years of free world liberal thinking and I am not so impressed with the status of the world. (Interview #18, 21.07.2011)

It seems the future narration of Norway's experience will never be as it was. . As the responses show, it is clear that multiple accounts of the past need to be told and these past stories must be linked to the contemporary reality of a culturally diverse nation.

7.4 Summary

I began the chapter by considering visitor perceptions at what the OHC says about social cohesion in Norway today. I noted that the best approach to unpack this puzzle was to look at how the OHC presents its narration to public. By fostering historical consciousness where inclusive collective memory as well as traditional history writing complement each other, museums have a leading role in influencing positive social change and re-writing collective national stories. 'Museums are places of leadership, where the very forces that shape social change can be discussed and polemicized... [Museums can] raise awareness of the world by telling individual stories of the past' (Lohman, 2008, p. xxxv). Museums indeed can lead in enhancing a socially cohesive society through the honest narratives and interpretations of national stories and myths (Rosenberg, 2011).

CHAPTER 8: Concluding Remarks

The general objective of this thesis has been to reflect on how one museum narrates history and the extent to which such narration impacts on national identity formation. It also tried to establish if there is a different Norwegian national consciousness being constructed around the alternative narratives provided by museums like the OHC in contrast with the Norwegian master narrative of Second World which emphasizes the country's resistance against the Nazi occupation. This research has been pursued in context of the contemporary discourse in human rights and multiculturalism, which encompasses discussions about racism, stigmatisation and other forms of discrimination with a peep in history on the consequences when minorities faced persecution. I argued that the OHC's narrative has the potential in contributing towards creating a sense of belonging and inclusive citizenship in a visibly diverse Norway. This is because I believe that the OHC's exhibition provides the possibility in making Norway to accept its full and complex past, which includes the traumatic shameful aspects as well as the great moments of its past.

I reviewed the debate on the museums evolution from a conservative institution to one that accommodates the diversity of its visitors. I also showed how the OHC became established and how it is changing how history is written and understood in Norway and beyond. The problem-posing approach to education, a critical perspective based on Freire's work is the theoretical scaffold that helped in evaluating my findings.

In the findings and discussions section (chapter 6 and 7), I show through the interpretations and meanings perceived by visitors in their encounter with the exhibition, how and what the museum teaches about racism, discrimination, and stigmatisation and its consequences in the past in Norway. Secondly in Chapter 7 I tried to look into what the OHC says about social cohesion in contemporary Norway.

Juxtaposed against the OHC's focus in educating the public about the Holocaust in Norway and the moral implications it conveys coupled with contributing towards the debate on the situation of racial and religious minorities in the country today, the museum seem to be doing an excellent job with the former. Many visitors have been able to appreciate the OHC's narrative of Norway's past, the negative reactions to cultural and racial differences resulting in the human rights of Norwegian Jewish citizens being violated and not recognized. .

The change in the way the museum narratives have tried to create historical consciousness through morally loaded stories has been noted by historians. This has made it more complex for the writing and teaching about the past. The past is now viewed from multiple perspectives. The totalising truths which master narratives portrayed geared towards fostering uncritical patriotism and nationalism has been rendered unacceptable.

The OHC housed in the former residence of Quisling; the Norwegian Prime Minister who collaborated with the Nazi occupation regime during the war period is politically as well as socially symbolic. This symbolism and its implications is summed up in a speech delivered on the opening of the OHC, 26 August 2006, by the Norwegian Foreign Affairs Minister at the time, Jonas Gahr Støre⁷:

Villa Grande became Vidkun Quisling's home and base – a symbol of dishonour and treason. This shaped the soul of the building at the time and for many years afterwards. From the tower, people must have been able to see the ships carrying Jews to the concentration camps in the winter of 1942-43. More than 760 people were deported in cramped conditions; fewer than 30 returned. [...]But genocide – both as an idea and as a system – begins elsewhere. It begins in people's minds. It develops in buildings like this one, where people are going about their everyday business. The Holocaust was not a natural disaster. It was an atrocity created by people. And its horrors were perpetrated in our country as well, by ordinary people with ordinary lives. [...]But the people who deported the Jews, who drew up the lists, who kept them in line, and who drove them to the quayside – they were all Norwegians. [...]And these were not isolated actions. They arose from motives found at a deeper level – in the people themselves, in the culture, in history, in the spirit of the time. Today we have come together to bring a new vision to Villa Grande and give its story a new direction. We are bringing a new message – the desire to learn from the past, to shed light on the small streams that can run together to create a flood of man-made tragedy.

In the attempt to craft a new type of citizenry which is inclusive in an increasingly diverse Norway, it is quite significant to represent the past completely without ambiguity. A sustained awareness of the Holocaust in Norway as well as building knowledge on religious minorities with the objective of fostering understanding, respect and social cohesion is vital in present day Norway. This is important to fight the threats posed by ultra-nationalist terrorist like Anders Behring Breivik, who on 22 July 2011, massacred around 70+ people including youngsters because of a warped ideology against multiculturalism. The OHC's mandate

⁷ See full speech on the following link: http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/Whats-new/Speeches-and-articles/speeches_foreign/2006/opening-ceremony---the-center-for-studie.html?id=420864

reflects Norwegian state policy requiring all institutions serving the public including museums to be cognizant of cultural diversity. The narrative on the Holocaust at the Centre is quite informative but it is not clear if it really inspires activism and attitudinal change in context of the discourse about multiculturalism and human rights in contemporary Norway especially when politicians of the right keep using rhetoric which is quite racist and discriminative to minorities and immigrants.

The OHC's presence in the museum landscape may have opened a dialogue and renegotiation of what is the complete and whole story of the Norwegian experience of the Second World War as a culturally diverse nation. By providing space for exhibiting the true story of Norwegian Jews impacts on national identity and help foster social cohesion. The ideal and potential social harmony attainable concerning 'the issue of minority narratives and national memory ...should... identify the hybrid nature of identities and grey-zones of cultures, which, after all, is what dominates most of social life'(Døving & Schwaller, 2010, p. 21).

The Oslo Holocaust Centre through its education programmes tries to develop historical and cultural awareness and respect for each other by using varied pedagogical exercises especially with school age museum visitors (Thorstensen, 2011). The teaching and learning about historical narratives pertaining to the fate of the Norwegian Jews during the Second World War which encompasses the planned murder with industrial precision of human beings requires personal reflectivity and interpretative skills critical to unpack the layers in the narrative of this period. The OHC's pedagogical exercises thus helps in exposing the visitors to engage in a reflective dialogic with its narrative which hopefully can impact on attitudinal change in relation to Norwegian national consciousness, collective memory and history.

The exhibition exposes the consequences of racism and other forms of discrimination with the potential to contributing significantly in the current debate. Students and other visitors hopefully get the moral message and thus are empowered to uphold human dignity and respect for difference. It becomes clear through the interpretations of the visitor responses that the moral message provided through Holocaust education can force societies like the Norway to include and represent all stories of its citizens in the narration of national stories. The experience of visiting museum exhibition has potential to make citizens to witness tolerance and multiculturalism being practiced (Rosenberg, 2011, p. 115). The Norwegian Holocaust experience thus makes the visitor to the OHC especially those of Jewish as well as

newly arrived immigrants feel included since the nation is willing to accept the difficult parts of its history. This gives legitimacy to the rhetoric of democracy and creates a sense of belonging, inclusivity, and a desire to participate and share in the national ideals of Norway. The story of the Holocaust in Norway may be helping in the production of a new inclusive national identity whilst broadening the understanding of collective memory and history.

Norwegian Jews, as evidenced in the OHC narrative, were denied their dignity and human rights based on perceived differences which were a threat to the homogenous Norwegian national identity. These discriminatory attitudes and practices against Norwegian Jews during the war period were ideological and orientated in state policy and routinized in everyday encounters. Regardless of relentless discrimination and racism, many if not most Jews living in Norway during and after the Second World War simply wanted to be considered Norwegian citizens. They were proud of their Norwegian identity. For these Norway was home. They shared common values and the various aspects of Norway's culture whilst wanting to keep their cultural idiosyncrasies and heritage. According to Levin (2010, p. 132); 'For the Norwegian Jews, integration into the Norwegian society has always been of importance and can be seen as a norm.'

Norway imagined both as a peace nation with natural beauty still seem legitimate though the perception that it had always been a peace utopia is no more persuasive. Both citizens of Norway and outsiders are being provided through OHC with the real story of the country's experience of the Second World War. Finally the future narration of the story of the nation pertaining to the war period cannot exclude the grey zones. As noted by one of the staff responses it is just impossible and that it is good to let the visitors know especially young students that these difficult stories concerning the treatment of the Jews and other minorities is part of the national memory. Following on Golding (2009, p. 192), I think museum's like the OHC have a massive role in promoting democratic citizenship through a critical pedagogy, which is dialogical, multi-perspective, collaborative, reflects diversity in the stories it narrates, inspires solidarity for a cohesive diverse and dynamic society where all have a sense of belonging. The nation needs both variety and togetherness (Kjeldstadli, 2008).

9. REFERENCES/BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahamsen, S. (1991). *Norway's response to the Holocaust*. New York: Holocaust Library.
- Abram, S. (2008). *Reproducing the Norwegian Myth: Egalitarianism and the Normal*. CTCC Research Papers: Current research in critical tourism studies. Research paper. Faculty of Arts and Society. Centre for Tourism and Cultural Change (CTCC), Leeds Metropolitan University. Great Britain. Retrieved from <http://www.tourism-culture.com/64/Research%20Papers/Reproducing%20the%20Norwegian%20Myth.pdf>
- Ahonen, S. (2005). Historical consciousness: a viable paradigm for history education? [Book Review]. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(6), 697-707. doi: 10.1080/00220270500158681
- Akman, H. (2008). Pluralism, cultural heritage and the museum. In K. J. Goodnow & H. Akman (Eds.), *Scandinavian museums and cultural diversity* (pp. XXXV, 266 s.). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Amundsen, A. B. (2011). *National Museums in Norway*. Paper presented at the Building National Museums in Europe 1750–2010. Conference proceedings from EuNaMus, European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen, Bologna 28-30 April 2011. EuNaMus Report No. 1. <http://www.ep.liu.se/ecp/064/027/ecp64027.pdf>
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, G. (2004). *Reinventing the museum: historical and contemporary perspectives on the paradigm shift*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: Altamira Press.
- Ashley, S. (2005). State Authority and the Public Sphere: Ideas on the Changing Role of the Museum as a Canadian Social Institution. *museum and society*, 3(1), 5-17.
- Aske, A. (2008). *The Hidden Narrative of Manor Houses and Their Cultural History in Norwegian Museums* Paper presented at the Comparing: National Museums, Territories, Nation-Building and Change. NaMu IV, Linköping University, Norrköping, Sweden 18–20 February 2008, Linköping. http://www.ep.liu.se/ecp_article/index.en.aspx?issue=030;article=014
- Barrett, J. (2011). *Museums and the public sphere*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Basit, T. N. (2010). *Conducting research in educational contexts*. London: Continuum.
- Bennett, T. (2004). *Pasts beyond memory: evolution, museums, colonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Bennett, T., Trotter, R., & McAlear, D. (1996). *Museums and citizenship: a resource book*: Queensland Museum.
- Bjerg, H., Lenz, C., & Thorstensen, E. (2011). "Introduction". In H. Bjerg, C. Lenz & E. Thorstensen (Eds.), *Historicizing the uses of the past: Scandinavian perspectives on history culture, historical consciousness and didactics of history related to World War II* (pp. 305 s.). Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Brochmann, G., & Kjeldstadli, K. (2008). *A history of immigration*. Oslo: Universitetsforl.
- Bruland, B. (2011). "Collaboration in the deportation of Norway's Jews: Changing views and representation". In R. Stauber (Ed.), *Collaboration with the Nazis: public discourse after the Holocaust* (pp. XII, 305 s.). London: Routledge.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bøe, L. H. (2008). Norwegian Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow? A joint documentation project. In K. J. Goodnow & H. Akman (Eds.), *Scandinavian museums and cultural diversity* (pp. XXXV, 266 s.). New York: Berghahn Books.

- Cameron, F. (2003). 'Transcending Fear – Engaging Emotions and Opinions - A Case for Museums in the 21st Century'. *Open Journal Museum*, 6.
- Chambliss, D. F., & Schutt, R. K. (2003). *Making sense of the social world: methods of investigation*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press.
- Coakley, J. (2004). MOBILIZING THE PAST: NATIONALIST IMAGES OF HISTORY. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 10(4), 531-560. doi: 10.1080/13537110490900340
- Coffee, K. (2007). Audience Research and the Museum Experience as Social Practice. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 22(4), 377-389. doi: 10.1080/09647770701757732
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K., & Bell, R. C. (2011). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.
- Corell, S. (2011). The solidity of a national narrative: the German occupation in Norwegian history culture. In H. Stenius, M. Österberg & J. Östling (Eds.), *Nordic narratives of the Second World War: national historiographies revisited* (pp. S. 101-146). Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). *The Landscape of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Douzin, C. (2000). *The end of human rights: critical legal thought at the turn of the century*. Oxford: Hart.
- Duffy, T. M. (2001). Museums of 'human suffering' and the struggle for human rights. *Museum International*, 53(1), 10-16. doi: 10.1111/1468-0033.00292
- Døving, C. A., & Schwaller, N. (2010). Introduction. In N. Schwaller & C. A. Døving (Eds.), *Minority narratives and national memory* (pp. 223 s.). Oslo: Unipub.
- Eckmann, M. (2010). Exploring the relevance of Holocaust education for human rights education. *Prospects*, 40(1), 7-16. doi: 10.1007/s11125-010-9140-z
- Eriksen, T. H. (1993). "Being Norwegian in a shrinking world". In A. C. Keil (Ed.), *Continuity and change: Aspects of Modern Norway* (pp. 266 s.). Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2012). Xenophobic Exclusion and the New Right in Norway. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 22(3), 206-209. doi: 10.1002/casp.2104
- Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: an interdisciplinary theory*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Falk, J. H. (2009). *Identity and the museum visitor experience*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: Left Coast Press.
- Falk, J. H., Dierking, L. D., & Foutz, S. (2007). *In principle, in practice: museums as learning institutions*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Flowers, N., Bernbaum, M., Rudelius-Palmer, K., & Tolman, J. (2000). *The Human Rights Education Handbook*. Minneapolis: Human Rights Resource Center, University of Minnesota.
- Freire, P. (1993 [1970]). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.
- Gilroy, P. (2004). *After empire: melancholia or convivial culture?* London: Routledge.
- Golding, V. (2009). *Learning at the museum frontiers: identity, race and power*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Gullestad, M. (2002). Invisible Fences: Egalitarianism, Nationalism and Racism. [Article]. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 8(1), 45.
- Gullestad, M. (2004). Blind slaves of our prejudices: Debating 'culture' and 'race' in Norway. [Article]. *Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology*, 69(2), 177-203. doi: 10.1080/0014184042000212858

- Habermas, J. (1998). The European Nation-State: On the Past and Future of Sovereignty and Citizenship. [Article]. *Public Culture*, 10(2), 397.
- Hellawell, D. (2006). Inside-Out: Analysis of the Insider-Outsider Concept as a Heuristic Device to Develop Reflexivity in Students Doing Qualitative Research. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(4), 483-494.
- Hillström, M. (2010). "Contested Boundaries". *Culture Unbound*, 2, 583-607.
- Hooper-Greenhill, E. (2007). *Museums and education: purpose, pedagogy, performance*. London: Routledge.
- Houghton, C. E., Casey, D., Shaw, D., & Murphy, K. (2010). Ethical challenges in qualitative research: examples from practice. [Article]. *Nurse Researcher*, 18(1), 15-25.
- Jensen, S. Q. (2011). Othering, identity formation and agency. *Qualitative Studies*, 2(2), 63-78.
- Jones, S. (2010). "Reframing Difference: Museums, Cross-cultural Communication and the Representation of Refugees". In H.-L. Skartveit & K. J. Goodnow (Eds.), *Changes in museum practice: new media, refugees and participation* (pp. XXXVIII, 151 s.). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Karlsson, K.-G. (2011). 'Processing Time-On the Manifestations and Activations of Historical Consciousness'. In H. Bjerg, C. Lenz & E. Thorstensen (Eds.), *Historicizing the uses of the past: Scandinavian perspectives on history culture, historical consciousness and didactics of history related to World War II* (pp. 305 s.). Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Kjeldstadli, K. (2008). Museums and collective identity: a new concept of "nation". In K. J. Goodnow & H. Akman (Eds.), *Scandinavian museums and cultural diversity* (pp. XXXV, 266 s.). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Knell, S. J. (2011). Knell, S.J. 2010. 'National museums and the national imagination', in Knell et al. (eds) , Routledge, *National Museums: New Studies from around the World*. London: Routledge.
- Kratz, C. A., & Karp, I. (2006). Museum frictions: public cultures/global transformations: Introduction. In I. Karp, C. A. Kratz, L. Szwaja, T. Y. and Frausto, C. Rassool, B. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett & G. Buntinx (Eds.), *Museum frictions: public cultures/global transformations* (pp. XXII, 602 s.). Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing interviews* (Vol. 2). London: SAGE.
- Kymlicka, W. (2007). *Multicultural odysseys*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2012). *Multiculturalism: Success, Failure, and the Future*. Paper presented at the "National Identity, Immigration, and Social Cohesion: (Re)building Community in an Ever-Globalizing World" Berlin. <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/Multiculturalism.pdf>
- Lenz, C. (2011a). 'The Second World War in the popular culture of memory in Norway'. In S. Paletschek (Ed.), *Popular historiographies in the 19th and 20th centuries: cultural meanings, social practices* (pp. S. [140]-154). Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Lenz, C. (2011b). "Strengthening Narrative Competences by Diversification of (Hi)stories". In H. Bjerg, C. Lenz & E. Thorstensen (Eds.), *Historicizing the uses of the past: Scandinavian perspectives on history culture, historical consciousness and didactics of history related to World War II* (pp. pp 257-280). Bielefeld: Verlag.
- Leonard, M., & Small, A. (2003). *Norwegian Public Diplomacy*. Oslo: Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Levin, I. (2010). "The Norwegian Jews in the Post-war Period: Strong Norm of Integration and Fear of Anti-Semitism". In Cora Alexa Døving & N. Schwaller (Eds.), *Minority narratives and national memory* Oslo: Unipub.

- Levy, D., & Sznajder, N. (2004). The institutionalization of cosmopolitan morality: the Holocaust and human rights. *Journal of Human Rights*, 3(2), 143-157. doi: 10.1080/1475483042000210685
- Lissovoy, N. D. (2007). History, Histories, or Historicity? The Time of Educational Liberation in the Age of Empire. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 29(5), 441-460. doi: 10.1080/10714410701566314
- Lohman, J. (2008). Today's museum: challenges for museums functioning in a mass culture. In K. J. Goodnow & H. Akman (Eds.), *Scandinavian museums and cultural diversity* (pp. XXXV, 266 s.). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Lybæk, L., & Osler, A. (2012). *Educating 'the new Norwegian we': national and cosmopolitan education policy discourses in the 21st century Norway*. Paper presented at the International Research Conference: "Cosmopolitanism, Communication and Citizenship Education", Örebro University Sweden.
- Macdonald, S. (2003). Museums, national, postnational and transcultural identities'. *museum and society*, 1(1), 1-16.
- Macdonald, S. (2006). Undesirable Heritage: Fascist Material Culture and Historical Consciousness in Nuremberg. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12(1), 9-28. doi: 10.1080/13527250500384464
- Malešević, S. (2011). The chimera of national identity. [Article]. *Nations & Nationalism*, 17(2), 272-290. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8129.2010.00479.x
- Marcus, A. S., & Levine, T. H. (2011). Knight at the Museum: Learning History with Museums. *The Social Studies*, 102(3), 104-109. doi: 10.1080/00377996.2010.509374
- Mendelsohn, O. (1991). *The persecution of the Norwegian jews in WW II*. [Oslo]: Norges hjemmefrontmuseum.
- Misztal, B. A. (2003). *Theories of social remembering*. Maidenhead, Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
- Møller, B. G., & Einarsen, H. P. (2008). As in a mirror. In K. J. Goodnow & H. Akman (Eds.), *Scandinavian museums and cultural diversity* (pp. XXXV, 266 s.). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Nadin, S., & Cassell, C. (2006). The use of a research diary as a tool for reflexive practice: some reflections from management research. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, 3(3), 208-217.
- Novick, P. (1999). *The Holocaust in American life*. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin.
- Osler, A. (2010). *Students' perspectives on schooling*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship: democracy and inclusion in education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2010). *Teachers and human rights education*. Oakhill: Trentham books.
- Osler, A., & Zhu, J. (2011). Narratives in teaching and research for justice and human rights. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 6(3), 223-235. doi: 10.1177/1746197911417414
- Otele, O., & Latrache, R. (2011). Does Discrimination Shape Identity? Identity Politics and Minorities in the English-Speaking World and in France: Rhetoric and Reality. [Article]. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 32(3), 199-207. doi: 10.1080/07256868.2011.565732
- Phelps, J. M., Blakar, R. M., Carlquist, E., Nafstad, H. E., & Rand-Hendriksen, K. (2012). Symbolic Boundaries and Ideology in the Norwegian Multicultural Society: A Longitudinal Study of Public Discourse. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 22(3), 187-205. doi: 10.1002/casp.1126

- Purbrick, L. (2011). Museums and the embodiment of human rights. *Museum and society*, 9(3), 166-189.
- Reeve, J., & Woollard, V. (2006). 'Influences on Museum Practice'. In C. Lang, J. Reeve & V. Woollard (Eds.), *The responsive museum: working with audiences in the twenty-first century* (pp. xix, 276 s.). Aldershot, England: Ashgate.
- Reitan, J. (2011). 'The Nazi Camps in the Norwegian Historical Culture'. In H. Bjerg, C. Lenz & E. Thorstensen (Eds.), *Historicizing the uses of the past: Scandinavian perspectives on history culture, historical consciousness and didactics of history related to World War II* (pp. 305 s.). Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Rivera-Orraca, L. (2009). Are museums sites of memory? *The New School Psychology Bulletin*, 6(2), 32-37.
- Rosenberg, T. J. (2011). History Museums and Social Cohesion: Building Identity, Bridging Communities, and Addressing Difficult Issues. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 86(2), 115-128. doi: 10.1080/0161956x.2011.561171
- Rounds, J. (2006). Doing Identity Work in Museums. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 49(2), 133-150. doi: 10.1111/j.2151-6952.2006.tb00208.x
- Ryan, T. (2004). Reflexivity and the Researcher: An Illumination. *Ontario Action Researcher*, 7(1).
- Salmons, P. (2003). Teaching or Preaching? The Holocaust and intercultural education in the UK. *Intercultural Education*, 14(2), 139-149. doi: 10.1080/14675980304568
- Sandell, R. (2002). Museums and the combating of social inequality: roles, responsibilities, resistance. In R. Sandell (Ed.), *Museums, society, inequality* (pp. 3-23). London and New York: Routledge.
- Sandell, R. (2007). *Museums, prejudice and the reframing of difference*. London: Routledge.
- Sanderson, L. (2010). Informed Consent in Educational Settings and the Novice Researcher. *Kairaranga*, 11(1), 50-55.
- Sass, A., & Abrahamsen, A. (2003). 'Righting The Wrongs of The Past'. In O. Kvasnes, B. Ormaasen, A. Sass & H. Wergeland (Eds.), *Jewish life and culture in Norway: Wergeland's legacy* (pp. 112 s.). New York: Abel Abrahamsen and Wergeland's Legacy.
- Seixas, P. (2004). "Introduction". In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing historical consciousness* (pp. XII, 455 s.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sem, L. (2009). 'Personal Pain, National Narrative'. In A. Eriksen & S. Jón Viðar (Eds.), *Negotiating pasts in the Nordic countries: interdisciplinary studies in history and memory* (pp. 315 s.). Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and violence: the illusion of destiny*. London: Allan Lane.
- Sèvčenko, L. (2011). "Sites of Conscience: Heritage of and for Human Rights". In H. K. Anheier & Y. R. Isar (Eds.), *Heritage, memory & identity* (pp. 416 s.). London: Sage.
- Short, G., & Reed, C. A. (2004). *Issues in Holocaust education*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Skånland, Ø. H. (2010). 'Norway is a peace nation': A discourse analytic reading of the Norwegian peace engagement. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 45(1), 34-54. doi: 10.1177/0010836709347212
- Smith, A. D. (2011). National identity and vernacular mobilisation in Europe. [Article]. *Nations & Nationalism*, 17(2), 223-256. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8129.2011.00491.x
- Soren, B. J. (2009). Museum experiences that change visitors. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 24(3), 233-251. doi: 10.1080/09647770903073060
- Stugu, O. S. (2011). 'Exhibiting the War. Approaches to World War in Museums and Exhibitions'. In H. Bjerg, C. Lenz & E. Thorstensen (Eds.), *Historicizing the uses of the past: Scandinavian perspectives on history culture, historical consciousness and didactics of history related to World War II* (pp. 305 s.). Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.

- Tai, E. (2010). Local and global efforts for human rights education: a case from the Osaka Human Rights Museum. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 14(5), 771-788. doi: 10.1080/13642980903202729
- Thorstensen, E. (2011). Historical Propaganda and New Popular Cultural Medial Expressions. In H. Bjerg, C. Lenz & E. Thorstensen (Eds.), *Historicizing the uses of the past: Scandinavian perspectives on history culture, historical consciousness and didactics of history related to World War II* (pp. 305 s.). Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Tibbitts, F. (2002). Understanding What We Do: Emerging Models for Human Rights Education. *International Review of Education*, 48(3), 159-171. doi: 10.1023/a:1020338300881
- Tight, M. (2010). The curious case of case study: a viewpoint. [Article]. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13(4), 329-339. doi: 10.1080/13645570903187181
- Ting, H. (2008). Social Construction of Nation—A Theoretical Exploration. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 14(3), 453-482. doi: 10.1080/13537110802301418
- Trofanenko, B. (2006). Interrupting the gaze: on reconsidering authority in the museum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38(1), 49-65. doi: 10.1080/00220270500038511
- Trofanenko, B. (2008). Dare we know the nation? Considering the nexus of discursive leveraging and identity. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 29(2), 257-272. doi: 10.1080/01596300801966989
- Valenta, M. (2009). Immigrants' Identity Negotiations and Coping with Stigma in Different Relational Frames. [Article]. *Symbolic Interaction*, 32(4), 352-371.
- Valenta, M. (2011). Multiculturalism and the politics of bad memories. *Open Democracy*. Retrieved from <http://www.opendemocracy.net/markha-valenta/multiculturalism-and-politics-of-bad-memories>
- Varutti, M. (2010). Using different pasts in a similar way'. *Culture Unbound*, 2, 745-768.
- Vassenden, A. (2010). Untangling the different components of Norwegianness. *Nations and Nationalism*, 16(4), 734-752. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8129.2009.00438.x
- Vergo, P. (1989). *The New museology*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Vertovec, S., & Wessendorf, S. (2010). *The Multiculturalism backlash*. London: Routledge.
- Vervaet, S. (2011). Whose Museum? Whose History? Whose Memories? Remembering in the Work of Dubravka Ugrešić. *Comparative Critical Studies*, 8(2-3), 295-306. doi: 10.3366/ccs.2011.0024
- Weil, S. E. (1999). From being about something to being for somebody: The ongoing transformation of the American. [Article]. *Daedalus*, 128(3), 229-258.
- Williams, P. (2007). *Memorial museums: the global rush to commemorate atrocities*. Oxford: Berg.
- Witoszek, N. (2011). *The origins of the "regime of goodness": remapping the cultural history of Norway*. Oslo: Universitetsforl.
- Xanthaki, A. (2010). Multiculturalism and International law: Discussing Universal Standards. [Article]. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 32(1), 21-48.

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Visitor Interview Questions/Protocol

Format and structure of protocol adopted from: Richard Sandell (2007, pp. 201-203)
Museums, Prejudice and the Reframing of Difference, Routledge: London and New York

Introduce who you are and purpose of your exercise

Hello/Morning or Afternoon –I am a research student from Buskerud University College, Drammen in Norway. I am studying the experiences of visitors to the Centre for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities. I would like to ask you few questions about your visit to the centre. The results of the study will be strictly confidential-your identity will be anonymous.

A. General Information

1. Where are arriving from today?
2. Are you visiting the HL Senteret/OHC on your own or in a group?

B. Motivation/Expectation

3. What inspired you to come to the HL Senteret/OHC today?

C. Experience from visit

4. What did you find particularly interesting?
5. How did you imagine Norway's national story prior to your visit?
6. What is missing in this exhibition?

D. Exhibition's Message

7. What message do you think the HL Senteret/OHC is trying to convey?
8. Do you think these messages are successfully communicated?
9. What does the exhibition tell you about human rights in Norway?
10. Does it tell you anything about diversity?
11. What do you think the HL Senteret/OHC should convey to the next generation?

E. Background of Visitor

12. Age
Nationality
Identity

13. Did any aspect of your background/identity influence your decision to visit the HL Senteret/OHC?

.....

Appendix II: Interview protocol for Staff

Name and position of staff member

Introduction of myself and purpose of interview

1. Can you give a brief overview of the purpose of the project/exhibition in relation to addressing human rights and multiculturalism in Norway?
2. Do you think the exhibition is achieving what it set out to do as articulated in the article of association?
3. In your view are the feedbacks from visitors (Norwegian) or otherwise resonating with the educational/pedagogic potential of the exhibition?
4. Do you think a new national consciousness is being reconstructed by the narrative of this particular exhibition?

Appendix III: Access letter to research location



BEKREFTELSE

Momodou Olly Mboge er student ved Høgskolen i Buskerud (HiB). I forbindelse med studiene ved HiB har han HL-senterets tillatelse til å foreta en intervjuundersøkelse blant ansatte og besøkende ved senteret.

Momodou Olly Mboge is a student with Buskerud University College (HiB). In relation to his research at HiB we give him permission to perform interviews of staff members and visitors at our center.

7 July, 2011

Georg Andreas Broch
Head of Administration