

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
<i>Foreword</i>	
Jay Winter	viii
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	xii
Introduction	
1 The Memory and Migration Nexus: An Overview <i>Irial Glynn and J. Olaf Kleist</i>	3
Part I Migrant Memories	
2 Cultures of History: The New Left, South Asians, and Historical Memory in Post-War England <i>Kevin Myers</i>	33
3 'I am also a Foreigner, but with Me it's Different': Polish Displaced Persons, War Memory and Ethnification in Belgium <i>Machteld Venken</i>	49
4 Using History to Relate: How Teenagers in Germany Use History to Orient between Nationalities <i>Josefine Raasch</i>	68
Part II Memories in Diverse Societies	
5 Caught between Two Worlds: The Europeans of Algeria in France after 1962 <i>Michèle Baussant</i>	87
6 Remembering Egypt: Evangelicals, Conservatism and Immigration in America <i>Hans Leaman</i>	106
7 Past Migrations, Contemporary Representations and Complex Multicultures in London <i>Mary J. Hickman</i>	138

- 8 African Asylum Seekers and the Changing Politics of
Memory in Israel 154
Moriel Ram and Haim Yacobi

Part III Migration Memories and the State

- 9 Famine Commemorations and Asylum Debates
in Ireland Conflated 173
Irial Glynn
- 10 Migrant Incorporation and Political Memories:
Transformations of Civic and Communal Belonging in
Australia since 1949 189
J. Olaf Kleist
- 11 Songs for the Nation: Migrant Pasts and
Global Futures in Singapore 214
Kelvin E.Y. Low
- Conclusion
- 12 History, Memory and Migration: Comparisons,
Challenges and Outlooks 237
Irial Glynn and J. Olaf Kleist
- Index* 245

Introduction

1

The Memory and Migration Nexus: An Overview

Irial Glynn and J. Olaf Kleist

For the 4th of July 2010, the online edition of the *New York Times* asked selected writers and historians to describe how immigrants today celebrate Independence Day in the United States, and to discuss whether this had changed over different generations.¹ The answers, mostly in the form of personal family memoirs, varied across a wide range: one recounted the enthusiastic patriotism of his immigrant parents; another expressed minority migrants' ambivalence about what the day was actually commemorating; and another concluded that some immigrants' indifference was the best indicator of their actual assimilation. The newspaper elaborated: 'How immigrants define themselves and how the laws determine who is welcome and who is not have played out in various ways throughout American history.'² That a day of commemoration, whatever the role of the memories associated with it, could be indicative of immigrants' incorporation is not an exceptional characteristic of a society as aware of its immigration history as the United States.³ The nexus between memories and migrant incorporation is a typical, widespread and significant feature of any country with immigration. Newcomers have to negotiate their place in their new countries as much as receiving societies must continually discuss and remould their policies, not least in relation to those who have arrived most recently.

As the growing diversity of societies is recognised as both an asset and a challenge, we show in this introduction how academia has been forced to re-evaluate some of its basic assumptions about migrant incorporation and social memories. In the 1920s, Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess from the Chicago School noted that 'Assimilation is a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experiences and history, are incorporated with them in a

common cultural life.⁴ By the 1960s, it had become clear in immigrant societies that, even in the face of pressure to conform and assimilate, successive generations of migrants and minorities tended to retain traits from their own cultural backgrounds. In order to classify this more obvious reality, scholars began to replace ‘assimilation’ with the term ‘multiculturalism’. In doing so, they recognised that people preserve parts of their own heritage and continue to identify with their cultural backgrounds. Today, many western countries tend to apply a policy mix of assimilation and more pluralist multicultural tendencies, fittingly termed ‘applied multiculturalism’ by Riva Kastoryano.⁵ Scholars have since regarded ‘incorporation’ of ‘new immigration’ as an interplay between migrants and society. Similarly, Memory Studies, previously occupied with national and other ‘identities’, has recently aspired to overcome its ‘cultural’ paradigm in favour of a more ‘transcultural’ perspective. However, scholars have rarely combined Migration Studies and Memory Studies to consider how perceptions of the past affect the incorporation of immigrants in their host societies.

The authors of this volume merge the extensive knowledge and relevant findings produced in both fields to demonstrate, through a series of empirical studies, how various actors have referenced diverse conceptions of their local, regional and national pasts to include and exclude immigrants from receiving societies. By focusing on how the presentation of a certain past relates to the immigration present, we aim to examine the relationship between the politics of memory and the incorporation of immigrants.

In this introductory chapter we examine in detail the cross-section of Migration Studies and Memory Studies. We consider the current state of research, as well as the challenges societies and politics face when they are confronted by shifting notions of belonging in an increasingly diversified world. By conversing with the main bodies of relevant literature from Migration Studies and Memory Studies, in particular, this overview will highlight how analysing memories can contribute to a better understanding of the complexities of migrant incorporation, and illustrate how migration expands our conception of social memories. Indeed, some of the key questions raised by examining the literature are analysed in depth in the empirical chapters that follow, the details of which will be outlined towards the end of this introductory chapter.

Memory in Migration Studies

Studies on the incorporation of immigrants up until now, especially in Europe, have tended to focus on political participation, which

has led to an overemphasis on the legal and political requirements relating to citizenship.⁶ As a consequence, there has been little work done to assess fundamental issues relating to belonging, such as how migrants identify with a society that has markedly different histories and memories from their own. The rare works on the subject tend to focus on small immigrant groups,⁷ or relegate history and memory to a peripheral role.⁸ Certain studies have acknowledged the importance that a society's self-perception has for immigrant politics, but experts have seldom analysed the role memory plays in this process. There are exceptions, however. Kathy Burrell and Panikos Panayi's *Histories and Memories* examined the production and representation of migrant histories in Britain, and the place of memory in these accounts of the past.⁹ Christiane Hintermann and Christina Johansson's recent volume, *Migration and Memory: Representations of Migration in Europe Since 1960*, focuses on how migration has been represented in Sweden and Austria since 1960, paying particular attention to school books and museum exhibitions.¹⁰ By contrast, our study is not confined to analysing any particular geographic area; instead, it considers various international examples from Europe, North America, Australasia, Asia and the Middle East. Furthermore, it explores memories beyond migrant perceptions and the cultural sphere. The book intends to converse with the significant advances made in Memory Studies to investigate its input into issues concerning migrant incorporation around the world and, in this introduction, its contribution to Migration Studies.

Migration Studies and the Politics of Incorporation

The recognition of diversity and of various heritages informing the lives of people in immigrant countries has led many governments since the 1970s to co-opt multiculturalism not just as part of the fabric of society but as a policy of incorporation. Gary Freeman asserts that multiculturalism is often 'less a choice than an unintended and often most unwelcome outcome' for states.¹¹ Despite not necessarily planning their current multicultural makeup, countries need to acknowledge and include their immigrants in order to reduce the risk of harmful social and ethnic divisions arising.¹² Jürgen Habermas remarked over twenty years ago that '[e]ven if we still have a long way to go before fully achieving it, the cosmopolitan condition is no longer merely a mirage'.¹³ This begs the question: How have countries adapted so far to their increasingly cosmopolitan environments? Not well, according to Craig Calhoun, who has surmised that pluralist conceptions of society have, as yet, failed to contend with salient notions such as 'tradition, community, ethnicity, religion, and above all nationalism'.¹⁴ Stephen

Castles has noted that multicultural societies have enormous implications for national culture and belonging in the long term, since overwhelmingly homogeneous national foundation myths and conceptions of the nation often contradict many countries' current heterogeneous realities.¹⁵ Does the multicultural makeup of many societies today, for instance, mean that national foundation myths and conceptions of the nation may have to be reworked to take into account countries' heterogeneous realities?¹⁶

In his chapter of the groundbreaking *Migration Theory*, James Hollifield notes that migration experts need to devote more attention to analysing the relationship between the politics of immigration and incorporation.¹⁷ Kastoryano, in her analysis of the so-called negotiation of identities in a society between people from immigrant backgrounds and the host state, found that, despite contrasting histories of immigration, Germany, France and America 'are trying to answer the same question: how to reconcile differences that arise in society... while maintaining and affirming the nation's integrity'.¹⁸ Rainer Bauböck offers a fascinating perspective on this dilemma. Because migration 'creates territorial populations which do not necessarily share a common past or future', he suggests offsetting this problem by developing a 'multiple pasts' perspective that attempts to integrate migrant histories into national narratives and mirror multicultural societies' regular diversification more accurately.¹⁹ Various chapters in this volume discuss the problem of reconciling different pasts with different presents and futures from an empirical perspective.

This book aims to develop various insights into how referencing certain memories of the past can influence social cohesion between immigrants and their host societies. Until now, Migration Studies has rarely considered how memories of the past can affect the reception and incorporation of immigrants in the present. In public debates about immigration, historical experiences are often recalled to underpin political positions. The past is remembered in different ways by different actors. As Henry Rousso has recently pointed out, the battle for memory is no longer only confined to exceptional crimes, such as the Holocaust, but is a structural element of contemporary societies.²⁰ The subject of immigration is no different. Memories are highly selective and politically contested and divergent actors often cite contrasting memories of the past to argue for the inclusion or exclusion of new immigrants. Pro-migrant actors may compare their forefathers to contemporary immigrants to encourage empathy and understanding amongst citizens for migrants. Anti-migrant actors, by contrast, may reference past events

or experiences that can increase animosity amongst citizens against immigrants. Chapters in this volume will explore which histories and memories are referenced in different countries – and why – in order to understand the benefits and limits of referencing the past in debates. By analysing how politicians, society more generally, and immigrants themselves remember the past, this book aims to help fill the *lacuna* on the subject of memory in migration studies, and provide a novel take on the incorporation of immigrants and minorities in host societies. In turn, considering how individuals and societies remember migration will compel us to reconsider concepts of memory.

Migration in Memory Studies

Memory Studies has an extensive back catalogue of philosophical, psychological and sociological works on how we remember. In recent decades, Memory Studies has transformed into an inter-, multi- or trans-disciplinary field of research.²¹ As a field, it is characterised by a shared interest in the social phenomenon of memory. But, with various disciplinary inputs and unspecified ends, the nature of the common interest is ill-defined and, in practice, often contradictory. Memory Studies finds a common denominator only where the various disciplinary interests in memories intersect. In fact, the convergence of interests in memory rather than any other interest delineates the field, and research concentrates, therefore, on references to the past for no other end but as an end in itself. Traditionally, theories in Memory Studies are focused on the contention that social remembering constructs cultural identities, ‘imagined communities’, and homogeneous belonging in nation-states for their own sake.²² Studies in the research field, therefore, have mostly focused on memories creating national belonging or on identity politics derived from conflicting memories. The political effects of memories on other issues and topics of social significance, such as migration, have mostly been neglected, until quite recently, within Memory Studies.

With the predominant contention in research that people employ cultural memories to construct ‘national identities’, migrants are excluded from national belonging or forced to assimilate.²³ In classic immigration countries, such as the USA, Canada and Australia, where states and societies have long utilised memories for the incorporation of newcomers, the occasional relevant study has placed migration memories within a national immigrant heritage.²⁴ In Europe, where the diversity of migration has recently become a controversial and politically challenging issue, scholars have come to acknowledge the significance

of memories for migrant incorporation and the prevalent role migration can play in Memory Studies. Yet, migration creates a paradox in many countries that have traditionally imagined 'belonging' along homogeneous lines, which markedly contradict their often heterogeneous history, their increasingly heterogeneous present, and their presumed heterogeneous future. Memories that had contributed to social cohesion in European states for many years by constructing 'national identities' now appear to exacerbate social tensions. Yet, memories can also be used to facilitate multicultural incorporation of migrants and to transform the receiving society's idea of belonging in order to include the diversity of newcomers. Pragmatic interest requires some kind of balance in the application of memories to attain social cohesion between people of different backgrounds. Because migration poses a challenge to some of the assumptions made in Memory Studies about homogeneous belonging, it has spurred new approaches to our understanding of social memories on individual, social and state levels.

Memory Studies and the Politics of Incorporation

While academic interest in memories varied between disciplines, agreement upon fundamental categories and principles helped to consolidate Memory Studies as a field.²⁵ Dedicated journals, centres, handbooks and, not least, the book series in which this volume appears, have been established in the last five years to debate memory across diverse subjects.²⁶ Despite a wide range of approaches to, and interest in, remembering, some basic suppositions prevail, on the basis of which all contributions find common ground. Fundamentally, memory is regarded as both individual and social. 'While the collective memory endures and draws strength from its base in a coherent body of people', sociologist Maurice Halbwachs pointedly argued, 'it is individuals as group members who remember.'²⁷ The relationship between individual memory and social memory is still contested today. Studies continue to refer to works by Halbwachs and the psychologist, Frederick Bartlett, who, independently of each other, first described this dichotomy in the 1920s and 1930s, with leanings towards a predominance of the social and a predominance of the individual, respectively.²⁸ While Memory Studies may emphasise one type of memory over the other, the interdependence of individual and social memory in the process of remembering is always acknowledged. From this stipulation is derived another supposition: that remembering connects individuals with others and creates notions of belonging in a bounded social relationship. Following Halbwachs, society and social peers are required for individuals to remember since

they provide the 'social framework' or logic for recalling an event, and the imagination of a group.²⁹ Belonging to that group is thus a result of remembering. The belonging constructed in the process can take on different modes, and the groups imagined vary in form, size and, crucially, in their types of relationship.

In regard to their social aspect, memories are political. Public references to the past are considered 'memory politics' for they construct belongings that determine who and how someone may be included in a group, a society, a nation or a polity.³⁰ Migrants may or may not be incorporated into such belongings. They may constitute a group among others, or they may not be recognised as migrants at all, depending on the social and political context in which the past is evoked. Memories that conjure up a relationship between migrants and the receiving society are political in terms of incorporation, determining the selectivity of admission, the position of new members in a society, and migrants' potential participation in the receiving polity. Who is a citizen and who belongs to a nation, who makes up society's majority and who is part of a minority are questions posed, not just for migration, but in recourse to memories in which selections and constellations of belonging are expressed.

As memories evoke notions of belonging, they affect political action. They gear policies towards ensuring the preservation of the heritage or tradition they evoke. In this case, memories function as a way of indirect persuasion to act according to a particular social group's legacy. In addition, memories directly inform state policies, including migration policies, with 'lessons from the past'.³¹ Moreover, the social relations imagined as belonging in references to the past constitute a model for political action in the political community or polity in question.³² In other words, memories influence who the principle actors executing policies are – whether individuals, nationals, citizens or the state itself – as well as the content of their policies.

Since memories construct belonging and are relevant to political action, they are also politically contested. Known as the 'politics of memory', members of groups and societies debate the interpretation of their collective past.³³ The conflict stems from the friction between the singularity of the group or society and the multiplicity of memories proposed as being constitutive of the group or society. This is especially prevalent in societies that have experienced drastic political transformations, such as regime change.³⁴ The politics of memory can be intense and passionate since different political actors' interpretations of the past compete with others to establish a society's belonging and the

direction of its policies. It is therefore also significant for societies that debate migration, in which case the memories recalled make specific statements about belonging and migrant incorporation. Moreover, the politics of memory are historical and respond to general developments and changes in society, both by adjusting the perception of the past to shifts in social constellations and because actors can utilise memories to meet new challenges.³⁵ Last, but not least, countries differ in their debates about the past because the politics of memory are specific to the socio-political organisation of groups, societies and polities.³⁶

Due to their political character, memories are relevant to migration in several ways: by determining belonging and the ensuing relationship between migrants and their receiving society, by influencing policies of migration, and by structuring the political debate about belonging and migration. All three aspects of political memory permeate three levels: social groups, national society and the state. Memories contribute to the discussion about the incorporation of migrants on each of these three levels.

Memories of migrants

Outside Migration Studies, Anselm Strauss's work on identity in the late 1950s first raised the link between memory and migration when he claimed that immigrants lost part of their memory and identity on their arrival in a new country.³⁷ Various works written in French developed these ideas in the 1960s and 1970s, with Roger Bastide suggesting that a 'syncretism' between different religious cultures can lead to a combination 'of the mythical history of two different traditions in one'.³⁸ In English, Homi Bhabha made the connection between memory and migrants' identity for Post-Colonial and Multicultural Studies in 1988. He wrote:

Cultural diversity is the recognition of pre-given cultural 'contents' and customs, held in a time-frame of relativism; it gives rise to anodyne liberal notions of multiculturalism, cultural exchange, or the culture of humanity. Cultural diversity is also the representation of a radical rhetoric of the separation of totalized cultures that live unsullied by the intertextuality of their historical locations, safe in the Utopianism of a mythic memory of a unique collective identity.³⁹

In contrast to the sceptical view about memory's role in mystifying and totalising 'identity politics', Bhabha coined a concept of cultural

hybridity that described migrants' position as in-between cultures.⁴⁰ Yet, migrants' autobiographical memories evoked a hybrid belonging. As Andor Skotnes pointed out: 'Personal testimony speaks precisely to how im/migrant subjects constantly build, reinvent, synthesize, or even collage identities from multiple sources and resources, often lacing them with deep ambivalence'.⁴¹ Ien Ang made a similar observation for diasporic memories: 'It is the myth of the (lost or idealized) homeland, the object of both collective memory and of desire and attachment, which is constitutive to diasporas, and which ultimately confines and constrains the nomadism of the diasporic subject'.⁴² Memory was an underlying and sceptically viewed, yet little discussed, issue in debates about migrants' identity politics in the late 1980s and early 1990s.⁴³ At the same time, migrants' memories were still largely absent from Memory Studies, as migrants' 'collage identities' seemed to undermine what Bhabha and others were so sceptical of in relation to memories in the first place – that is, their totalising and constraining character.

While the theoretical role of memories in diasporas and transnational migration was contemplated sporadically for a long time, especially in the French literature during the 1980s and 1990s by the likes of Danièle Hervieu-Léger, Jacques Barou, Nicole Lapierre and Jocelyne Dakhli, it took English-speaking authors longer to research migrants' memories in the same detail.⁴⁴ As Andreas Huyssen noted in an article from 2003 that analysed diasporic migrant memories: 'As opposed to national memory, diasporic memory remains seriously understudied'.⁴⁵ Many more enquiries into migrants' memories, which analyse migrants' mediation between their contrasting pasts and presents, have since followed in oral history, anthropology, sociology and other disciplines.⁴⁶ However, with migrant diasporas at the core of this research, these studies can create totalising and constraining identities from apparently cohesive migrant memories by assuming that a collective group of migrants has a common and cohesive past. Josefine Raasch shows critically in her chapter of this book that Berlin teenagers with migrant backgrounds negotiate relevant histories often incoherently rather than in a cohesive hybrid or diasporic model and she discusses what leads them to identify with one or another element of their past.

Arguably, Museum Studies also influenced Memory Studies' more recent interest in migrant memories, as the former frequently had to establish ways to represent diverse constituencies. In the light of 'travelling cultures', John Urry cautioned against making assumptions of static heritage in an anthology on museum theory from 1996.⁴⁷ While focused on travel within Britain, rather than transnational migration,

Urry questioned museums' tendency to exhibit national heritage. Sharon Macdonald, who co-edited the same volume, argued several years later that museums had to adjust their focus due to social transformations, such as globalisation, from national to 'transcultural identities'.⁴⁸ Museums, by taking into account immigration pasts, presented a differentiated image of migrants with memories of both their origin and their receiving countries. To exhibit migrants, this acknowledgement of migrant memories became a standard device used in museums that included migration.⁴⁹ Yet, migrants' transcultural memories in museums were not isolated, as in academic research, but were instead set and 'incorporated' in the context of the migration history of the receiving society.

While migrants' transcultural memories are usually regarded as expressing cross-border belonging for individuals and for groups within a diverse society, Wolfgang Welsch suggested in an essay in 1999 that 'transculturality' describes a permeable model of belonging for societies that are diverse and offer to 'incorporate the foreign'.⁵⁰ Transcultural memories are, then, not just memories of migrants but memories that transcend national boundaries.⁵¹ Indeed, migrants have also utilised transcultural memories to incorporate themselves into their receiving society.⁵² For example, Machteld Venken describes in this volume a complex case in which Polish World War Two veterans secured their place in post-war Belgian society by referencing their past contribution to the country's liberation. This claim was challenged in the 1980s by historical scrutiny and the arrival of new Polish immigrants, which forced Polish-Belgians to re-negotiate their past and 'identity' in relation to Belgian transcultural memories. That national memories were not always open for migrants to attach themselves to, and that the acceptance of migrant memories in the receiving society had often to be fought for, is demonstrated by Kevin Myers in his chapter on 'cultures of history' in Britain. A BBC radio programme on South Asian teenagers, produced from a left-wing and post-colonial perspective, introduced, not without friction, migrant memories into 1960s mainstream society. Overall, migrants' handling of the past illustrates their varied mediation, negotiation and contestation with the receiving society in their quest to be acknowledged and incorporated.

Memories in Diverse Societies

For migrants to incorporate their memories in those of the receiving society, the latter had to be perceived as inclusive of migrants or migration. In traditional immigration countries, national memories included

migration as an obvious, while not always uncontroversial element, of the past. Historian Michael Kammen, for example, described the United States' origin, in his Pulitzer Prize winning book, *People of Paradox*, of 1972, as the ongoing tension between the indigenous and the new, the latter caused continuously by colonialism and immigration.⁵³ In *Mystic Chords of Memory*, published twenty years later, Kammen revisited the American paradox.⁵⁴ Typical of this immigrant society, he suggested, was the diversity of heritages remembered, rather than the dominance of one national heritage. John Bodnar saw the diversity of memories in American society in migrants' ethnic subcultures, which he described as essential vernacular elements of the US commemorative culture that, together with official memories, constituted US national identity.⁵⁵ Critically, he found that official institutions only accommodated the memories of highly influential people 'within and outside of ethnic communities and institutions to define the celebration and presentation of ethnic heritage'.⁵⁶ In an essay seven years earlier, he illustrated how the heterogeneous social history of immigration to the United States became a symbol of American national unity.⁵⁷ Memories of immigration were understood to be quintessential to the national memory of the United States but were not in conflict with one another and were constitutive only in combination with a plurality of other memories. In this regard, the United States was also different from other classic immigration countries. Hans Leaman underlines such claims in this volume with his fascinating chapter, in which he describes how some socially conservative Christian groups in the USA dropped their mid-twentieth-century opposition to immigration, drawing pro-immigration positions from their application of Biblical migration histories to the situation of (even illegal) immigrants in the US today.

Migration memories are used and expressed in societies' public realms in many ways. Often, they are materially manifested, in memorials and museums, in ways which have little direct impact on the incorporation of immigrants but express the role of migration memories within societies. For example, both Kammen and Bodnar analyse the Statue of Liberty as an institution of immigration memories in the context of American commemorative practices.⁵⁸ Indeed, the structure housed the world's first permanent immigration exhibition, which opened in 1972. It closed in 1991, one year after the launch of the nearby Ellis Island Immigration Museum. Such presentations of the immigration past were not controversial *per se* in America's differentiated commemorative context. However, museum exhibitions diverge from differentiated approaches to memories in that they construct,

isolated from broader public debates, national migration memories. Joachim Baur criticised museums' nationalisation of migration memories, not just in Ellis Island but also in migration museums in Canada and Australia.⁵⁹ In the latter two societies, memories of migration became relevant only in the context of multiculturalism, first in museums and recently also in academic reflection. The first migration museum in Australia opened in 1986 and others have followed. In Canada, the Pier 21 museum has exhibited the country's immigration history since 1999. In migration museums, however, multiculturalism and the diversity of migrant memories appear as a national identity of migration. The variety of migrant memories is inherently subjugated by, and rendered into, a national memory of immigration, which incorporates migrants and lays claim to defining the receiving society, a predicament that Ian McShane discussed in a thoughtful chapter about exhibiting migration.⁶⁰ Moreover, migration memories in the Australian and Canadian public realms are mostly confined to specific migration exhibitions, museums, or other well defined manifestations and are not as widely discussed in the public realm as some other social memories of national relevance, such as indigenous and colonial memories. In contrast to the USA, memories of migration are not regarded as one among many that together create national memories but as one national memory that competes with other memories for the definition of 'national identity'. Ghassan Hage sees a dilemma in Australian commemoration, as migration memories clash with, rather than complement, indigenous memories in their claims to define exclusively the national identity.⁶¹ He suggests strengthening diverse ethnic memories against national memories, which would, however, leave diverse migrant memories without a setting into which they could incorporate in the first place.

Classic immigration countries have developed various ways of incorporating migration into their memories. Classic conceptions of national memories in Europe, by contrast, proved less receptive to incorporating migrants or migrant memories. Pierre Nora's eminent project *'Lieux de Memoire'* aimed to reconstruct a French national identity through various realms of memory. Gérard Noiriel pointed out in his brilliant and counter-intuitive contribution to Nora's compilation, 'The French and Foreigners', that migrants made up part of French national memories only by their exclusion. The editors of the German version, *Erinnerungsorte*, frankly admitted that the memories of foreigners, as opposed to German migrants, were not part of German national identity and therefore not included in their project.⁶² Similarly, in the most

influential German concept of national remembrance, Jan and Aleida Assmann's 'Cultural Memory', migrant memories are not considered but appear conceptually as 'counter-memories' that are characterised by 'cultural suppression, alienation and marginalisation'.⁶³ In a long European tradition, states associated homogeneous memories with national identities that appeared in conflict with cultural diversity.⁶⁴ Unsurprisingly, immigration museums proved highly controversial in many European countries where memories of migration were viewed as a challenge to certain national identities. The 'Cité National de l'Histoire de l'Immigration' in Paris, a project of various political calculations and expectations on both sides of the political spectrum, was soon swept up in a controversy about France's immigration policies and national identity, even before it opened in 2007.⁶⁵ It also led to debates in Museum Studies about exhibiting migration pasts, and similar initiatives for migrant museums followed in other countries, such as in the UK.⁶⁶ In Germany, initiatives since the 1990s by migrant and left-wing groups for a national migration museum have thus far failed. Instead, communal and regional museums are starting to incorporate memories of migration.⁶⁷ Throughout Europe, the commemoration of migration differed from country to country.⁶⁸ Yet, rather than incorporating migration into national memories, or even incorporating them as elements of national memories, European societies instead sidelined memories of migration.

With migration taking on renewed relevance in many societies, partly because of the growth in prominence of debates surrounding immigration and multiculturalism, Memory Studies has had to adjust its conception of remembering. Alison Landsberg described, from a transcultural perspective in a study from 2004, the attempt to include migrants in the national memory of 1920s and 1930s assimilationist America as forcing 'prosthetic memories' of ethnic subcultures onto immigrants *in lieu* of their migrant and origin memories. Such a description also fits, and is perhaps even more accurate, of the way European national memories have incorporated migrants until recently. A greater current acceptance of diversity and of transcultural memories in Europe has led Jan Motte and Rainer Ohliger to suggest that societies will have to decide between promoting 'shared memories' or 'divided memories'.⁶⁹ The first case would mean including migrants in national memories, as occurs more generally in classic immigration countries. The latter case would see separate memories of immigrants, on the one hand, and of the receiving society on the other, a trend that has evolved in most European societies that remain sceptical of diversity.⁷⁰

Societies at the periphery of Europe that negotiate migration between shared and divided memories are the subjects of two chapters here. Both the UK and Israel are classic immigration countries. Despite this, national belonging is characterised by memories of homogeneous national identities relating to English nationalism in England and the Jewish nation for Israel. Drawing on extensive studies in two London neighbourhoods, Mary J. Hickman describes how memories of established residents in the receiving society either include or exclude memories of migration. She argues that whether migration is incorporated positively in such memories or not depends more on specific local histories of migration than on national conditions. Haim Yacobi and Moriel Ram, in contrast, analyse a recent Israeli national debate about Africans claiming asylum in Israel. They present how political and public interest groups represent national memories, in some instances memories of the same events, to include or exclude these asylum seekers from a national identity that could offer them protection. Memories contribute to and are used to negotiate belonging in migrant-receiving societies. Politics of memory, in these cases, involve debates about the acceptance and selection of migrants into a national community that is defined and re-defined in reference to the past.

Migration Memories and the State

The representation of memories in society often seems caught up within a confined cultural sphere. Manifestations of migration memories, and even contestations about them, can easily appear as self-referential affirmations of belonging rather than being seen as relevant to policies and political action. Thus, the state has traditionally played a minor role in Memory Studies and how states remember migration has heretofore received only scant attention.

How states promote the remembrance of migration can influence social relations, social dynamics and the capacity for migrants to participate in society. Therefore, memories of migration represent an important political issue. Museums, memorials and national days may then emerge as political instruments of the state that can help form a national belonging in which migrants may be incorporated, in one way or another. The state's memory politics are even more obviously and directly utilised to incorporate migrants in schools through historical education.⁷¹ Viola Georgi has pointed out how teaching about the past can contribute to a civic belonging that can incorporate immigrant pupils.⁷² Moreover, Kelvin Low draws our attention in his chapter of this book to a hitherto neglected commemorative instrument of the

state that has an impact upon people's sense of belonging and their memories of migrants. The lyrics and music videos of national songs, he argues, present immigrant histories in Singapore that suit the requirements of the present society's perceptions of belonging. Memories here are purposefully evoked to incorporate certain migrants in the polity.

Belonging created through memories is often highly selective and therefore incorporates some migrants but not others. Tony Kushner argued, in regard to refugee policies in the UK, that memories of historical events in which refugees found protection in Britain were used discriminately in political debates.⁷³ By emphasising some historical events, involving certain refugees and not others, he suggests, politicians distinguished between desirable and undesirable asylum seekers and, as a consequence, could mould state policies accordingly. Olaf Kleist considers how different modes of belonging can be selectively evoked through memories from an historical perspective, as well as from a political perspective. His chapter in this volume looks at how Australian governments altered the incorporation of immigrants with the transformation of memories over the course of 60 years. The past in these cases facilitated the state's selective incorporation of migrants by constructing appropriate modes of belonging.

Beyond forming a sense of belonging in society that may influence or structure the incorporation of migrants, memories can also affect migration policies more directly. They can inform policies with experiences and lessons from the past. Klaus Neumann observed that the selective memories of past events of people seeking asylum limited the options in the present of policymakers in Australia on boat people.⁷⁴ Neumann's study is part of a collection of essays, which he co-edited with Gwenda Tavan, that illustrate how the past was employed in Australia to inform various immigration and refugee policies.⁷⁵ Nancy Foner and Richard Alba have made the case that it is not just public memories but 'the institutional responses that have developed as part of the processes of remembering and redressing the circumstances, and injustices, of earlier eras' that shape the incorporation of contemporary immigrants and their children.⁷⁶ Irial Glynn, in this volume, adds to this assertion by showing that it was the legacy of remembering Ireland's historical famine and its history of emigration that political actors drew upon in debates about asylum seekers in the mid 1990s. In fact, he demonstrates that the commemoration of these events had the power not just to influence but to transform refugee policies in Ireland, if only for a brief period. Migrants and immigrant societies depend on memories not just to incorporate the new and the established or to create a belonging that

is inclusive of new arrivals, but to complement state policies that select who can join the political community and who cannot.

Summary and findings of this volume

This book utilises sociological, anthropological and historical approaches to examine how perceptions of the past affect the incorporation of immigrants in societies around the world. It takes into account how individuals, sections of society and the state use memories when navigating around issues linked to history, identity and immigration. The structure of the book reflects the composition of much of this introductory chapter. The first part analyses memories of migrants themselves by examining how immigrants negotiated their own identities in relation to their newfound homes. The second part considers how different memories in culturally diverse societies interacted and sometimes competed with contrasting memories referenced by other sectors of society. The third part focuses on how states' references to memories of the past influenced their migration policies and facilitated the incorporation of immigrants. Each chapter enhances our understanding of what occurs when themes related to memory and migration converge by highlighting the complexities in a number of different settings around the world. Together, the chapters illuminate the many ways in which memories imagine belonging, construct social cohesion and inform policies in diverse societies.

Kevin Myers's case study of the representation of British-Asian teenagers in the 1960s says a lot about prevailing attitudes to cultural diversity in Britain more generally. It also provides an insight into how the mass media can influence debates about history, memory and migration. Myers reveals that migrant communities often become memory makers themselves because of their absence from national memories. Asian communities in Britain, Myers convincingly contends, selectively used the past to pursue social justice and identity. However, this was not without its problems. British-Asian teenagers' versions of their colonial past, often conveyed to them via their families, frequently contradicted the positive images that prevailed in Britain regarding the country's imperial history. Migrants therefore often have to find a balance between representing their own minority culture properly, based on the recollection and inscription of specific historical experiences, whilst not ostracising the culture of the majority. Another issue raised by Myers relates to agency. Who actually communicates people's memories and identities to the wider public is vital, as reflected

in the huge difference between how the same immigrants expressed their identities in a television documentary and a radio documentary. Myers explained that the marked divergences between the two representations – the presenter in the television documentary asked no questions about Indian history or the legacies of empire – arose because of the contrasting worldviews of the media teams that produced the documentaries.

By focusing on how Polish veteran organisations chose to convey their previous military experiences in Belgium during the Second World War to accelerate their incorporation after later settling there, Machteld Venken's chapter again demonstrates the importance of immigrants' agency. Polish veteran groups knew the value of underlining 1) their heroic role in the liberation of Belgium, 2) their Catholicism, and 3) their potential political victimisation under Soviet Communism, to achieve a type of privileged migrant status. Significantly, articulating a certain representation of their military experiences also helped these migrants to find coherence amongst themselves. In this way, Venken demonstrates how certain migrant memories can unify migrants' own identities in addition to helping migrants incorporate into their new societal environments. By analysing how Polish veteran groups remembered war-time experiences from the 1940s until the present, Venken's chapter also illustrates how memories can adapt to changing national and international circumstances, such as the end of the Cold War. It shows how memories can be passed on to people often unconnected to events – in this case Polish migrants to Belgium from the 1980s onwards – if citing certain memories can still produce valuable results for those recounting them.

Josefine Raasch, in her fascinating study of how Berlin teenagers of immigrant origin deal with the past, shows how incoherently people can approach the past. Since nearly all of the teenagers interviewed identified with two or more ethnicities – a type of hybrid self whereby different aspects of their identities could be multiple, muted or frequently overlap – this is perhaps not that surprising. Raasch raises salient questions relating to migrants dealing with place, since almost all of the teenagers she questioned were curious about recent historical events in their city of birth and upbringing, which presumably helped orient them in the present. By contrast, they were not interested in discovering Berlin's extensive history dating back several centuries: their curiosity only concerned what happened within living memory. The one teenager not interested in learning about Berlin's past at all was, significantly, a citizen of Turkey, the same country where he hoped

to return to live in the future, suggesting that the past not only helps to explain the present but can relate to the planned future.

The second part of the book studies the interaction of diverse memories in diverse societies. As a way of linking the first part of the book to the second, Michèle Baussant's chapter focuses on Algerian Europeans' memories and on the reception they encountered in French society when they fled Algeria in 1962. Baussant describes how Metropolitan France's overwhelmingly negative memories of those who departed France for Algeria in the nineteenth century affected Algerian Europeans' reception and incorporation when they returned to France in 1962. Although Algerian Europeans had considered themselves as French people in Algeria, when they settled in France in the 1960s they found that Metropolitan French did not feel the same way about them. Mainland French society looked upon Algerian Europeans, particularly those of Spanish, Italian or Maltese descent, as notably inferior. This reinforced Algerian Europeans' own sense of exile: not only had they unwillingly departed their homes but their relocation to France revealed that their supposed motherland saw them as a type of illegitimate, embarrassing offspring for whom it cared little. Algerian Europeans felt socially – but not necessarily economically – marginalised. In contrast to the way Belgium treated its privileged Polish military veterans, Baussant's chapter reveals the ostracisation felt by certain types of underprivileged migrants, and the barriers they face when seeking incorporation.

Hans Leaman examines how some evangelical leaders in the United States have drawn on both Biblical and American history to argue that Evangelicals should remember themselves as immigrants and personally identify with the situation of immigrants today. By doing so, Leaman draws our attention to how closely America's understandings of itself are tied to both religious discourses and its prevalent immigration narrative. Evangelicals typically identify their forefathers as pilgrims led to America by divine providence, a narrative that is modelled on the way the children of Israel were led to the Promised Land. This is an account with potentially strong exclusive cultural connotations. Nonetheless, it has helped evangelical Americans identify with migrants crossing the deserts of the American southwest today. This is an account of how the memory of America as a nation of immigrants can moderate opposition to immigration even among otherwise socially conservative circles.

Mary J. Hickman's chapter illustrates how narratives of place and belonging in London play out amongst people with similar economic

circumstances but different histories and memories. Historical experience, Hickman finds, plays a critical role in social cohesion. Residents of the Kilburn area of London, a place that has a long history of multi-layered and intersecting migratory flows, do not claim their area of residence as exclusively their own – it is a place potentially open to all. Because of the area's long history of positive resolutions of migration-related inequalities, people in Kilburn can relate and empathise with migrants due to their own similar familial memories of migration and the difficulties that come with trying to adapt to new cultures. The process of pluralisation, therefore, does not cause the same fears amongst people in Kilburn as it does amongst long-term residents in Downham, an area unused to foreign immigration until recently. The perceived exceptionality of foreign immigration to the area saw a rise in what Hickman refers to as 'bottom-up fear' of migrants among residents, who felt that immigration challenged a way of life that they had hitherto always been perceived as homogeneous. Despite parallels between the experiences of Downham residents and immigrants, such as the way neighbouring middle-class areas looked upon working-class Downham people as a threat, residents rarely draw parallels between long-term residents and newcomers. Hickman's findings have important repercussions for processes of incorporation and patterns of identification as they indicate how dominant narratives and practices in local settings can help to explain the reception and potential incorporation of migrant groups.

Various actors in Haim Yacobi and Moriel Ram's chapter on debates over African asylum seekers in Israel drew upon ancient biblical references, in a similar manner to American Evangelicals, to support their sometimes contrasting views. The most effective tool pro-asylum actors used to influence debates in Israel, however, was to compare the Africans to Jewish refugees who attempted to flee the Holocaust. The Jewish past, pro-asylum actors argued, compelled Israel to treat these asylum seekers with compassion. Recognising the value of this comparison, African asylum seekers emphasised the bond between them and Holocaust survivors to help achieve their target of remaining in the country. Memories of more recent historical events, such as the issue of Palestinian refugees, also affect Israeli refugee debates. The development of juridical, political and physical mechanisms since the 1950s to counter the movement of Palestinian refugees means that actors opposed to the acceptance of Sudanese refugees can call upon memories linked to supposed infiltration by foreign refugees to support their opposition to certain immigration. One of the most stirring findings from the chapter relates

to how both pro- and anti-asylum actors can reference similar events to put forward completely contrasting views, thus reflecting the divergence of memories that exist surrounding the same event.

The third part of this book deals with the use of memory by the state. Irial Glynn demonstrates in his chapter on refugee debates in Ireland in the mid 1990s that the way in which a state remembers its own migration past can influence how it treats migrants in the present. The conflation of Ireland's 150th famine commemorations with the country's first ever major political debate on refugees had a significant effect on the country's immigration policy. The Irish Famine caused the death of over one million people and the emigration of another million. Famine commemorations often portrayed these emigrants as refugees forced to flee turmoil and suffering in their homelands. Therefore, the plight of refugees in the 1990s resonated in Ireland because of the simultaneous commemoration of the country's own painful and migrant past. When politicians compared past Irish emigrants to contemporary migrants seeking asylum in Ireland, they drew on a long history of associating the suffering of Irish people with others perceived to be experiencing similar hardships. However, the fall in comparisons between the Irish emigrant past and foreign refugees and asylum seekers in Ireland exposes how certain memories can recede in importance when they bear an uncomfortable relationship with the changing present – in this case, Ireland's return to more restrictive refugee policies.

Olaf Kleist's chapter effectively uses the story behind official attempts to incorporate migrants in Australia since 1949 to uncover the multi-faceted way that states need to operate to successfully attain social cohesion between citizens and newcomers. He acutely underlines the dilemma that states have when trying to incorporate migrants through civic ventures, such as undergoing the new Australian citizenship test, while accommodating contested cultural memories, such as how the First Fleet landing in Australia is remembered, that might help to include or exclude these same migrants. Memories, Kleist contends, help to re-imagine and create a certain mode of belonging and social cohesion, thereby providing historically appropriate paths into society for immigrants. Civic and cultural memories are present in society at the same time but are often at odds with each other, with one dominating the state's focus more than the other. Examining the relationship between the two forms of memory allows us, he suggests, to understand the policies, politics and transformations of migrant incorporation in terms of belonging.

Kelvin Low's chapter analyses how national day songs (and accompanying music videos), composed for Singapore's annual celebration of independence, deliver messages of unity and loyalty to galvanise a sense of belonging to the nation. These songs often highlight the country's romantic view of its past low-skilled migrants, who later became fully fledged Singaporeans because they drove the economy forward in earlier times. Nonetheless, the songs show little interest in contemporary low-skilled migrants, referred to officially as foreign workers, because the state does not regard them as potential future citizens. By contrast, recent songs have sought to include 'useful' skilled immigrants because they can ensure continuing and future prosperity, thereby demonstrating how the state can use memories – this time in the form of songs – to justify its immigration policies.

The chapters of this volume show that the nexus between memory and migration is of global relevance. While the examples presented here are country specific, they are highly relevant beyond their setting. They demonstrate the many ways memories can assist the inclusion and exclusion of immigrants. The varying approaches to memory and migrant incorporation in this collection shed light on the complex connection of these two social phenomena in ways that are novel and timely. The authors of this volume have begun exploring new issues related to the memory and migration nexus. Readers can learn from their findings as well as from some of the challenges that they encountered. In our conclusion, we set out some of the issues raised in this volume that we feel need to be pursued in future studies. We hope that this book serves to inspire readers to consider the relevance memory has in the politics of migrant incorporation.

Notes

1. *The New York Times Online*, 'How We Adopted the Fourth of July', Opinion Pages: Room for Debate, 3/7/2010, available at <http://roomfordebate.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/07/03/how-we-adopted-the-fourth-of-july/> (accessed 18/7/2011).
2. *Ibid.*
3. We use 'incorporation' as a neutral umbrella term for the inclusion of immigrants in the receiving society that encapsulates more specific policies, such as 'assimilation', 'integration' and 'multiculturalism'.
4. Robert E. Park and Ernest Watson Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology: Including the Original Index to Basic Sociological Concepts*, (3rd revised ed., Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1969), 735.
5. Riva Kastoryano, *Negotiating Identities: States and Immigrants in France and Germany*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002 (originally published in French in 1997)), 10.

24 *Introduction*

6. Nira Yuval-Davis, 'Belongings: In Between the Indigene and the Diasporic', in Umut Ozkirimh (ed.), *Nationalism and its Futures*, (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 127–144.
7. Anne-Marie Fortier, *Migrant Belongings: Memory, Space, Identity*, (Oxford/New York: Berg, 2000).
8. Andrew Geddes and Adrian Favell (eds), *The Politics of Belonging: Migrants and Minorities in Contemporary Europe*, (Aldershot: Ashgate/ICCR, 1999).
9. Kathy Burrell and Panikos Panayi (eds), *Histories and Memories: Migrants and their History in Britain*, (London/New York: Tauris, 2006).
10. Christiane Hintermann and Christina Johansson (eds), *Migration and Memory: Representations of Migration in Europe since 1960*, (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2010).
11. Gary P. Freeman, 'Immigrant Incorporation in Western Democracies', *International Migration Review* 38, 3, 2004, 945–969, esp. 961.
12. Charles Taylor, 'The Politics of Recognition', in Amy Gutmann (ed.), *Multiculturalism: The Politics of Recognition*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 25–73, esp. 26.
13. Jurgen Habermas, 'Citizenship and National Identity' (1990), appendix II in *Between Facts and Norms*, (translated by William Rehg, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996), 515.
14. Craig Calhoun, 'Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism', in Umut Ozkirimh (ed.), *Nationalism and its Futures*, (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 93–126, esp. 103.
15. Stephen Castles, 'How Nation-States Respond to Immigration and Ethnic Diversity', Steven Vertovec (ed.), *Migration and Social Cohesion*, (Aldershot: Edward Elgar, 1999), 3–18.
16. For discussion of the foundation myths and conceptions of the nation, see Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) and Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (2nd ed., New York/London: Verso, 1991).
17. James Hollifield, 'The Politics of International Migration', in Caroline Brettell and James Hollifield (eds), *Migration Theory*, (New York: Routledge, 2008), 183–237, esp. 213.
18. Riva Kastoryano, *Negotiating Identities: States and Immigrants in France and Germany*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002 (originally published in French in 1997)), 3.
19. Rainer Baubock, 'Sharing History and Future-Time Horizons of Democratic Membership in an Age of Migration', *Constellations* 4, 3, 1998, 320–345, esp. 320 and 334.
20. Henry Rousso, 'History of Memory. Brief Reflections on an Overloaded Field', in Muriel Blaive, Christian Gerbel and Thomas Lindenberger (eds), *Clashes in European Memory: The Case of Communist Repression and the Holocaust*, (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2010).
21. For an excellent overview of historical theories of memory see Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi and Daniel Levy (eds), *The Collective Memory Reader*, (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). On Memory Studies see Kerwin Lee Klein, 'On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse', *Representations* 69, Winter, 2000, 127–50; Jeffrey K. Olick, 'From

- Collective Memory to the Sociology of Mnemonic Practises and Products', in Astrid Erlil and Ansgar Nünning (eds), *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 151–61.
22. See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (London/New York: Verso, 1983, (revised and extended edition 1991)), 155–162; Aleida Assmann, *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des Kulturellen Gedächtnisses*, (München: C.H. Beck, 1999); John R. Gillis, 'Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship', in John R. Gillis (ed.), *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 1–24; Eric J. Hobsbawm and Terence O. Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); David Middleton and Derek Edwards, *Collective Remembering*, (London: Sage, 1990); Pierre Nora, 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux De Mémoire', *Representations* 26, 1989, 7–24.
 23. See J. Olaf Kleist, 'Grenzen der Erinnerung: Methoden des Vergangenheitsbezugs und Ihre Implikationen für Migrationspolitik', in Elisabeth Boesen and Fabienne Lentz (eds), *Migration und Erinnerung: Konzepte und Methoden der Forschung / Migration et Mémoire: Concepts et Methodes de Recherche*, (Münster: Lit, 2010), 223–55.
 24. See for example Joachim Baur, *Die Musealisierung der Migration: Einwanderungsmuseen und die Inszenierung der Multikulturellen Nation*, (Bielefeld: Transcript 2009); John Bodnar, 'Symbols and Servants: Immigrant America and the Limits of Public History', *The Journal of American History* 73, 1986, 137–151; Alison Landsberg (ed.), *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004).
 25. See also Steven D. Brown, 'The Quotation Marks Have a Certain Importance: Prospects for a "Memory Studies"', *Memory Studies* 1, 3, 2008, 261–71.
 26. See Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi and Levy, *The Collective Memory Reader*, see endnote 21; Susannah Radstone, 'Memory Studies: For and Against', *Memory Studies* 1, 1, 2008, 31–39; Henry L. Roediger III and James V. Wertsch, 'Creating a New Discipline of Memory Studies', *Memory Studies* 1, 1, 2008, 9–22.
 27. Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, (translated by Francis J. Ditter Jr. and Vidar Yazdi Ditter, New York: Harper&Row, 1980, originally published in French in 1950), 48.
 28. Maurice Halbwachs, *Les Cadres Sociaux de la Mémoire*, (Paris: F. Alcan, 1925); Frederic C. Bartlett, *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1932). For the current debate see Jeffrey Olick, 'Collective Memory: The Two Cultures', in Jeffrey Olick (ed.) *The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility*, (New York/Oxford: Routledge), 2007, 17–54; Wulf Kansteiner, 'Memory, Media and Menschen: Where Is the Individual in Collective Memory Studies?', *Memory Studies* 3, 1, 2010, 3–4; Harald Welzer, 'Re-Narrations: How Pasts Change in Conversational Remembering', *Memory Studies* 3, 1, 2010, 5–17.
 29. Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, see endnote 27; Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, (translated and edited by Lewis A. Coser, Chicago University of Chicago Press, 1992), 46–53.

30. See, for example, Helmut König, Julia Schmidt and Manfred Sicking (eds), *Europas Gedächtnis: Das Neue Europa zwischen Nationalen Erinnerungen und Gemeinsamer Identität*, (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2008); David Lowenthal, 'Identity, Heritage and History', in John R. Gillis (ed.), *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 41–57.
31. Annika Brändström, Fredrik Bynander and Paul 't Hart, 'Governing by Looking Back: Historical Analogies and Crisis Management', *Public Administration* 82, 1, 2004, 191–210.
32. See Marie-Claire Lavabre, 'Memory and Partisan Identity: The Case of the French Communist Party', *European Journal of Political Research* 14, 1–2, 1986, 171–85; Marie-Claire Lavabre, 'Demokratische Identität und Erinnerung: Mikrosoziologie der Intergenerationellen Vermittlung', in Gesine Schwan et al. (eds), *Demokratische Politische Identität: Deutschland, Polen und Frankreich im Vergleich*, (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 2006), 317–58.
33. See, for example, Katherine Hodgkin and Susannah Radstone, *Contested Pasts: The Politics of Memory*, (London: Routledge, 2003); Konrad H. Jarausch and Thomas Lindenberger (eds), *Conflicted Memories: Europeanizing Contemporary Histories, Studies in Contemporary History* (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2007); Daniel J. Walkowitz and Lisa Maya Knauer, *Contested Histories in Public Space: Memory, Race, and Nation*, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009).
34. See Elazar Barkan, *The Guilt of Nations: Restitution and Negotiating Historical Injustices*, (New York/London: Norton, 2000); Berg and Schaefer (eds), *Historical Justice in International Perspective*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2008); Gonzalez Enriquez Brito and Fernandez Aguilar, *The Politics of Memory: Transitional Justice in Democratizing Societies*, (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press 2001).
35. See, for example, Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009); A. Dirk Moses, *German Intellectuals and the Nazi Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
36. See, for example, Richard Ned Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner and Claudio Fogu, *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, (Durham, NC/London: Duke University Press, 2006), esp. the introduction by Ned Lebow.
37. Anselm Strauss, *Mirrors and Masks: The Search for Identity*, (Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Press, 1997 (originally published by The Free Press 1959)), 168.
38. Roger Bastide, 'Mémoire Collective et Sociologie du Bricolage', *L'Année Sociologique* 21, 1970, 65–108, esp. 101. See also Jan Nederveen Pieterse, 'Hybridity, So What? The Anti-Hybridity Backlash and the Riddles of Recognition', *Theory, Culture & Society* 18, 2–3, 2001, 219–245.
39. Homi K. Bhabha, 'The Commitment to Theory', *New Formations* 5, 1988, 5–23, 18.
40. Homi K. Bhabha, 'Culture's in-Between', in Stuart Hall and Paul Du Gay (eds), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, (London/New Delhi: Sage, 1996), 53–60; Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2004) (1994).
41. Rina Benmayor and Andor Skotnes, 'Some Reflections on Migration and Identity', in Rina Benmayor and Andor Skotnes (eds), *Migration & Identity*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

42. Ien Ang, 'On Not Speaking Chinese: Postmodern Ethnicity and the Politics of Diaspora', *New Formations* 24, 1994, 1–18, 5.
43. Rüdiger Kunow and Wilfried Raussert (eds), *Cultural Memory and Multiple Identities*, (Münster: Lit, 2008).
44. Danièle Hervieu-Léger, *La Religion pour Mémoire*, (Paris: Cerf, 1993); Jacques Barou, *Mémoire et Intégration*, (Paris: Syros, 1993); Nicole Lapierre, *Le Silence de la Mémoire: A la Recherche des Juifs de Plock*, (Paris: Plon, 1989); Jocelyne Dakhli, *L'Oubli de la Cité: La Mémoire Collective à l'Épreuve du Lignage dans le Jérid Tunisien*, (Paris, La Découverte, 1990). Our thanks go to Michèle Baussant for drawing our attention to these works.
45. Andreas Huyssen, 'Diaspora and Nation: Migration into Other Pasts', *New German Critique* 88, 2003, 147–64, esp. 149.
46. For example, Vijay Agnew, *Diaspora, Memory and Identity: A Search for Home*, (Toronto/London: University of Toronto Press, 2005); Timuel D. Black, *Bridges of Memory: Chicago's First Wave of Black Migration*, (Evanston, Ill.: North Western University Press; London: Eurospan, 2003); Nathalie Huynh Chau Nguyen, *Memory Is Another Country: Women of the Vietnamese Diaspora*, (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2009). Also, several chapters in Elisabeth Boesen, *Migration und Erinnerung: Konzepte und Methoden der Forschung / Migration et Mémoire*, (Berlin: Lit, 2010); Julia Creet and Andreas Kitzmann, *Memory and Migration: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Memory Studies*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011).
47. John Urry, 'How Societies Remember the Past', in Sharon Macdonald and Gordon Fyfe (eds), *Theorizing Museums: Representing Identity and Diversity in a Changing World*, (Oxford/Cambridge: Blackwell, 1996), 45–65.
48. Sharon J. Macdonald, 'Museums, National, Postnational and Transcultural Identities', *Museum and Society* 1, 1, 2003, 1–16. This article was first published in a German edited collection that also contained a translation of Urry's chapter: Rosmarie Beier-de Haan, *Geschichtskultur in der Zweiten Moderne*, (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2000).
49. See, for example, Ian McShane, 'Challenging or Conventional? Migration History in Australian Museums', in Darryl McIntyre and Kirsten Wehner (eds), *National Museums: Negotiating Histories: Conference Proceedings*, (Canberra: National Museum of Australia, 2001), 122–33; Viv Szekeres, 'Representing Diversity and Challenging Racism: The Migration Museum', in Richard Sandell (ed.), *Museums, Society, Inequality*, (Abingdon: Routledge, 2002), 142–52; Sebastian Padmini, 'Mobilizing Communities and Sharing Stories: The Role of the Immigration Museum in One of the Most Culturally Diverse Cities in the World', *Museum International* 59, 1/2, 2007, 151–59; Katherine J. Goodnow, Hacı Akman, and the Museum of London, *Scandinavian Museums and Cultural Diversity*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008); Hanne-Lovise Skartveit and Katherine J. Goodnow, *Changes in Museum Practice: New Media, Refugees and Participation*, (New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2010). Also: Hintermann and Johansson (eds), *Migration and Memory: Representations of Migration in Europe since 1960*, see endnote 10.
50. Wolfgang Welsch, 'Transculturality – the Puzzling Form of Cultures Today', in Mike Featherstone and Scott Lash (eds), *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World*, (London: Sage, 1999), 194–213.

51. Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider, 'Memory Unbound', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5, 1, 2002, 87–106; Udo J. Hebel (ed.), *Transnational American Memories* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009).
52. See, for example, Sveta Roberman, 'Commemorative Activities of the Great War and the Empowerment of Elderly Immigrant Soviet Jewish Veterans in Israel', *Anthropological Quarterly* 80, 4, 2007, 1035–64.
53. Michael G. Kammen, *People of Paradox: An Inquiry Concerning the Origins of American Civilization*, 1st ed., (New York: Knopf, 1972).
54. Michael G. Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991).
55. John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).
56. *Ibid.*, 77.
57. Bodnar, 'Symbols and Servants: Immigrant America and the Limits of Public History', see endnote 24.
58. *Ibid.*; Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory*, see endnote 54, throughout part four of the book.
59. Baur, *Die Musealisierung der Migration*, see endnote 24. On Ellis Island see also Joachim Baur, 'Commemorating Immigration in the Immigrant Society: Narratives of Transformation at Ellis Island and the Lower East Side Tenement Museum', in Mareike König and Rainer Ohliger (eds), *Enlarging European Memory: Migration Movements in Historical Perspective*, (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2006), 137–46.
60. McShane, 'Challenging or Conventional? Migration History in Australian Museums', see endnote 49. See also Andrea Witcomb, 'Migration, Social Cohesion and Cultural Diversity: Can Museums Move Beyond Pluralism?', *Humanities Research* 15, 2, 2009, 49–66.
61. Ghassan Hage, 'Polluting Memories: Migration and Colonial Responsibility in Australia', in Meaghan Morris and Brett Bary (eds), *'Race' Panic and the Memory of Migration*, (Hongkong: Traces, 2001), 333–62.
62. Etienne Francois and Hagen Schulze (eds), *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte*, vol. I-III (München: C.H. Beck, 2001).
63. Jan Assmann, *Das Kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und Politische Identität in Frühen Hochkulturen*, (München: C.H. Beck, 1992), 155, quote translated by the authors.
64. See, for example, Dan Diner, 'Nation, Migration, and Memory: On Historical Concepts of Citizenship', *Constellations* 4, 3, 1998, 293–306; Xosé-Manoel Núñez, 'History and Collective Memories of Migration in a Land of Migrants: The Case of Iberian Galicia', *History & Memory*, 14, 1–2, 2002, 229–58. See also John R. Gillis, 'Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship', in John R. Gillis (ed.), *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 1–24.
65. See 'Ministère de l'Immigration: Première Crise, Premières Démissions', *Libération*, 17/5/2007, available at www.liberation.fr, accessed 30/5/2011. Also: Nancy L. Green, 'A French Ellis Island? Museums, Memory and History in France and the United States', *History Workshop Journal* 63, 1, 2007, 239–53.
66. See Mary Stevens, 'Immigrants into Citizens: Ideology and Nation-Building in the Cité Nationale De L'Histoire De L'Immigration', *Museological Review*

- 13, 2008, 57–73; Isabelle Vinson (ed.), *Museum International*, special issue on the Cité National De L'Histoire De L'Immigration Paris, 59, 2–3, 2007. On the imitative in the UK see Mary Stevens, 'Stories Old and New: Migration and Identity in the UK Heritage Sector: A Report for the Migration Museum Working Group', (London: Institute for Public Policy Research, 2009). Also, the project webpage, www.migrationmuseum.org, accessed 30/6/2011.
67. For example Eva Ettingshausen, 'Das Notaufnahmелager in Giessen als Ort der Erinnerung', *Spiegel der Forschung* 26, 2, 2009, 22–23; also: Das Online-Migrationsmuseum Rheinland-Pfalz, available at [www. http://lebenswege.rlp.de](http://www.lebenswege.rlp.de), accessed 30/6/2011.
68. See Hintermann and Johansson (eds), *Migration and Memory*, see endnote 10; Goodnow, Akman and the Museum of London, *Scandinavian Museums and Cultural Diversity*, see endnote 49; Philip Marfleet, 'Forgotten by History; Refugees, Historians and Museums in Britain', in Katherine J. Goodnow, Jack Lohman and Philip Marfleet (eds), *Museums, the Media and Refugees: Stories of Crisis, Control and Compassion*, (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2008), 17–29.
69. Jan Motte and Rainer Ohliger, 'Men and Women with(out) History? Looking for "Lieux De Mémoire" in Germany's Immigration Society', in Mareike König and Rainer Ohliger (eds), *Enlarging European Memory: Migration Movements in Historical Perspective*, (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2006), 147–60.
70. However, Claus Leggewie has suggested a model for memories for Europe as a whole which, not unlike the concept of memories in the United States, consists of several strands of memory or, as Leggewie puts it, of seven so-called circles of memory of which memories of immigration is one, see Claus Leggewie, 'A Tour of the Battleground: The Seven Circles of Pan-European Memory', *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 75, 1, 2008, 217–34.
71. Hintermann and Johansson (eds), *Migration and Memory*, see endnote 10.
72. Viola Georgi, *Entliehene Erinnerung: Geschichtsbilder Junger Migranten in Deutschland*, (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2003).
73. Tony Kushner, *Remembering Refugees: Then and Now*, (Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 2006).
74. Klaus Neumann, 'Oblivious to the Obvious? Australian Asylum Seeker Policies and the Use of the Past', in Klaus Neumann and Gwenda Tavan (eds), *Does History Matter? Making and Debating Citizenship, Immigration and Refugee Policy in Australia and New Zealand*, (Acton, ACT: ANU E Press, 2009), 47–64.
75. Klaus Neumann and Gwenda Tavan, *Does History Matter? Making and Debating Citizenship, Immigration and Refugee Policy in Australia and New Zealand*, (Acton, ACT: ANU E Press, 2009).
76. Nancy Foner and Richard Alba, 'Immigration and the Legacies of the Past: The Impact of Slavery and the Holocaust on Contemporary Immigrants in the United States and Western Europe', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 52, 4, 2010, 798–819.

Index

- Adorno, Theodor W., 215
 agency, 18–19, 54
 Ahern, Bertie, 182
 Alba, Richard, 17
 Algeria, 20, 87–101, 101 n 2, 103 n 27
 Algerian, 20, 87, 90, 93, 96–98, 101
 Algerian Europeans, 87, 88–89,
 92–98, 100, 103 n 27, 28, 29, 104
 n 37, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46, 47
 Algiers, 87, 89–90, 92, 94, 96–97
 America, Latin, 112–113
 America, *see* United States
 Anderson, Benedict, viii, 123
 Andrews, Kevin, 203
 Ang, Ien, 11
 Ashplant, Timothy, 53
 ‘Asian Teenagers’, radio programme,
 34, 36, 39–44
 assimilation, 3–4, 15, 91–93, 97, 100,
 144, 194–195, 225, 241, *see also*
 incorporation
 assimilation, return to, 207
 Assmann, Aleida, 15, 126 n 8, 177
 Assmann, Jan, 15
 asylum seekers, 16, 17, 21, 22, 139,
 146, 149, 154–167, 167 n 1, 168
 n 13, 169 n 15, 173, 174, 176,
 182–185, 202, 240, 242
 Australia, 7, 14, 17, 22, 189–208, 240
 Australia Day Committee, National
 (NADC), 196, 209, n 14, 210 n 34
 Australia Day Council, Federal
 (FADC), 194, 196
 Australian Bicentenary Authority
 (ABA), 197–198
- Balibar, Etienne, 163
 Balmer, Randall, 114
 Ban Ki-moon, 158
 Barou, Jacques, 11
 Bartlett, Frederick, 8
 Bastide, Roger, 10
 Batisah, Taufik, 222–223
- Bauböck, Rainer, 6, 239–240
 Baur, Joachim, 14
 Belgian Association for Polish
 Ex-Combatants (BVPO), 57–58,
 60–61
 Belgium, 19–20, 49–63, 240
 belonging, 4, 8–10, 12, 16–18,
 22, 23, 53, 71, 87, 140, 144,
 189–208, 215, 218–219, 224–225,
 237–238, 240–241, *see also*
 identity
 belonging, civic, 16, 191–192,
 194–196, 199–202, 204–208
 belonging, communal, 150, 191,
 194, 196, 198, 200–201, 204–205,
 207–208
 belonging, narratives of, 138, 147,
 151–152
 belonging, national, 6, 16, 190, 194,
 200, 216, 219
 belonging, political, 140, 190,
 196, 207
 belonging, territorial, 156
 belonging to place, 18–19, 141
 Benmayor, Rina, 69
 Berlin, 11, 19, 68, 70, 73, 76, 78
 Betts, Katherine, 204
 Bhabha, Homi, 10–11
 Bible, 109, 114, 118–119, 123, 132 n
 47, 160
 Biblical, 13, 20, 109, 114–115,
 117–118, 120–122, 124
 Birmingham, 34, 36–37, 42
 Birrell, Bob, 204
 Bodnar, John, 13, 238
 Boletsi, Maria, 215
 Bono, U2, 179
 borders, 12, 108, 112, 116, 119, 146,
 156–160, 163–166, 175, 176
 boundary, 12, 35–36, 53, 72, 110, 156,
 161, 221–222, 225–228
 Bourdieu, Pierre, 53
 Brimelow, Peter, 112

- Britain, 5, 11–12, 17–18, 33–34, 39–44, 49, 60, 112, 138–139, 144–145, 157, 177–178, 192, 197, *see also* United Kingdom
- British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), 12, 34, 37, 39
- Britishness, 152, 198
- Brown, David, 228
- Buchanan, Patrick, 112, 116, 122
- Burgess, Ernest W., 3
- Burrell, Kathy, 5
- Burrow, John, 34
- Bush, George W., 115
- Calhoun, Craig, 5
- Calvinist, 115
- Carey, Galen, 113, 117
- Castles, Stephen, 5–6
- Catholicism,
 - Catholicism, in Belgium, 17, 55–56, 60
 - Catholicism, Ireland, 175, 180
 - Catholic, anti-, 17, 113
 - Catholics, American, 113, 117, 118, 134 n 63
 - Catholics, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, 117
- Chicago School, 3
- Christianity, 13, 37–39, 44, 55, 111, 114–117, 119, 122, 124, *see also* Catholicism, Protestantism
- Christian heritage, U.S., 107, 123
- Chua Sian Chin, 219
- Chua, Tanja, 222
- citizen, 6–7, 9, 19, 22, 23, 35, 51–52, 59, 61, 74, 80, 88, 90, 92, 106, 116, 119, 195, 199, 201–205, 217–218, 221–222, 224, 226–228, 240
- citizenship, 5, 22, 49, 57–58, 66 n 43, 71, 81, 92, 108, 113, 118, 128 n 17, 135 n 76, 150, 159, 191–195, 198–207
- Citizenship Convention, 192–197, 206
- Citizenship Day, 201, 203, 205
- citizenship test, 22, 191, 202–205
- civil society, 50, 53–55, 156, 174, 196, 227
- class, 21, 33–37, 39, 45, 92, 122, 141, 144–145, 147, 151, 155, 190
- Cold War, 19, 50–52, 54, 56, 60, 63, 76, 111, 122, 240
- colonialism, 13, 144, 179
 - colonialism, settler, 189, 206
- Colson, Charles, 115–116, 134 n 63
- commemoration, 3, 14–15, 17, 22, 35, 56–58, 123, 173–174, 178–183, 190, 192–194, 196–198, 201, 206, 241
- Communism, 19, 35, 54–56, 59–60, 62–63, 111, 176, *see also* Soviet Union
- community,
 - community, cultural, ethnic, national, 5, 13, 16, 18, 33, 45, 68, 88, 100, 120, 123, 139, 146, 150, 190, 199–200, 202, 207
 - community, imagined, 7, 123, 137 n 93, 207
 - community, local, 33, 95, 98, 149, 150, 151, 155, 178, 192, 200–201, 205, 216
 - community, migrant, 18, 33, 40, 43, 44–45, 52, 77–79, 81–82, 144, 147, 180, 191, 196, 202, 215, 225
 - community, political, 9, 18
 - community, religious, 107, 109, 113–114, 119, 120–121
- ‘compassionate conservatism’, 133 n 54
- cosmopolitanism, 5, 89, 142, 146, 150, 175, 199, 216–218, 220, 224–226, 228
- Daipi, Hawazi, 214
- Dakhliya, Jocelyne, 11
- Daly, Mary, 179
- Darfur, 156–160, 163, 168 n 13, 14
- David, Simon Ben, 162–163
- Dayan, Yael, 159
- deportation, 108, 113, 118–120, 155, 157, 164
- detention, 117, 158, 166, 201
- diaspora, 11
- diaspora memories, 11, 33, 36, 101, 138, 180–181, 217

- Displaced Persons, DPs, 49–54, 56, 62, 96, 192
- diversity, 3, 5, 7–8, 13–15, 33, 83, 112, 152, 191, 196–198, 200–201, 205
- diversity, cultural, 10, 15, 18, 33, 106, 118, 125, 152, 192, 198, 206–207
- Dobbs, Lou, 115
- Doyle, Avril, 173, 180–181
- Doyle, Roddy, 179, 184
- Dunkerton, Ivor, 40
- Edensor, Tim, 225
- Edwards, James, 119–120
- Egypt,
 - Egypt, biblical, 106, 114–116, 118, 123–124, 163
 - Egypt, modern, 155–157, 159–160, 163–167
- Eley, Geoff, 35
- Ellis Island, 13–14
- emigration, 17, 22, 61, 77, 174, 176–178, 180–182, 185, 221, 240
- empire, 122
 - Empire, British Empire, 19, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42–45, 138, 199
 - Empire, Ottoman Empire, 76, 79
- England, 16, 33–40, 42–43, 45, 139, 144–145, 190, 198
- Erdmans, Mary, 52
- Esnault, Gaston, 96
- ethnicity, 5, 34–35, 50, 53, 71, 77–78, 81, 92, 140–141, 144, 162, 207
- Europe, 4–5, 7–8, 14–16, 20, 49–52, 55, 58, 60–63, 68, 88–89, 92, 98, 106, 108, 114, 142, 160, 173, 175, 177, 179, 183–185, 192, 239
- Evans, Chris, 205–206
- Evian Accords, 93
- exclusion, 6, 14, 23, 54, 111, 123, 144, 151, 173, 189, 208, 224, 225–226, 237
- exile, 20, 56, 59, 87–88, 90, 93, 95, 99–101, 173, 177, 179
- family reunification, 113, 118, 120, 132 n 45, 137 n 92
- famine, 17, 22, 173–183
- First Fleet, 22, 189–191, 194, 197–198
- First Polish Armoured Division, 49–51, 54, 56, 58, 62
- First World War, 55, 57, 72, 76, 78
- Foner, Nancy, 17, 122
- ‘foreign talent’, Singapore, 217–218, 224–225
- ‘foreign worker’, Singapore, 23, 214, 217–218, 223–225
- Foster, Roy, 177
- France, 6, 15, 20, 49, 87–88, 90–95, 97, 99–101, 240
- Francis, Samuel, 122
- Fraser, Malcolm, 197
- free enterprise, 111
- Freeman, Gary, 5
- Fromentin, Eugène, 89
- Geldof, Bob, 179
- generation, 3–4, 72–73, 78, 80, 100, 106–107, 109, 113, 154, 177, 182, 193, 197, 219, 227–228
- generation, second, 35, 37, 52, 142, 144–145
- Gennep, Arnold Van, 89
- geopolitics, Cold War, 54, 63
- geopolitics, Israel, 156, 158, 159, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167
- Georgi, Viola, 16, 68, 240
- German, 14–15, 55, 68–69, 71–73
- German-Turkish, 68–69, *see also* Turkish-German
- Germany, 6, 14–15, 49, 55, 68–83, 155, 184–185
- Gilroy, Paul, 33
- Goh Chok Tong, 220–222
- Great Britain, *see* Britain
- Great Irish Famine, 147, 176, 180
- Habermas, Jürgen, 5
- Hage, Ghassan, 14
- Halbwachs, Maurice, x, 8, 54, 69, 80, 126 n 8
- Hall, Stuart, 34–38, 43
- Heimat*, 76
- Henry, Jim Douglas, 40
- heritage, 4–5, 7, 9, 11–13, 33, 101, 107, 114, 117, 123, 146, 150, 158, 193–201, 203–204, 206–207, 216, 220–222, 225, 227–228, 231 n 39

- Hervieu-Léger, Danièle, 11
 Hintermann, Christiane, 5
 Hiro, Dilip, 34–36, 38, 40, 44
 Hirst, John, 204
 History Wars, 189
 Hollifield, James, 6
 Holocaust, 68, 74, 78, 157–159, 184
 Holt, Harold, 193
 Homet, Marcel, 96
 homogeneity, 6–8, 15–16, 21, 34, 50,
 120, 141, 148, 150–152, 177, 191,
 207, 225
 hospitality, 113, 117–118, 123, 183
 Howard, John, 203
 human rights, 113, 155, 165, 167
 Hunter, James D., 121
 Huntington, Samuel, 112
 Huyssen, Andreas, 11
 Hwang, Jenny, 116–117
- identity, 10, 12, 18, 35, 40, 43, 76,
 88, 98, 116, 120, 122–123,
 138, 163, 191
 identity, Asian in Britain, 12,
 34–37, 39–40, 42–44, 143, 240
 identity, *bricolage* of, 78, 93, 100, 107
 identity, ethnic identity, 42, 79, 81
 identity, hybrid, ix-x, 11, 19, 88,
 138, 142
 identity, national, 13, 14–16, 34,
 42–43, 69, 76, 81–83, 109–111,
 123, 155–156, 162, 181, 194, 198,
 203, 215, 216, 224–225, 237
 identity, politics of, 7, 10–11
 ideology, 215, 226
 ‘imagined community’, *see*
 community
 Immigrants,
 immigrants, illegal /
 undocumented aliens, viii, 13,
 108, 110, 113–114, 118–120, 125
 n 6, 139
 immigrants, new, 6, 59, 112, 122,
 138–139, 141–142, 152, 192, 196
 immigration,
 immigration, anti-, 107, 132 n 45
 immigration, hostility about, 96,
 143, 147, 149–150, 161, 175,
 183–184
 immigration, policy, 22, 59, 108,
 110–112, 120, 123, 125 n 6, 149,
 151, 154, 192
 immigration country, 7, 12–16,
 195, 240, 242, *see also* ‘nation of
 immigrants’, U.S.
 immigration history, 3, 14, 117, 174,
 194, 197
 imperialism, 36, 38, 41–42, 179
 imperialism, anti-, 39, 145
 inclusion, 6, 23, 23 n 3, 54, 123, 191,
 200, 208, 222, 225–226
 incorporation, 3–10, 13, 17–23, 23
 n 3, 50, 52–54, 56–60, 62–63,
 66, 142–143, 189–196, 198–202,
 205–208, 218, 223–228, 237–238,
 240–242, *see also* assimilation
 ‘infiltrator’, 154–156, 159–160,
 162–167
 International Migrants Day, 214
 International Refugee Organisation
 (IRO), 49, 51–52
 Ireland, 17, 22, 140, 142–143, 173–185
 Irish, 22, 142–145, 185
 Israel,
 Israel, biblical, 20, 114, 116–118,
 122–124
 Israel, modern, 16, 21, 154–167, 240
 Jewish, 16, 21, 80, 123, 142–143, 155,
 157–163, 166–167, 175
 Jews, 74–75, 78, 89–90, 111, 124, 143,
 155, 162, 173
 Johansson, Christina, 5
 Judaism, 37
 Justice, 70, 78, 114, 118
 justice, historical justice, 70, 74–75,
 78, 80–81, 181, 189
 justice, injustice, 17, 68, 70
 justice, social justice, 18, 35
- Kaczynski, Edmund, 57–58
 Kammen, Michael, 13
 Kansteiner, Wulf, 120
 Kastoryano, Riva, 4, 6
 Kennedy, Liam, 189
 King, Steve, 119
 Kong, Lily, 227
 König, Mareike, 52

- Kurdish, 75, 77–78, 81–82, 176
 Kurdish-Turkish conflict, 83–84 n19
 Kurds, 71, 75, 78, 83–84 n 19
 Kushner, Tony, 17
- Lammy, David, 33
 Land, Richard, 118–119
 Landsberg, Alison, 15
 language, 39, 43, 61, 72, 101, 112,
 116–117, 144, 150, 159, 192, 206
 Lapid, Shalev and Yosef, 158
 Lapierre, Nicole, 11
 Lee, Terence, 227
 Lee Hsien Loong, 223–224, 228
 Lewkowicy, Romm, 157
 liberalism, 40
 liberalism, neo, 146
 Lieux de Memoire, 14
 London, 16, 20, 36, 138–152
 London-Downham, 21, 138,
 146–152
 London-Kilburn, 21, 138, 142–147,
 149, 151–152
 Long, Paul, 37
 ‘long-term settled’, 138–140, 142,
 144, 152
 Lukacs, John, 37
- Macdonald, Sharon, 12
 Macedonian, 70–73, 77, 81–82
 Maier, Charles, x
 Mann, Itamar, 154
 Mark, Emily, 180
 Massey, Doreen, 141
 McCain, John, 125 n 6
 McShane, Ian, 14
 Mediterranean, 87, 95–96
 melting pot, 97, 100–101, 207
 memory,
 memory, civic, 191–196, 199–202,
 204, 206–208
 memory, collective, x, 8, 11, 54, 69,
 80, 100, 107, 109, 120, 122–123,
 126 n 8, 154, 156–157, 161,
 166–167, 205
 memory, cultural, 7, 12, 15, 22, 191,
 194–198, 200–207, 215
 memory, political, 10, 190–192,
 197, 207
 memory, politics of memory, 4,
 9–10, 16, 154, 167, 191
 memory, social, 3–4, 8, 14, 50, 177,
 216, 226, 237–238, 240
 memory, transcultural/
 transnational, 12, 15
 memory, vernacular, 177
 memory politics, 9, 16, 51, 196, 215
 Memory Studies, viii, 4–5, 7–8,
 11, 15–16, 50, 52, 120, 123, 124,
 207–208, 237, 242
 Migrant Workers Centre (MWC),
 214, 223
 migrants, *see* asylum seekers,
 immigrants, refugees.
 migration, *see* emigration,
 immigration
 Migration Studies, 4–7, 10, 50–53,
 237, 242
 Miloe, Yiftach, 160
 Minkenberg, Michael, 107
 Modood, Tariq, 33
 Mohammed, Prophet, 79
 Moore, T. M., 115
 Mosaic law, 115
 Motte, Jan, 15, 68
 multiculturalism/multiculture, 4–6,
 8, 10, 14–15, 44, 68, 112, 122,
 138–139, 142–146, 191–192,
 196–198, 200, 202, 206–207
 museum, 5, 11–14, 16, 33, 106,
 180, 241
 Museum Studies, 11–12, 15
 Muslims, 37, 89, 93, 97, 137 n 92, 202
 myth, 6, 10–11, 38, 43, 46 n 4, 91,
 94, 100, 106, 111, 122, 137 n 91,
 155–156, 159, 180, 204, 215, 238
- Nair, Parvati, 215
 Narrative, 20–21, 34, 40–41, 44, 50,
 53, 55–56, 61–63, 69, 73, 81,
 109, 110, 121, 138–142, 147, 149,
 151–152, 177, 204, 238, 240
 narrative, belonging, *see* belonging,
 narratives of
 narrative, meta-, 122–123
 narrative, national, 6, 36, 54–55,
 106, 110, 122–124, 124 n 3, 138,
 204, 215–216, 219, 225–226, 228

- 'nation of immigrants', U.S., 130 n 27,
see also immigration country
- National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), 113, 117
- National Council of the Algerian Revolution, 94
- National Famine Monument, Ireland, 180–181
- national origin quotas (U.S.), 125 n 7
- nationhood, 43
- Naturalisation Ceremony, 193, 206
- Nazis,
 Nazis, contemporary, 74–75
 Nazis, historical, 43, 54–56, 60, 68–69, 75, 78, 80, 155, 159
- Neumann, Klaus, 17
- New Left, 34–37, 39, 41, 45
- New York, 238–239
- New York Times, 3
- Noiriel, Gérard, 14
- Nora, Pierre, 14, 90
- Notting Hill Riots, 35
- O'Donoghue, John, 183
- O'Flynn, John, 225
- Ohliger, Rainer, 15, 52, 68–69, 240
- Olmert, Ehud, 158, 164–165
- oral history, 11, 35, 140, 178
- origin, 12–13, 15, 19, 40, 71, 79, 90, 93, 96, 98–101, 113, 120, 147, 150, 165, 189–190, 194, 197–198, 200–201, 203
- O'Sullivan, John, 112
- O'Toole, Fintan, 184
- Panayi, Panikos, 5
- 'parallelizing histories', 81
- Paris, 15, 89
- Park, Robert E., 3
- Parker, Charles, 34–42
- Pelegrí, Jean, 101
- Penn, Shira, 154
- 'pieds-noirs', 95–96
- pilgrims, 89
 Pilgrims, U.S., 20, 114–115, 122–123
- place, spacial, 3, 19, 34, 72, 76–77, 80, 139–153, 219–220, *see also* Displaced Persons
 place, belonging to, 72–74, 79, 141, 143–144, 146, 152, 203
 place, narratives of, 20–21, 95, 138–139, 141, 152
- Plittim, Anu, 154
- Poland, 49–50, 56, 58, 60
- Powell, Enoch, 35, 42–43
- Protestantism,
 Evangelicals, 20–21, 106–109, 113–124, 126 n 9, 127 n 12, 128 ns 17, 21, 129 n 23, 24, 132 n 47, 133 n 54, 135 n 76, 83, 136 n 89, 137 n 92
 Family Research Council, 136 n 83
 'Focus on the Family', 135–136 n 83
 Liberty University, 118
 Prison Fellowship, 115
 Southern Baptist Convention, 118
- Qadir, Anwar, 43
- Rahman, Mizanur, 217
- Rantell, Kathleen, 40
- Raousset-Boulbon, G. de, 88
- Reagan, Ronald, 111
- re-enactment, 198, 200
- Refugee Convention, UN, 175
- refugees, 17, 21–22, 49, 52, 56, 58–60, 96, 99, 114, 118, 139, 146–147, 154–167, 167 n 1, 174–176, 178, 180–183, 188, 201–202
 refugees, Sudanese, 21, 155–158, 160–162, 165–166
- religious freedom, 113
- remembrance, 15–16, 54, 123, 218, 223
 remembrance, gestural, 226–228
- Renan, Ernest, viii, 106
- republican movement, Australia, 199–200
- Republican Party, U.S., 107, 121, 125 n 5
- Reynolds, Gillian, 39
- Rifman, Shmulik, 163
- Robb, Andrew, 202–203
- Robinson, Mary, 179–181
- Roman Empire, 72
- Rosenberg, Iris, 158
- Rouso, Henry, 6

- Rubio, Marco, 110, 130
 Rui-en, actress, 222
- Said, Edward, 37, 43
samsui, 219, 231 n38
- Second World War, 12, 19, 49, 54–58, 60–62, 72, 74, 76–77, 140, 143, 157, 166, 175, 190, 191–192
- Shalev, Avner, 157–158
 Shetrit, Meir, 159
 Shwartz, Eithan, 156, 158
 Sikh, 37, 44
 Singapore, 17, 23, 214–229
 Skotnes, Andor, 11, 69
 Smith, Andrea, 100
 social cohesion, 6, 8, 18, 21–22, 45, 112, 122, 138–141, 152, 206
 Soerens, Matthew, 116–117
 song, 90, 178, 214–229
 song, national, 17, 23, 215–216, 218, 222, 224, 228, 231 n 35
 song, ‘Reach Out for the Skies’, 222–223
 song, ‘The Fields of Athenry’, 178
 song, ‘This is My Land’, 218–219
 song, ‘Where I Belong’, 222
 South Asian, 12, 33–36, 43, 44
 Soviet Union, 49, 54
 Statue of Liberty, 13
 Staver, Matthew, 118–119
 Steiner, Niklas, 185
 Strauss, Anselm, 10
 Sudan, 154, 158
 Suleiman, Susan R., 53
 Sword, Keith, 52
- Tampa Affair, 201–202
 Tavan, Gwenda, 17, 204
 Tel Aviv, 155, 157, 159, 160
 The Benelux Circle, 56–60, 62
 Thompson, E. P., 35
 Turkey, 19, 52, 68, 71, 76–81, 176
 Turkish, 68, 71, 73, 76–77, 79, 82
 Turkish-German, 69, *see also* German-Turkish
- United Kingdom, 15–17, 138–140, 183, 185, *see also* Britain
 United States, 3, 6, 13, 15, 20, 37, 52, 106–124, 124 ns 3, 7, 176–177, 181, 198, 202
 Urry, John, 11–12
- Valera, Éamon de, 178
 Velayutham, Selvaraj, 218, 221
- Welsch, Wolfgang, 12
 White Australia Policy, 190, 194, 196, 198–199, 201
 Williamson Jr, Chilton, 111
 Willis, E. A., 195
 Wispé, Lauren, 185
 Woodham-Smith, Cecil, 178
 workers, foreign, 160, 164
 World War One, *see* First World War
 World War Two, *see* Second World War
- Yad Vashem, 157–158
 Yadgar, Yaacov, 216
 Yeo Guat Kwang, 223
 Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim, 123

