

HISTORIANS WITHOUT BORDERS: THE USE AND ABUSE OF HISTORY IN CONFLICTS

UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, 19-20 MAY 2016

CONFERENCE REPORT



SUPPORTED BY



IN COOPERATION WITH



CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	1
Historians without Borders in Finland: What, why and how	2
Opening Words.....	4
2. Keynote Speeches.....	6
Bernard Kouchner: History and Memory.....	6
Margaret Macmillan: Using History to Understand the Present.....	9
Ibrahim Gambari: United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Trends and Lessons Learned	12
Romila Thapar: Historians as Public Intellectuals.....	14
Peter Turkson: The Role of History in Reconciliation and Peace Mediation	20
3. Workshop Discussions.....	22
Power, Diplomacy, Revolution or Society in Modern Mediterranean History?.....	22
Writing a Common History for Israel and Palestine.....	25
The Presence of History in East Asia: Why Can't Bygones Be Bygones?.....	27
1917 in Finnish and Russian Historiography.....	29
Colonial History or History of Colonialism.....	31
Turks and Armenians, 1915 and after.....	37
4. Further Work of Historians without Borders	41
Closing Plenary.....	41
Media Summary.....	45

1. INTRODUCTION

History continues to play a role in conflicts. Therefore, what can historians do to prevent the abuse of history for political purposes? These were the main themes of the conference organised by Historians without Borders in Finland 19-20 May 2016 at the University of Helsinki in Finland. About 300 participants from the fields of history, politics, diplomacy and education, among others, gathered to consider the uses and abuses of history as well as to establish an International Network of Historians without Borders.

The conference programme provided various perspectives that succeeded at gendering thorough discussion. The response from the participants was overwhelmingly good and the idea behind Historians without Borders was welcomed with enthusiasm. The conference also attracted considerable media attention both in Finland and internationally. As a result of a fruitful discussion and some new ideas in the final session, proposed declaration establishing the international network was unanimously adopted and the members of its coordinating committee were nominated. The declaration was signed by almost all the conference participants and is now open for signing by historians wanting to join the network.

The following will present a summary report of the conference and its results. It will consist the proceedings from the final session and the formal declaration as well as reports from all individual sessions prepared by the moderators and their rapporteurs. In addition, a summary of the media visibility will be included.

HISTORIANS WITHOUT BORDERS IN FINLAND: WHAT, WHY AND HOW

Historians without Borders in Finland (HWB) was founded on 17th June 2015 in Helsinki. It was founded upon the acknowledgement that in today's world we should be increasingly concerned about both ignorance and the abuse of history in politics, as well as of the consequences of these to international relations. Ignorance fosters abuse and abuse fosters conflicts. Historical myths are used to create and sustain enemy images and justify aggressive policies. Different views and interpretations of history and historical events often contribute to the perpetuation of conflicts.

Yet historians can also contribute to mediation and conflict resolution. International organisations and governments should welcome and support independent and international research. They should foster contacts between historians from all countries, and encourage them to work together in defusing conflicts involving facts and interpretations of historical events. Historians can build cross-border understanding by bringing together different parties' perceptions and interpretations of such events.

Historians without Borders in Finland believe that the time has come for independent historians in all countries to come together and place their knowledge and experience at the service of efforts to prevent and solve internal and external conflicts, and post-conflict management. Historians can and should be used as experts in helping mediation by bringing the views of opposing parties closer to each other.

From the beginning, HWB in Finland got a supportive response. Among the founders were almost all prominent Finnish historians as well as diplomats with mediation experience. The founding meeting was also addressed by Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, President Martti Ahtisaari, who recalled the numerous times during his career when additional knowledge about history would have aided a conflict-resolution process. There is a clear need for making such information more visible and easily accessible.

As its official objectives, HWB in Finland aims to

- promote and deepen general and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of history;
- promote open and free access to historical material and archives;
- promote interactive dialogue between different views and interpretations of history to bring closer diverging views of the course of historical events;
- support efforts to impede the abuse of history to foster conflicts or to sustain enemy images and distorted myths, and to contribute to the use of history in defusing and resolving conflicts.

HWB seeks to achieve these objectives by organizing public and expert discussions, participating in general debate in the media, carrying out research and publishing on the theme as well as by taking part in different conflict-resolution processes.

Immediately after its foundation, HWB in Finland started to develop international contacts. Through meetings and extensive correspondence with historians and other interested actors in many countries, the grounds were built for establishing an international network of Historians without

Borders. The wide interest expressed at the global level encouraged HWB in Finland to carry on its work.

The good response also sparked the idea of organising an international conference in order to gather interested parties together to further discuss the objectives and activities of the initiative and to establish the international network. Such an event was considered necessary in order to form an understanding about overall expectations directed at the eventual network. The realisation of this plan was made possible as funding was granted from the Jane and Aatos Erkkö Foundation in Finland.

OPENING WORDS

Prepared by: Ms. Emma Hakala

The conference “Historians without Borders: The Use and Abuse of History in Conflicts” was opened up 19 May 2016 by Mr. Erkki Tuomioja, the Chairman of Historians without Borders in Finland. In his short address, he pointed out that history is always present in our lives, influencing and guiding our actions, whether we acknowledge it or not. Yet we are living in times when ignorance of history is growing, with less understanding of how we have arrived at where we are today.

Living with history is not always easy and history is the cause of many past, ongoing and undoubtedly also future conflicts. Yet Tuomioja pointed out that ignorance of history or forgetting it does not make it disappear or harmless. On the contrary, it leaves the door open to the many ways of abusing history.

Therefore, Tuomioja stated, the time has come to ask what historians themselves can do not only to prevent this misuse but to put their knowledge and experience to positive work in the service of conflict prevention, resolution and mediation. The conference was organized with the idea to agree on the founding of the International network of Historians without Borders, which indeed had already been the ambition when Historians without Borders in Finland was founded last June.

With this, Tuomioja wished the participants a good conference and introduced the following speaker, Nobel Prize Laureate, President Martti Ahtisaari.

Reflecting on his own experiences from conflict resolution, President Ahtisaari observed that different interpretations of history are strongly present in every peace mediation process. Conflicting parties usually have contrasting views about historical events and these may end up escalating and maintaining conflicts. Yet at present, history as a whole is too often sidelined, manipulated and even ignored in conflict resolution.

President Ahtisaari saw many uses for the expertise of historians in conflict resolution processes. For one thing, they could be involved more in actual negotiating tables, bringing in useful perspectives and setting the current problems into their historical context. While it may not always be possible to address all the past wrongdoings and crimes in one negotiation process, and it may be necessary to look past some difficult questions, it is important to be aware of their influence in the background. This also is the only way to ensure that the wrongdoings are dealt with at a later stage and that the peace agreement includes a mechanism for addressing the past in a constructive way.

Historians could also provide impartial analysis for the use of conflict resolution and prevention, presenting past mistakes and successes. Seeking for the truth, in past or present, can sometimes be a risky profession and therefore should not be taken for granted. In addition, analysis can show which factors that have been crucial for building democratic societies. President Ahtisaari pointed out that Finland has often been seen as an example of a country which recovered from a painful civil war in 1918, reunited to fight during World War II and has since experienced fast development into a wealthy European nation.

Finally, an initiative Historians without Borders could foster and take part in public discussion on history in forums where fact-based and impartial information is most needed. The misuse of history

is not something that has only happened in the past. Instead, it continues to take place and may be especially harmful in the fast-paced media environment of today.

President Ahtisaari concluded by emphasizing the need to address the root causes of conflict in all mediation processes. Inequality remains a crucial factor, as the lack of opportunities leads to frustration and anger. Successful conflict resolution must therefore always result in a better future for everyone.

2. KEYNOTE SPEECHES

BERNARD KOUCHNER: HISTORY AND MEMORY

Moderator: Dr. Teija Tiilikainen

Rapporteur: Ms. Eeva Innola

The first Historians without Borders –seminar session tackled real examples from conflict areas and from mediation efforts through experienced speakers. Key note speech was given by Mr. Bernard Kouchner, co-founder and former president of the Nobel Peace Prize winning Doctors without Borders. He has over forty-years of experience from humanitarian work in conflict zones. After the key note speech Ms. Elisabeth Rehn gave her commenting speech and remarks and a panel discussion followed with both of the speakers. The session was chaired by Dr Teija Tiilikainen, director of the Finnish Institute of International Affairs.

“Welcome to the big family of Sans Frontières!”, Mr. Kouchner, the co-founder of Médecins Sans Frontières started his speech to the historians. The Historians without Borders -conference is an important meeting since history interacts in all fields. It is important and fundamental to assure that there is this interaction with history also in conflict resolution and in peace mediation. History means something to everyone, from policy makers to civil societies. Mr. Kouchner has served as a Minister for Foreign Affairs of France but he said that it was not the place where he learned history or diplomacy or the place where he learned to understand the world. You can learn some of that, a tiny bit from books but it is the 40 years of humanitarian field work where he learned his invaluable lesson on diplomacy and saw the use and abuse of history in conflicts.

Mr. Kouchner told that he learned the best lesson in history by taking risks, venturing out to countries that were not familiar, by confronting ideas that he did not share, by reaching out to people who were not necessarily friends and by offering medical help to people he was politically opposed to.

Mr. Kouchner was involved in founding the Médecins Sans Frontières in 1971, in the aftermath of the horrific Biafran War. In the beginning the organization faced difficulties. It was nearly impossible then to treat patients on the other side of a border, as by law the doctors were not able to treat people in other countries. So they fought for changing the law. Mr. Kouchner stated that sometimes to change the history; you have to change the law.

Theoretical lesson is not enough for learning about human being, Kouchner underlined. Human beings are made of flesh and blood but there is more to that. Humans are a mix of culture, national identities, history and above all they are of different backgrounds. Humans are made of roots and dreams and to put that in another words; humans are made of history and the hopes for future. Understanding the role of history is essential. And that is why historians are essential in understanding the world. In the same way understanding the world is essential in understanding history.

Mr. Kouchner addressed meanings of history and borders. History is not a privilege, it is not only a property of historians, he said. Through his experience Mr. Kouchner has been able to grasp the ambiguity of the lines that divide and shape our world. Borders are important. First of all, in democracy borders are the framework in which sovereignty is exercised. Small states need their

borders to signify their independency. Borders can be a privilege to a nation; they can be a signal and symbol of freedom. But sometimes this is an illusion. In creating and understanding borders history is more needed than geography. Borders can have many other meanings as well, and not all of them positive. Borders can be mental or physical. Borders can lead nations to misfortune, generate oppression and block freedom. Mr. Kouchner has been a witness to many of such tragedies. He has seen with his own eyes what terrible acts have been done in the name of borders.

Mr. Kouchner praised the very important idea of the Historians without Borders organisation. The role of historians in peace mediation is too weak. The role of historians in preventing a war has been non-existent. Historians are coming only after the war. Mr. Kouchner pointed out that during his years involving peace mediation efforts, not a single historian played a role as a historian. But, understanding history and histories behind a conflict could be a beginning for understanding the culture, a starting point for laying the grounds for mediation. Mr. Kouchner wanted to paint a realistic picture for this work and for the Historians without Borders -organisation. He wanted to underline that there will be difficulties. "You will face a lot of conformist people!", he said. As, did Médecins Sans Frontières in the beginning. Opposition came also from other medical doctors, people from the same profession. "Well, after the Nobel prize, it got a bit easier", Kouchner noted.

"Good luck my friends!", Mr. Kouchner sincerely wished for the Historians Without Borders.

PANEL

The chair of the panel, Dr Teija Tiilikainen, director of the Finnish Institute of International Affairs launched the panel session by noting that history is open for several interpretations and historical memory can be a powerful tool.

The commenting remarks were given by Ms Elisabeth Rehn, former Finnish Minister of Defence and former UN Undersecretary-General and special UN Rapporteur for Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

History is just unfortunately too much about wars, Ms. Elisabeth Rehn started her remarks. Of course it is the "winners" who write the history. History is so very important but what do we remember when looking back to history lessons at school? Ms. Rehn took a moment to memorize her high school period: "It is the dates, dates and battles that I remember: 732 Battle of Poitiers, 1742 the Battle of Bloody Marsh, 1066 the Battle of Hastings... What does these dates and battles really mean to us, ordinary people?" Ms. Rehn pointed out that she is not a historian nor a researcher, but rather a person who ended up in places where history was made. And this experience gave her views on histories relating to wars and conflicts. But not only, it also gave an understanding on how deeply rooted and meaningful certain histories are to the local people.

Ms. Rehn experienced this especially during her work as a United Nations Special Rapporteur on Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina. There it really struck her how tangible the role of a certain historical memory can be: "Local people asked me that don't I remember the battle of Kosovo? Of course I do, but it was 600 years ago! (1389)" That is when Ms. Rehn realized how meaningful this centuries old event still was, how much it still mattered to the people. From her very first visit to Kosovo in 1995 she learned the importance of that particular battle for the situation of the former Yugoslavia today. Every discussion, from ordinary people to worst war criminals to policy makers

started from describing that battle, the Battle of Kosovo, on whose side they were and so forth. And only after this half hour of history discussion – the mediation talks could begin.

As history, the ways it is told, is so deeply rooted, the way history is taught at schools is highly important. After her experiences in the usage of history in conflicts in the Balkans, Ms. Rehn tried to influence exactly this, the school system. But she found it extremely difficult. Ms. Rehn sees the future in the younger generation. Fortunately, young people are more forward-looking, she stated. Even though history has to be remembered, the younger generation does not want to carry resentment about it.

Another important view that Ms. Rehn emphasized, was the role of women, both in history and in conflict prevention. Women have usually been the lesser group in history writing and same applies in conflict resolution. Now the importance of women in conflict prevention and peace mediation has been acknowledged. One example of this is the UN resolution 1325 that is striving further in this acknowledgement.

We have to bear in mind the role of history and the long shadow of historical memory also in post-conflict peace building. Ms. Rehn finds it irritating that, when a war ends and international organizations step into that conflict-driven area and just advise the local communities to bury the hatchet: “Now, act like friends and forget the past!”. Even though houses are ruined and gardens might be full of land mines. It is not working like that, Ms. Rehn reminded us. She underlined that we need to give time for the local communities to start the healing process.

DISCUSSION

In the following discussion with the audience, the question of justice in dealing with sensitive historical memories was raised. It was pointed out that it takes time to get over feelings of injustice in the past. It is difficult to create lasting peace without addressing the experienced injustice. The panelists agreed. Ms. Rehn has been a witness for issues of justice and injustice. She said that achieving justice can bring some relief to the survivors of war crimes for example, and these projects can be helpful for the life after the conflict. Mr. Kouchner also agreed that there is no peace without justice. But he emphasized strongly the importance of conflict prevention: “Justice comes only after the peace that comes after the war. We should try to prevent the war in the first place!”.

MARGARET MACMILLAN: USING HISTORY TO UNDERSTAND THE PRESENT

Moderator: Oula Silvennoinen

Rapporteur: Suvi Kansikas

History is important and it can give us tools to understand the present were Professor Margaret MacMillan's main arguments in her keynote speech "Using History to Understand the Present".

We can read every day in our newspapers how history is used and abused. As an example, MacMillan referred to the intense debate in the UK on Brexit, the referendum on whether the UK should remain in or leave the European Union. During the campaigning references have been made to Dunkirk. The latest misuse of history occurred when London ex-Mayor Boris Johnson brought up Hitler as a proof that there have always been people in Europe who try to dominate others – the EU being another recent example.

Professor MacMillan underscored that it is the obligation of professional historians to warn against this kind of misuse of history. History is and should be debatable, but it is not a competition and it is never the truth that could be used by one side or the another as evidence.

History gives tools to understand how the world and our society became what it is today. In the first instance, it is a tool to understand ourselves, because we are the products of our own experiences, inheritance and inherited attitudes. We must first learn to understand ourselves and where our attitudes come from before we can understand others, what they remember, what they have experienced and what motivates them. We want to tell a story about ourselves, and we want that story be good. But we also need to understand how other see us, and for this, history is a very good tool to do this.

MacMillan pointed as an example to current Russian foreign policies, which cannot fully be understood without understanding recent Russian and Soviet history. The country suffered hideous losses twice in the wars of the 20th century and the Russian people saw their country humiliatingly lose its superpower status at the end of the Cold War. The Russian population largely supports the government's foreign policy and it is due to the experiences the Russians have endured and their hopes of getting some compensation.

However, the assumptions that we make about the society and ourselves might be false. According to MacMillan, people have the habit of thinking that the ways we do things in the present are normal, and moreover, are the best ways to do things. This is a wrong assumption. And wrong assumptions may lead to erroneous decisions and bad politics. There are countless examples of a situation in which there have been clever decision-makers who have had access to a lot of information and who have been provided with intelligent advice, and they still have made bad decisions. Her own example concerns the path leading to the First World War. At the time, leading politicians, the military, diplomats, all thought that the next Great War would be short because the economy could not support a long war. The few voices that argued differently were shunned.

History therefore should teach us humility: we should understand that we do not know everything and that someone else might be right and we might be wrong. What history also teaches us is to ask good questions. It does not give answers, nor blue prints for future. What it does is it shows

warning signs: what might come afterwards if we continue on this road, with these policies, make these decisions. Thus, history offers alternatives. It shows that there have been other ways to organise the society and decide on issues. It shows ways to see and do things differently.

Macmillan tells us to question whether there have in the past been similar situations as we find today. What decisions were made at the time? How did they turn out? What alternatives were discarded and why? Her example is about globalization. It is taken today for granted that globalization as we know it will continue forever and produce continuous benefit for the mankind. Yet, during the decades before the onset of the First World War, there can be found similar tendencies as we see in our world today: there was a broad antipathy towards immigrants, little sympathy for the displaced persons, racism and right-wing populist national movements were on the rise. There also was a rise of new rising powers and the hegemony of the time, Great Britain, was not as powerful as before, and not as capable to maintain its power. How were the rising powers, Japan and Germany accommodated a century ago and how successful was it?

The other major thing history can give for the present, is to help challenge dominant myths. This is also another of the historians' obligations. MacMillan raised one particularly dominant narrative, that of the clash of civilizations -argument. This should be challenged because a clash between civilizations is by no means inevitable.

History is international, it doesn't stop at the borders. The history of the European civilization starting with the Roman Empire is a history of movement of ideas, people and goods. It has been interconnected with other civilizations and it is constantly created. A civilization is not a bloc that collides with others; it assimilates otherness. History should stress the way ideas travel and how the world is interconnected. For example, any Italian would claim tomato sauce to have always been part of Italian cuisine, but in fact, tomatoes were foreign to all Europeans before the New World was found in the 16th century.

Therefore, what we consider as the norm should be questioned. As history tells us, things haven't always been this way. We should see that the present is more complicated, we should understand that the past is more complicated, and we should know that the future is also more complicated than we assume.

In the panel discussion Professor Jussi Hanhimäki, from the Geneva Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies and Professor Jan C. Behrends from Potsdam Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung gave their remarks on the theme, both largely concurring with Professor MacMillan's points and arguments.

Professor Hanhimäki pointed out that history is concert of disagreements, as there always will be different interpretations of events and of their meaning and interpretation. Therefore, historians will need to engage also with the public memory. The historians' task is to fight against ingrained, false, ideas about the past. However, the second point he made was that professional historians are not very fitted for giving advice, or providing tools on how to make judgements and decisions. They have been part of the nation-building process, working in state-funded universities, where their task has been to discover a collective past. This is one area where the profession could still do more. One way historians can be of service to the present-day policymaking is to offer analogies. Not in the sense of giving a straightforward oversimplified analogy but by offering alternatives. History

teaches us that nothing is inevitable. Thirdly, he pointed out that history gives us tools to see beyond our own narrow perspective. Professor MacMillan concurred with Hanhimäki that analogies are tools for thinking, but never guidelines for action.

According to Professor Jan C. Behrends, the profession of history, for example in his country, is too attached to the nation: historians write a national narrative from a national perspective. They have yet to overcome the borders, and they need to take more interest in the international, transnational and the comparative. He pointed out that the cultural turn perhaps depoliticised the discipline too much. It brought with it many new perspectives, topics and methods, but it took the focus away from others. For instance, East European area studies saw interest and funds drastically cut as the emphases on Russia's post-socialist development and the post-Cold War order seemed to suggest the reduction of tensions in the region. In the present-day return of tensions since 2014, history is both a discipline and a tool to understand the region.

Behrends gave two examples from his own country on how knowing the past is necessary for breaking historical myths. The first one concerned Germany's position during the recent refugee crisis and the second one was the surprising, to outsiders, lack of German solidarity on the Euro-Maidan protests in Ukraine. On the first issue, one needs to acknowledge recent German history, which is a history filled with replaced people, and a country that had its capital city divided into two by a concrete wall. The Second World War may have been forgotten in other parts of Europe, but it and its legacies are still part of the German identity. The Germans' lack of solidarity for the Ukrainians, on the other hand, had its base in how the public memory has been remembering and invigorating the myth about the year 1989. 1989 was a peaceful revolution; people went to the street to protest peacefully making the leadership give up its power. This myth has been so powerful that people have totally forgotten that typically revolutions are violent.

IBRAHIM GAMBARI: UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS: TRENDS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Moderator: Ms. Katri Kulmuni

Rapporteur: Ms. Eeva Reittilä

Ibrahim Gambari is the former Minister of External Affairs of Nigeria and has served as the Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations. He has also acted as the Chairman of the United Nations Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and Special Adviser to the Secretary-General of the United Nations among many other positions at the UN.

Mr. Gambari emphasized in his keynote speech that peacekeeping has really become a principal tool of the UN in maintaining international peace and security. However, the concept and conduct of peacekeeping in the UN have significantly evolved over time. He admitted that there have been some notorious failures amongst the past operations.

"While the United Nations Peacekeeping operations have adapted to changing international political environment and indeed have contributed significantly to the successful resolution of conflicts such as in Namibia, Mozambique, Sierra Leone and Liberia, there have also been conspicuous failures such as the Mission in Bosnia and UNAMIR in Rwanda."

Ambassador Gambari also pointed out that UN peace operations are often deployed in an environment where there is little or no peace to keep in the first place. The spread of violent extremism and the scourge of terrorism, overlaid onto long-simmering local or regional conflicts and the growing aspirations of populations for change, is placing pressure on governments and the international system to respond to these challenges.

"There is a clear sense of a widening gap between what is being asked of UN Peace Operations today and what they are able to deliver", Mr. Gambari said.

He acknowledged that with a current generation of conflicts proving difficult to resolve and with new ones emerging, it is essential that UN peace operations, along with regional and other partners, combine their comparative advantages and unite their strengths in the service of peace and security.

Professor Helena Ranta, who reflected on Ambassador Gambari's keynote speech, raised up the recent allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA), made against UN peacekeeping troops - the most egregious ones emerging from the MINUSCA mission in the Central African Republic. Mrs Ranta pointed out that the cases of SEA in peacekeeping missions are seriously undermining the work of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations in many mission and have clearly pointed out the absence of an effective accountability mechanism.

Despite existing UN policies to prevent SEA in UN peacekeeping missions, recent allegations bring to light the failure by the UN and Troop Contributing Countries (TCCs) to prevent occurrences, but also to effectively report, investigate, bring perpetrators to justice, and provide adequate assistance to victims. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has proposed implementing a 'naming and shaming' policy in order to tackle the problem. The policy would allow the Secretary-General to disclose in his future reports to the UN General Assembly "country-specific information on the number of credible allegations being investigated by Member States". This was done for the first

time earlier this year, despite earlier resistance from TCC's in the General Assembly's Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations. A naming and shaming policy had already been proposed in 2005 by then Ambassador Zeid of Jordan.

Ambassador Gambari expressed his strong concern on the recent allegations, which according to him, have earlier been silenced. He expressed his implicit support to the Secretary-General's proposal on establishing a naming and shaming policy, as well as to the enforcement of an absolute zero tolerance on SEA in all UN peacekeeping missions.

Under the current legal framework, the UN depends on TCCs in holding their military members accountable for any criminal misconduct on missions. To allow a peacekeeping operation to function independently, both civilian and military peacekeepers receive immunity from the jurisdiction of the state in which the operation is situated.

Major General Juha Kilpiä (ret.), second member of the panel following Ambassador Gambari's speech, underlined the need to pre-train troops in employing sensitivity on missions. According to him, peacekeeping troops need to know where they are acting. This requires an understanding of local history and traditions in order to be part of the solution, not part of the problem. He emphasised that this aspect is taken seriously into account when training Finnish troops.

ROMILA THAPAR: HISTORIANS AS PUBLIC INTELLECTUALS

Moderator: Dr. Emilia Palonen

Rapporteur: Mr. Taavi Sundell

Historians have multiple roles. One that has been taken up in varying degrees has been that of public intellectuals. On the one hand it has been a national task, but the intellectuals have been collaborating with others across the borders. The praxis of the intellectuals has been transnational – sometimes more, sometimes less. The aims have been national or transnational, even universal. Being an intellectual is a public activity, in the context of conflicting perspectives and stories, to provide different readings of the matter to the wider audiences. Sometimes these may have been simplifying stories that have served political purposes.

The keynote was by the professor emerita Romila Thapar from Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU) author of many books on the topic and the classic *History of India* (1966). She is also one of the authors of the *Public Intellectual in India* (2015). She is an Honorary Fellow at the Lady Margaret Hall (Oxford) and SOAS (London). She is an engaged intellectual, not afraid to challenge conventional views with academic research.

The commentators were Dr. Marja Jalava, Senior Lecturer in Political History at the University of Helsinki, and the leader of the Academy of Finland funded project *Asymmetries in European Intellectual Space* (2012–2016), who has explored Nordic scholars and also specializes on university history; and the Rector of the University of Tampere, Liisa Laakso, a scholar of development studies who has focused on failed states and African politics, and the experience of tackling with the current Finnish government that has introduced funding cuts to the universities. The discussion was moderated by Dr. Emilia Palonen, Senior Lecturer in Political Science at the University of Helsinki, who has focused on democracy, populism and politics of memory in Hungary, and is an engaged public intellectual.

It was an all-female, multi-generation panel. The rapporteur was Mr. Taavi Sundell, a doctoral researcher at the University of Helsinki working on university policy in Finland and Jordan, and the global academic commons.

Keynote lecture: Romila Thapar: Historians as Public Intellectuals

Followed by a panel discussion

Panellists: Dr. Marja Jalava, University of Helsinki

Prof. Liisa Laakso, Rector of the University of Tampere

Moderator: Dr. Emilia Palonen, University of Helsinki

ROMILA THAPAR

According to Thapar, the historians of today need to recognize that they have a role to play in society as public intellectuals. This disallows them from retiring comfortably to an ivory tower and instead requires them to encounter fraudulent histories— often related to particular nationalisms, religions, languages, ethnicities, and dominant groups —claimed as history in order to bolster up specific political ideologies. Historians also have to protect history as a discipline. This has to be

done not only via established scientific channels, but also by analyzing the socio-economic contexts of particular events in order to educate the public on how historic scholarship can be differentiated from popular fantasies about the past.

On Thapar's view, fraudulent histories serve the politics of identity, a type of politics very common today. The basis of nationalism can be found from the construction of a new community with a shared past reflected in shared history and culture. The interdependence of history and nationalism is therefore very close, history being a major source of identity. Using colonial India as an example, Thapar discussed in her presentation the colonial reconstruction of history whereby existing local interpretations of the past were set aside by colonial scholars, and new communities were imagined within the discourses of the latter.

Colonial scholarship encountered identities and their systems of stratification, such as those based on the cast system, and a multiplicity of religions and religious sects distinct from the ones found in Europe at the time, but found it convenient to replace these with monolithic religious groups, two of which were viewed as prominent: Hindu and Muslim. The middle-classes of the colonies later on internalized these constructions of the colonial powers and came to accept religion as being the main marker of their identities and religious groupings as the natural protagonists of history.

The colonial interpretation of India's past was intended to support colonial policies and was premised in large part on theories of two nations, and the Aryan race. In reality, it was the interest in establishing a secular democracy that actually encouraged the largest and the most effective nationalism within India, the secular anti-colonial nationalism. However, in the 1920s these two other theories gave rise of subsidiary nationalisms rooted in religious extremism which have since come to play a central role in the contemporary politics in South-Asia. These communal nationalisms have supported the theory of two nations and used religion as their identity, the enemy being not the colonial power, but each other, today known as India and Pakistan.

However, the role of cast—ignored by these colonial histories—came back to haunt reality, it being a force transcending religious identities and breeding more fierce confrontation between different casts than has taken place between religious groups. Still, even while reading this situation in an erroneous manner through the colonial lenses, the colonial interpretation found its way into the existing nationalisms based on religious identities. As pointed out by Thapar, history became to be viewed as a millennial conflict between Hindus and Muslims each with their own utopians.

After independence in 1947, it was assumed that secular history—articulating Indian as the main identity instead of Hindu or Muslim—would prevail, since secular anti-colonialism had spearheaded the movement for independence. However, at present, Hindu Nationalism is carrying forward the colonial interpretation of Indian history, silencing minorities and those who question the histories supporting the establishment of religion-based states. The irony in all of this was pointed out by Thapar: popular histories going back to the colonial gaze are now being proclaimed as indigenous histories and opposing academic histories are being dismissed as imitations of Western history and their proponents labelled as Marxists or Commies.

Historians in India have therefore had to defend their work from religious extremists and the antipathy felt towards intellectual liberalism. However, as argued by Thapar, this state of affairs is not confined to India alone and can be found from other countries as well, the issue therefore being

that of how to protect the right of historians to research and publish what they deem as relevant. Weighing in on the current situation in India, Thapar told the audience that the situation is not hopeless regarding the publication of research, but as for what is being taught to students, the situation is more severe. The pattern is recognizable from many contexts: it begins with specific changes in school text-books, after which the next step is the curriculum for graduate and post-graduate studies becoming controlled by central governmental authority and made to be applied in a uniform manner in all universities.

Thapar pointed out that many ex-colonial societies are experiencing today acute political and intellectual confrontations in the name of a variety of nationalisms emanating from an understanding of history as developed by the colonial scholars (and challenged by post-colonial scholars). When history gets enmeshed in such a manner with identity politics, the historians have to differentiate between analytical history and narratives that fantasize the past, and be prepared to explain the differences between the two. Moreover, historians have to be able to explain the birth, existence and transformation of differentiated religious and cultural forms found in societies in a way which is sensitive to the spaces these have created and the identities they have constructed. Such explanations also have to be able to reach the public in order to make it more knowledgeable about the processes that go into the making of such formations.

By way of a conclusion, Thapar listed out examples of historical baggage that historians, as public intellectuals, have to be able to unpack, such as questions relating to border disputes and the role of cartography has played in these; the role of religious organizations in the past as well as in the present, and the different relationships these have manifested towards the state; and civilizations as containers of histories transcending and eroding the imagined hermetic borders of these civilizations. In Thapar's words, we are today faced with the question of what to do with the grand narratives of nationalism and civilization? Whose history are we defending?

LIISA LAAKSO

According to Laakso, Thapar's presentation clearly pointed out that one of the most important roles for intellectuals in societies is to provide new concepts for discussion. Through these concepts it becomes possible to open up discussion on dominance and power in society, and to provide tools for the future. Historical understanding is of high importance for both of these processes. As for dominance and the way in which, for example, religious identities are being used in politics, it is not so much a question of beliefs or worldviews, argued Laakso, as it is about marking communities and making distinctions between us and the others. In other words, religion is being used in an instrumental fashion in such cases for political purposes. As for writing of history and traditions, Laakso referred to historians working on Africa who have introduced a distinction between two publics, civic and primordial, and the ways in which the nationalist movements reflected different discourses and moralities, both with regard to the Western liberal struggles and the primordial familial discourses. With these conceptualizations it has become possible to open up new ways of analyzing and debating African nation building experiences. As an example, Laakso reflected upon discussions dealing with the so-called invention of tradition. She proposed that more important than the theory *qua* theory was the concept in itself and the debates it enabled concerning, for example, authenticity and ethnicity. Finally, Laakso pointed out that history is also an important tool for the future. We do not know what the future will look like, but if we think about mobility in

contemporary globalized societies and, for example, the role of diasporas, the current borders can be questioned and imagined anew, and here historical knowledge has a role to play.

MARJA JALAVA

Jalava begun by taking up the issue of school text-books and curriculum as battlefields for political hegemony, and connected this to the question of the need of a public intellectual to have an educated public. Without this, in Jalava's words, good enough public, the intellectual is confined to a monologue and cannot reach a meaningful dialogue with her audience. Until recently, argued Jalava, historians in Finland have been blessed with an educated public. However, the cutting down of teaching of history in Finnish upper secondary schools makes her worried. In the future, if this trend continues, as depicted by Thapar, we will open up the door to wild fantasies and narratives which have little to do with actual empirical evidence of the past. Paraphrasing an idea according to which everyone can be an artist, Jalava made what she labelled as a utopian claim according to which everybody should be a public intellectual, i.e., everybody should be able to make a critical contribution to the society, and for this reason, we need to maintain a basic level of education in history.

ROMILA THAPAR

On the issue of new concepts, Thapar pointed out that it is also a question of making people understand that it is necessary to have new concepts and that the way in which knowledge advances is not just about repeating the old concepts that are already there. In other words, the role of education is not to give information to the students but to teach them how to think, a role which India's education system is performing poorly according to Thapar. As argued by her, knowledge advances, or should advance—static knowledge is an absolute failure of a society. Therefore, the invention of new concepts is an important process and a one in which the public intellectuals have an important role to play in, as well as to investigate and explain the ways in which concepts can evolve as they travel in time from one context to another.

As for the invention of tradition, Thapar noted that there is often a tendency to oppose tradition with the present day, and see the former as baggage passed over unchanged from one generation to another. However, tradition itself is a historical process, argued Thapar, in the sense that the idea of a tradition itself changes as does the (invented) contents with which it is filled with. Using rituals such as Independence Day parades as an example, Thapar highlighted the ways in which these are often initially iterations of traditions found from other locations but which then through repetition become to be seen as tradition proper. In order to understand the different purposes different traditions can serve, argued Thapar, one must always understand the contexts within which they were invented and why they were invented. Another related concept brought out by Thapar was that of heritage—what is heritage? What do we select from the past as we clearly are not repeating the past as a whole? This is a historical process with each new generation making its own selections and interpretations, and according to Thapar, it is this process which has to be understood and historians as public intellectuals can contribute to this task as well.

On the issue concerning the need for an educated public, Thapar sympathized with those worried about the marginalization, or at times even the removal of education of history. Reflecting on the

Indian situation on this matter, Thapar described it as one of marginalization of reliable history and the replacement of reliable history by fantasy. Concluding by comparing a total history of a society with an individual biography, and seeing these two as serving the same purpose since we read them to understand the society/individual in question, Thapar agreed that the question of defining a public and getting into a dialogue with it is extremely important. However, she ended her comments with the following question: how do you get into a dialogue with a public?

EMILIA PALONEN

Taking up the contemporary Hungarian context where a re-emergence of historical writing has taken place offering multiple points of identification and contestation for the members of the public, Palonen asked what should a public intellectual do in a situation such as this where history has become very fragmented, polarized, and sub-culturalized?

ROMILA THAPAR

For Thapar, this is a situation where historians have a significant role to play—a situation where history is being used for purposes other than the advancement of knowledge. It is extremely important for the historians to realize what the public debate is about, but unfortunately very often they do not. A historian can go on living in her ivory tower producing esoteric knowledge without entering the debate, but however, argued Thapar, a historian is never out of the debate since whatever new ideas, theories and concepts one comes up with, they have an impact on the person whose reading them. They have an impact on the public, and hence one has to not only explain to the public what they are doing but also to be clear about the reasons why they are doing it, and why it is important not only to historians themselves but also to the public. The responsibility of the historian to intervene in such a manner to public debates is something that Thapar wanted to underline very strongly.

LIISA LAAKSO

Laakso pointed out that historians, as well as members of other disciplines, have to also disseminate their research to the public and at times there might be powerful forces who do not accept certain kinds of interventions. These are situations where the international intellectual community should step in and support these scholars. As an example of this kind of support Laakso mentioned the Scholars at Risk –network.

AUDIENCE

As well as inventing new concepts, it is also important to revisit the old ones. There seems to be a tendency within social sciences these days to too quickly dismiss the concept of nationalism on the grounds that it is archaic, primordial, and so on and so forth. By doing so, we are repeating the discourse of globalization which is a discourse of capital. Capital does not want nation states, capital does not want borders. It wants free movement. Therefore, when we are despising nationalism, we are forgetting that a nation state is *the* agent for many sub-altern populations. They have to wage their struggles through the nation state, and make their claims to the nation state. So, how about inventing concepts such as popular nationalism, people's nationalism or sub-altern nationalism rather than just dismissing nationalism?

ROMILA THAPAR

Thapar agreed that there are not many states in which you can dismiss nationalism in a hurry. It is still very much there. Talking about the situation in India and the conflicts between secular and religious nationalism, one dare not say I will not talk about nationalism. Even if you want to distance yourself from its manifestations, you still have to study it and engage with it. At the same time, however, it is important to explain to the public that we also have new concepts, explain their difference to the old ones, and argue why they are more appropriate when we think so. As for globalization, one has to look what it is doing also within nation states and weigh in each particular instance its pros and cons.

PETER TURKSON: THE ROLE OF HISTORY IN RECONCILIATION AND PEACE MEDIATION

Moderator: Mr. Pekka Haavisto

Rapporteur: Ms. Emma Hakala

In his key note speech, Cardinal Peter Turkson focused on the interconnections between memory, history and religion, and the role these play in peace mediation. He first recalled the old saying that it is the winners who write history, and suggested historical interpretations may therefore be open to revisions and corrections. These may, in some cases, even be necessary in order for people to live together in a peaceful way.

History is a part of the evolution of religion, and vice versa. Historical events become memories that provide a source for morality, thereby also becoming a reference point for religion. These are further represented by monuments and historical remnants, which occupy an important place in our cultures. The question therefor is to what extent this constant presence of history and religion can be used to contribute to peace-building.

Cardinal Turkson continued by going through several examples of the work the Catholic Church has done to promote peace and conflict-prevention. In particular, he mentioned the Second Vatican Council between 1962-65, which in many ways aimed to redefine its approach to its history. Crucially, this also coincided with the independence movements in several African countries. Consequently, in the early 1960's, Pope John XXIII turned the eyes of the Church towards the issue of development. This also incorporated the challenges that were facing the de-colonialized new nation-states in Africa.

Following this, Pope Paul VI redefined peace as development, but also pointed out the development is not possible without a peaceful environment. This put the development of the newly independent African states at the very center of the concern of the Catholic Church. However, at the same time it made it important for the Church to reconsider its relationship to the history of colonialism.

In the time of Pope John Paul II, the Catholic Church also revisited its relationship to Galileo and set up a council to reconsider the role of his theory with regard to the teaching of the Church. Similarly, the Church opened a discussion about the history of the Inquisition, which eventually led the Pope to ask for pardon from those who had been caused to suffer in the history of the Church. These examples, among others, show how the Catholic Church has, in different ways, revisited memory and history in the name of reconciliation and peacebuilding.

Cardinal Turkson emphasised that the historian has a responsibility not to be influenced by any kind of partisan thinking or later ideological views, thus applying current values to events that took place in the past. Instead, the historian should aim to look at the truth of what has happened and integrate this into the understanding into human life and society.

Meanwhile, the conditions for revisiting the past may be risky and accompanied by certain kinds of pitfalls. Cardinal Turkson suggested some useful criteria that may contribute to a constructive reconsideration of history. For one thing, there is a need to recognise past misconduct, promise not to repeat it, and to repair the damage that arises from it. Responsibility is a big issue with regard to this. The evil of an act often outlives its perpetrator and may become a heavy burden on the

descendants. Therefore, asking for forgiveness may sometimes be the only way to achieve peace and understanding within a community. However, reciprocity is not always possible, and therefore both the initiatives and forgiveness may sometimes have to be unilateral.

There are some dangers that need to be avoided when revisiting the past in order to achieve reconciliation. Firstly, it cannot be based on judgement or self-righteousness, especially in the part of the offender. Secondly, reparation should not be the only goal of reconciliation; otherwise it may only end up maintaining bitterness within the community.

Finally, Cardinal Turkson emphasised the importance of dialogue and education as necessary conditions enabling the use of history in a society in a positive way that promotes reconciliation and peace. Whether in schools, communities or even within families, it is only through listening to each other that we can overcome the burdens of history and proceed with our lives to the future.

The lecture of Cardinal Turkson was followed by a discussion with the Mr. Eamonn Gilmore, the former Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade of Ireland, moderated by Mr. Pekka Haavisto, the former Minister for Environment and Development of Finland. Mr. Gilmore drew on his experiences from the peace reconciliation processes in Northern Ireland and Columbia, stressing the importance of understanding history in both cases.

In particular, he noted that a tendency not to talk about history because it is seen as too difficult or painful only leaves it to be abused by those who wish to use it for negative purposes. For example, in Northern Ireland, official commemorations of Irish independence and other events that eventually led to conflict have very strongly attempted to reflect the various sides of history and its interpretations, thereby rather including than excluding any group. He argued that, in order to use history for reconciliation, what we need is more history, better history and shared history.

Mr. Haavisto asked the panellists if there perhaps sometimes are situations where there is too much history, thus fostering conflicts from very distant past. For example in the Balkans the recent different sides of the wars in 1990s used history from the battle of Kosovo Polje, which took place as far back as 1389.

In such cases, according to Cardinal Turkson, history is used as an excuse to justify certain goals and objectives and therefore simply misused rather than being over-abundant. Mr. Gilmore agreed, emphasising that we cannot change history but we can try to understand it better and learn from it. Whether concerning reconciliation or anything else, the way we choose to use history is the key.

3. WORKSHOP DISCUSSIONS

POWER, DIPLOMACY, REVOLUTION OR SOCIETY IN MODERN MEDITERRANEAN HISTORY?

Moderator: Dr. Pertti Ahonen

Rapporteur: Dr. Melina Rokai

The workshop was attended by approximately 40 people in a tightly packed seminar room. It was opened by Dr Pertti Ahonen, Professor of General History at the University of Jyväskylä, who welcomed the participants and introduced the two speakers: Dr Rinna Kullaa, the leader of the five-year RUSMED-project funded by the Academy of Finland and a visiting Professor at the Centre d'Histoire at Sciences Po in Paris, currently on leave from a tenure-track position in Global History at the University of Tampere, and Dr Leyla Dakhli, Director of Research at the CNRS in Paris, presently leading the working group on Migration, Territories and Societies at the Marc Bloch Center in Berlin.

Dr Rinna Kullaa opened her presentation by referring to the interplay of the keywords in the workshop's title, explaining that she understood the seemingly open-ended title as a way of asking questions about the general, current situation in the Mediterranean region. Dr Kullaa highlighted the frequent appearance of the area in the media, stressing the tendency of commentators to read the history of the area in a way that projects their opinions on the future of the region. She further stressed that such a practice leads to a reading of the politics of the Mediterranean basin through the 'bad guy/good guy' dichotomy. Dr Kullaa also explored the body of historiography pertaining to the issue, singling out the understanding of the Mediterranean region as three spaces (the 'Maghreb', the 'Balkans', and the 'Middle East') that communicate with each other, while also indicating that the historiography of the region might not be sufficient for understanding the current migration crisis that the region is facing. She sees the remedy in a different approach that would include several aspects: rethinking the history of the Balkans as a part of the Mediterranean and taking into consideration that the ex-colonial states had their own histories, irrespective of colonialism. This would entail a shift away from the current understanding that focuses on the colonizing powers conquering and ruling the former colonies. As the second aspect of the new perspective on the region, Dr Kullaa emphasized the need for an awareness of the fact that the newly established states there were not ideologically fixated on the idea of the nation state, thus acknowledging the importance of their search for more equality with the ex-colonisers. The third aspect that needs consideration, according to Dr Kullaa, is the legacy of violence in the region, which gets passed on from one set of circumstances to another. Reflecting on the use of the term 'revolution' in the title of the workshop, Dr Kullaa maintained that the history of the region has to allow for the persistent influence of Russia/the Soviet Union.

Dr. Leyla Dakhli highlighted the necessity of looking at the Mediterranean space and its current situation from the perspective of the late Ottoman Empire, i.e. that of an empire that had been built in a different way than those of 19th century Europe, thus offering a perspective focused on the view of the people inhabiting the space. In line with this outlook, Dr Dakhli emphasized the need to

reframe the Mediterranean space by 1) deconstructing the earlier interpretation of the space, which was defined by discourses centred on a division between the Western European and the Arab worlds. She further emphasized other ways in which this reframing could be carried out: by 2) studying networks that look beyond spaces of departure, transit and arrival, by understanding new social movements as well as by 3) examining the role of actors and agencies functioning in the region and their confrontations so that individual and collective experiences can be mapped. When discussing the Mediterranean world in relation to borders, Dr Dakhli argued that studies of the established borders of the post-Ottoman world do not explain how the people of the area related to them, and that it is essential to think beyond the official borders of the states carved out from the remnants of the Ottoman Empire. Referring further to the interplay between society and power in the Mediterranean, Dr Dakhli emphasized how our current confrontation with migration and our understanding of the Mediterranean Sea as a border need to be revised by viewing the Mediterranean as a material space, particularly as a space that has also witnessed significant reverse migrations from Europe to North Africa, especially in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Dr Dakhli concluded by underscoring the possibility of using the idea of 'non-successful' pasts for assessing the situation of the region today.

In the discussion that followed, Dr Kullaa's and Dr Dakhli's views on the interplay between power, society, revolution and diplomacy in the Mediterranean region inspired a lively and constructive debate, which brought forth new ideas for re-interpreting Mediterranean history and further enriched the arguments offered by the two panelists. H.E. Mr. Ibrahim Gambari, former Minister of External Affairs of Nigeria, gave valuable input into the discussion by commenting on interconnections among the forces mentioned in the panel's title. He reflected on how the Mediterranean basin turned from a source of intellectual ideas into a notion that symbolizes an 'us' versus 'them' outlook and highlighted the role of the Sahara desert as a source of division. Dr Dakhli connected these comments to her view that a historian following migration through history needs to go where the people go, stressing, for example, how migrants departing from countries south of the Sahara stopped their journey in sub-Saharan countries, thus creating a different trend from the often dominant narrative that focuses on migrants from southern Africa who came to stay in northern Africa. She further accentuated how existing interpretations also result from power relations within Africa and are connected to perceptions of the 'whiteness' of North Africa.

H.E. Ms. Tiina Jortikka-Laitinen from the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and a former ambassador of Finland to Tunisia stressed the need to acknowledge the multi-layered historical legacy of Tunisia. She emphasized this by elaborating on her experiences in advising post-'Arab spring' Tunisians, who desired to implement the political transition process in their own way, which drew on earlier periods of Tunisia's history.

Additional constructive input included the suggestion that the logic of the great powers needs to be taken into account when studying the history of the Mediterranean region. The importance of writing a synthetic history of the region was also emphasized, especially in view of the title of the panel, which highlighted the fragmented nature of existing research on the area.

H.E. Mr. Mohammed Ariad, the Ambassador of the Kingdom of Morocco to Finland, highlighted the necessity of taking into account Moroccan historical influence on the Mediterranean region as yet another perspective on Ottoman influence in the area, particularly since the way in which these two

empires (the Ottoman and the Moroccan) acted in the region resembled a 'gentlemen's agreement', whereby the Moroccan empire stretched its influence into the depths of the African continent. He further emphasized the non-monolithic character of the 'Arab spring' experience and also offered the valuable observation that in past migrations to North Africa, which were motivated in good part by the construction of the infrastructure there, Morocco was a destination country.

The panel and the discussion were brought to an end with a lively discussion of the Sahara desert and its role as a borderline, thus stretching the space of Mediterranean historical experience even further.

WRITING A COMMON HISTORY FOR ISRAEL AND PALESTINE

Moderator: Prof. Hannu Juusola

Rapporteur: Dr. Riikka Tuori

Various channels of media, public opinion, and academic institutions reproduce two contradicting narratives about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, each with its own set of myths and conflicting views of the past – both heroic and catastrophic. Israeli Palestinian Professor Mahmud Yazbak (University of Haifa) and Israeli Jewish Dr Jonathan Furas (Tel Aviv University) discussed the need for more inclusive narratives as a crucial step in conflict resolution, the impact of the so-called New Historians on the Israeli historical consciousness, and the urgent need for co-operation between international academic community and Israeli and Palestinian historians.

Mahmud Yazbak's presentation outlined his research project on Haifa, the lively and diverse port city in northern Israel. Written in co-operation with Israeli Jewish and Palestinian scholars, the work appeared as a microhistory of the city (*Haifa Before & After 1948 – Narratives of a Mixed City*, 2011) and examined the impact of the establishment of the state of Israel on the individual lives. Trying to overcome past distortions and provide fresh ground for reconciliation, each chapter of the book is jointly written by an Israeli and Palestinian scholar. The work represents one of the few successful cases of mixing two narratives in the Israeli academic context. Yazbak also outlined a number of problems the group had had in writing the work. Some Israeli Jews, for instance, left the project, which, in their view, resulted in interpretations that were too much against their own historical narrative of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Further, some critical questions were left basically untouched due to conflicting interpretations. It appears that microhistory is the area where joint projects can be carried out easier than in some other fields of historical research.

In his presentation, Jonathan Furas introduced the main features of Hebrew and Arab education systems during the British Mandate for Palestine (1920–1948). Arab and Jewish children attended separate schools with separate curricula, were taught in different languages, and treated differently by the British colonial rule. The ostensible lack of dialogue between the two systems produced an intriguing paradox. While Jewish and Arab pedagogues put forth their own national agenda and perceived the other side as an imminent threat, the separate systems in fact developed into two sides of the same organism contributing to the same vicious circle that has never abated.

In the following discussion, the audience was interested in the Israeli school system and in the way textbooks depict historical narratives to schoolchildren. Yazbak argued that after 1948 the Israeli education system has only become more segregated. The Arabic-language track is guided by Israeli educational principles, whereas much of the Palestinian history and geography are absent from officially endorsed textbooks. He suggested that both Palestinian and Israeli narrative become part of the Israeli curricula; the Arab track of education in particular needs more than the Israeli version of it past. Furas added that Jewish children learn little about the Arab history. Textbooks fail to depict Palestinians as individuals but rather represent them as "the other". Pictures and stories about everyday-life in Arab communities are absent, and many central topics of the conflict, the status of the West Bank and Gaza or refugee camps, are marginalized. Moreover, lessons of Arabic as the second official language of Israel are not sufficiently offered for Hebrew-speaking students. Although Arab children in Israel tend to learn Hebrew relatively well, Jewish students encounter Arabic only

as a minor language. Many young Israelis learn Arabic thoroughly in the army as the language of the “enemy”, instead as the language of their fellow citizens. Both panellists criticized the lack of daily contact between young Arabs and Jews due to the separate school tracks. The first contacts between Arab and Jewish students are established at college age, too late for closer bonds to develop. Yazbak pondered whether friendships formed between schoolchildren could offer yet unexplored routes for a peaceful resolution of the conflict.

The audience asked about the role of the New Historians (as part of the Post-Zionist trend) in the shaping of historical narratives at Israeli universities and among the general public. New Historians based their research on Israeli archives opened to the scholars in the 1980s. Researchers such as Ilan Pappé and Avi Shlaim have since challenged the standard versions of Israeli historiography by bringing forth previously silenced topics, most prominently the Israeli role in the birth of the Palestinian refugee problem. Furas commented that New Historians did reach some of their goals in the Israeli academic setting, and many of their views have remained valid in subsequent historical research. For example, before the Post-Zionist revelations, the *Nakba* (“Catastrophe”) of 1948 as a critical historical event in Palestinian consciousness was invisible in the Israeli media. Recently, however, politically hardened attitudes in Israeli society have left less space for academic questions about the officially promulgated views of the past. Furas associated the shift in the atmosphere to the slow demise of the peace movement since the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin in 1995. Consequently, most high-ranking New Historians have ended up working in foreign universities outside Israel.

An important part of the debates was the question whether a historian needs to share some basic elements of the national narrative in order to have her views accepted in a society. Those arguing in this line maintained that total rejection of a national narrative alienates a historian from her society. Others, however, pointed out that through breaking national myths highly critical historian may also play a role in accelerating change. In any case, historians may also have an impact on the historical narratives when other factors, such as a general political atmosphere, is supportive of rethinking of the past.

The moderator Professor Hannu Juusola inquired about the role international academic community could have in facilitating future projects and contacts between Israeli and Palestinian scholars. Both Furas and Yazbak acknowledged the difficulty of joint initiatives. Often fraught with bitter debates and intercommunal complications, they remain rare in Israeli academia. The type of research conducted by Yazbak – producing microhistories and examining private life from multiple perspectives – must be endorsed because they may provide more inclusive and compassionate narratives, as well as new platforms for genuine encounters between scholars. Both panellists argued that historians should continue to challenge and reshape historical narratives. As noted by Yazbak, Jewish and Arab scholars must work together as equals and remain in constant dialogue. The panellists agreed that fruitful co-operation between Israeli and Palestinian historians in the international arena may offer a more balanced view of the past and hope for reconciliation in future.

THE PRESENCE OF HISTORY IN EAST ASIA: WHY CAN'T BYGONES BE BYGONES?

Moderator: Dr. Jyrki Kallio

Rapporteur: Mr. Teemu Naarajärvi

This panel was organised jointly with the Finnish Institute of International Affairs (FIIA). The moderator started the panel by noting how the history in East Asia seems to be providing grounds for rising nationalism, and asking if this has always been the case or is it merely a post-WWII issue. Moreover, how was it possible that while the political tensions run high, the complementary economies have resulted in increasing economic interdependence among countries stuck in political disputes?

First speaker, Professor Nakano gave a presentation titled "The Challenges of Reconciliation in the Neoliberal Age." Marking how there has been now 70 years since the end of the WWII, the current East Asia is experiencing an increasing economic prosperity that has, in midst of the China's rise, brought back the issue of geopolitics especially in the form of quest for resources and secure sea lanes. This has created, together with the lack of dialogue in the region, potential for a coming war between the United States and Japan against China, although the chances for this are small. However, according to Professor Nakano, "accidents can happen".

According to Professor Nakano, in East Asia the issues of history are issues of politics. Drawing examples from the statements of Japanese Premier Shinzo Abe in 2015, his visit to controversial Yasukuni Shrine in 2013, the handling of WWII sex slaves called "comfort women" in Japan as well as the way Japanese history textbooks deal with the WWII legacy, he claimed how the Japanese ruling Liberal Democratic Party has become more "revisionist" in its dealings with history since the 1980s.

The reasons why in Japan there was no similar concept and drive to *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, coming to terms with the past, term linked with post-WWII Germany, lie according to professor Nakano in the post-war elite continuity in Japan, suppression of the post-war political left and the persistence of authoritarian regimes in post-war China and Korea. However, there is a difference how the older generation of Japanese leaders tried to handle with the issue of Japanese wartime history to the current, (neo)liberal regime: from the early 1980s to late 1990s Japan made attempts to address the difficult issues to make it possible for Japan to become politically strong among its neighbours. This changed in late 1990s to give way to nationalism and identity politics that have seriously affected the relations with Japan with China and South Korea.

In conclusion, Professor Nakano argued that the likelihood of governmental solution to the issue is small, especially due to the Japanese government's lack of control over a divided Japanese society in midst of austerity politics: nationalism has become a necessary tool for all Northeast Asian leaders to stay in power, and this has become even more clear in times of economic problems Japan is facing.

The second speaker, Professor Julie Yu-Wen Chen presented a case discussing the use of maps in the issue over disputes Pinnacle/Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands in East China Sea. According to Professor Chen, there was no real dispute over these islands before early 1970s, when rich energy resources

were found in the area. The emergence of energy prospects cause Taiwan to push forward its national frontier to include the area under dispute to this day.

Professor Chen introduced an article of her and her colleagues published in 2012, arguing that no Taiwanese maps prior to 1971 marked the islands and their surrounding areas to belong to Taiwan. These maps, as well as numerical geographic information excluded these areas in stark contrast with maps published afterwards. She gave several possible explanations for this, starting from the developments in the interpretation of territorial disputes, where maps have become more important tools for supporting claims related to the disputed territories. Another possible explanation saw Taiwan as using maps made by others in prior to 1971, and third explanation saw Taiwan accepting the control of the United States over the islands before their release to Japan in 1972.

In any case, and in relation to use and abuse of history, Professor Chen explained the public reaction in Taiwan to the article in question. The reactions were much divided reaching to online insults towards the authors, in their part affirming Professor Nakano's views on the rise of nationalism and identity politics in the Taiwanese society, too: an issue of history had become an issue of contemporary politics.

In the following session of questions and answers issues such as the role of historians in uprooting the truth, the capability of East Asian countries to move on from the current disputes, the differences in the usage of history in different societies as well as the role of Korea in the midst of all the current disputes were discussed. The moderator Jyrki Kallio from FIIA returned in the end to the original question: can bygones be bygones? Both panellists saw the politics of identity and branding as an obstacle to positive developments, and saw the key to these problems in the leaders of all countries in the region. As the problems would exist as long as they would be useful to the politicians, the situation calls for statesmen, not politicians to take the lead.

1917 IN FINNISH AND RUSSIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

Moderator: Dr Henrik Meinander

Rapporteur: Ms Sofia Storbacka, MA

The workshop took place on Thursday afternoon, May 19, and attracted circa 130 participants into an auditorium at the Faculty of Social Sciences. The moderator Henrik Meinander, Professor of History at the University of Helsinki, welcomed the audience and introduced the two lecturers, Doctor Sergei Zhuravlev and Doctor Kimmo Rentola. Dr Zhuravlev is a Leading Researcher at the Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow. He received his Ph.D. in Russian History from the Russian State University for the Humanities (1989), and Doktor nauk degree from the Institute of Russian History, RAS (1999). His major field is Soviet and post-Soviet history. Dr Rentola is Professor of Political History at the University of Helsinki. He received his doctoral degree (D.Soc.Sci) in 1994 at Helsinki University and functioned as Professor of Political History at the University of Turku (2006—2014) before his return to his Alma Mater as Professor in 2014.

Dr Rentola started his presentation on “The Year 1917 in Two Historiographies” by discussing the concept of the Great Russian Revolution, which implies a number of contradictive historical connotations, that is, both gravely tragic and heroic memories that will be difficult to combine and integrate together during the coming anniversary of the revolution. Within the Orthodox Church the year of 1917 is clearly understood as a disastrous moment in Russian history, whereas it from a Russian imperialistic point of view is a more complicated story. On the one hand it meant the collapse of the old tsarist system and the loss of the Western borderlands of empire, but on the other hand it resulted in the birth of the Soviet Union, the new great power, which many in Russia tend to interpret as an inevitable and modernized version of the old imperialist regime. A similar twofold memory or should we say interpretation of the year of 1917 has remained strong in Finland. Truly enough, the Bolshevik rule paved the way for Finnish independency declaration and the Russian recognition of the new status. But at the same time the Bolsheviks were closely involved in the Finnish Civil War that soon thereafter broke out and left a deep scar in the Finnish collective memory. Since the 1960s Finnish and Russian historians have had less and less problems to agree on the facts, but naturally the interpretations of the causes and consequences of these years will continue to differ. Despite a gradual widening of their perspectives, Finnish historians still tend to see the years of 1917-1918 as a turning point in the grand narrative of the nation. And because of this it is not either probable that the popular view of these years will change radically in the years to come.

Dr Zhuravlev analysed in his presentation “Russian Revolution of 1917: to glorify or to condemn?” how the revolution is understood by the political elite, the academic community and popular opinion at the eve of its anniversary. The political elite has not yet decided how to cope with the complicated legacy of the revolution. When the Yeltsin regime described the revolution as a destruction of the Russian culture, the Putin regime is more focused on the damages it caused the Russian statehood. In line with this Lenin’s internationalist goals are today less valued than Stalin’s more patriotic rhetoric and programme. Zhuravlev distinguished thus a number of shifting interpretations, which all in one or another way reflect the current Russian aversion against revolutionary changes in

society. Instead of seeing it as an inevitable and crucial change in Russian history, the two revolutions in 1917 are reconsidered more as one national disaster driven by fanatics and German money. And simultaneously World War II as the Great Patriotic War has gradually taken over the mythological function, which the October Revolution had in the Soviet Union. In the popular discourse on the revolution a division between “white” and “red” interpretations has been rather strong since the 1990s, but notably only a minority (15%) of the population nowadays accept a revolution as a solution for political change. Dr Zhuravlev also analysed the Finnish interpretations of the revolution and emphasised the need to see the Finnish path to independency even more in a close connection to the revolution in Russia. And as consequence of this he asked why Finland and Russia could not commemorate the year of 1917 also as a mutual event in our history.

The presentations awoke a lively discussion both between the two scholars and in the audience. Rentola wanted to know when the general concept of “the Russian Revolution” became accepted also in Russia, to which Zhuravlev replied that it is a recent result of a societal debate, in which the whole revolutionary process was increasingly emphasised. Rentola answered Henrik Meinander’s request about how much Finnish historiography on the year of 1917 is still narrowed by nationalist views by admitting that it is still a problem and pointing out the importance of independent research.

Dr Erkki Tuomioja noticed that it seems that we are following and analysing each other’s histories. But is this enough, could we develop more common writing, to which Russian and Finnish could join? Are there any efforts or possibilities to bring together historians from other neighbouring countries? Rentola replied that such attempts have already occurred in the research on the Winter War, and added that the most fruitful way to advance on this front is not to establish state committees for this purpose but to develop cooperation between individual scholars and research groups. Zhuravlev agreed on this and pointed out that Russian historians are already cooperating in this manner with Polish and Ukranian historians. Unfortunately a similar network has been harder to establish with Baltic scholars. The idea should not be to find arguments for apologizes for wrong doings but to find a way to communicate in a constructive way about the mutual past. The Finnish-Russian dialogue is in that sense a good example.

Dr Jeremy Smith pointed out that historians have political ideas as well and asked, if it is it possible to write without being political? If you try to be objective, we need to find something positive to say about Bolsheviks. Can we get away from being political, or should we embrace it? Rentola replied, absolute objectivity is impossible and the personal political understanding has undoubtedly an effect on what you write, but you should not put political ideas as the starting point for your work. Zhuravlev: This is a provocative question and I agree with Rentola, it is practically impossible to be totally objective, especially during the first 100 years after the occurred moment or process in question.

Mr René Nyberg, former Finnish Ambassador in Moscow and Berlin referred to President Putin’s recent commemoration of the beginning of World War II (1.9.1939) as an example of that the political elite is also sometimes recognizing historical facts and wider perspectives on the past.

In addition to these themes the discussion also focused on the future of both the Russian and Finnish public memory and its specific role in domestic politics.

COLONIAL HISTORY OR HISTORY OF COLONIALISM

Moderator: Prof. Holger Weiss

Rapporteur: Mr. Kaarlo Wirta

The Moderator opened the session by underlining that the workshop is not expected to come to any conclusion but to formulate an agenda on how to and to whom this forum will be meant in the future. Thereafter, he introduced the two speakers, professor Meyda Yegenoglu and professor emeritus Anthony Asiwaju.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SPEAKERS:

Meyda YEGENOGLU is professor of cultural studies and sociology. She is currently a professor of sociology and cultural studies at Istanbul Bilgi University and a Senior Research Fellow at IASR at University of Tampere. She has received her Ph.D from University of California, Santa Cruz and has held visiting appointments at Columbia University, Oberlin College, Rutgers University, New York University, University of Vienna and Oxford University.

Professor Yegenoglu has published on postcolonialism, orientalism, Islam, secularism and religion, nationalism, cosmopolitanism, Europe/European identity, globalization and migrancy. Her work crosses disciplinary boundaries and brings different strands of thought such as deconstruction, psychoanalysis and postcolonial into productive rendezvous with each other. She is the author of *Colonial Fantasies: Towards a Feminist Reading of Orientalism* (Cambridge University Press, 1998) and *Islam, Migrancy and Hospitality in Europe* (Palgrave-MacMillan, 2012).

Her current work in progress addresses the Armenian genocide during the Ottoman rule in Anatolia 1915. It focuses on issues of testimony and witness, mourning, remembrance, and gestures that seek forgiveness and apology from the victims of the genocide. She problematizes whether one can apologize and seek forgiveness from victims who are now absent? She also examines how the Turkish nationalist and official narrative has repressed that history, which resulted in the inability of the Turkish people to mourn for their lost friends. It also examines the stories told by Kurdish people and how their narratives do help in remembering the Armenian presence in the Anatolian land. By examining these narratives she questions whether they are instrumental in the building of a sense of community, albeit lost one.

Anthony Ijaola ASIWAJU is Professor Emeritus of the University of Lagos, Nigeria and Fellow of the Nigerian Academy of Letters, Fellow of the Historical Society of Nigeria, and Member of the National Order of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (MFR).

Professor Asiwaju is a notable African Historian with widely acknowledged pioneering scholarly publications on localized impacts of European imperialist partitions and comparative colonialism, especially of the French and British in West Africa, he has also pioneered the over-lapping research interests in African borderlands and regional integration studies and policy advocacy. The policy sensitivity of the academic research engagement has led to involvement as expert and consultant to wide ranging national, regional, continental and international policy initiatives, including specific roles and functions as Nigeria's pioneer Commissioner (International Boundaries) of the National Boundary Commission and a foundation member of the African Union Border Programme (AUBP)

Steering Committee in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. He has also been consultant to several regional organs of the United Nations Organization in Africa.

In the implementation of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) judgment of the celebrated Case of the Land and Maritime Boundary Dispute Between Cameroon and Nigeria, Professor Asiwaju was Leader of the Nigerian Delegation on the Sub-Commission on Affected Populations of the U.N.-Supervised Nigeria-Cameroon Mixed Commission. He has as well actively taken part as an expert on the Cambridge-based Corcordis International Conflict Resolution Initiative on the Sudan-South Sudan border and borderlands, and is consulted on the on-going establishment of Namibia's 'Border Delimitation and Demarcation Commission'.

Professor Asiwaju's numerous publications include, among others, *Western Yorubaland Under European Rule, 1889 – 1945: A Comparative Analysis of French and British Colonialism* (London, Longman, 1976); Ed. (1984), *Partitioned Africans: Ethnic Relations Across Africa's International Boundaries, 1884 – 1984* (London/New York: Christopher Hurst & Company, Publishers, and St. Martin's Press); *Artificial Boundaries* (University of Lagos Press, Inaugural Lecture's Series, 1984); *West African Transformations: Comparative Impacts of French and British Colonialism* (Lagos & Oxford: Malthouse Press, 2001); *Boundaries and African Integration: Essays in Comparative History and Policy Analysis* (Lagos: PANAF Publishing Incorporated, 2003), Ed. with Paul Nugent (1996), *African Boundaries: Barriers, Conduits and Opportunities* (London: Frances Pinter); *Borders in Africa: An Anthology of the Policy History* (Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Institute for Peace and Security Studies, 2015) and 'Terrorism and African Border Governance', *Reflections on Nigeria's Foreign Policy, Vol. IV: The Challenges of Insurgency*, Abuja Society for International Relations Awareness and Fredrick Ebert Stiftung, 2015.

KEY POINTS BY PROF. YEGENOGLU:

Professor Yegenoglu's presentation concentrated on the question of how colonial history is remembered and forgotten in Europe. Firstly, she emphasized in her presentation that how the nation's past is remembered is of utmost importance. Secondly, she underlined the necessity of a revisiting of European history from the perspective of its colonies. Thirdly, she stressed that examining colonial history and its racialized relations to the colonies is critical for envisioning a cosmopolitan Europe today.

KEY POINTS BY ASIWAJU:

Professor Asiwaju's presentation was intended to provoke a discussion about the history of colonialism as a theme of global interest and relevance to issues of conflicts and conflict resolution. Secondly, he presented a practical demonstration of how historical scholarship and historians have been grappling with the highly vexed factor of borders in international and regional conflicts.

DISCUSSION – DIALOGUE WITH THE AUDIENCE

Discussion started at: 11.05

After the stimulating presentations by Professor Asiwaju and Professor Yegenoglu, we had roughly one-hour time left for discussion. Based on the initial reactions from the audience and the long

queue for comments and questions it would be a lively forum. The discussions were started with returning to Professor Asiwaju's presentation. The first question was directly linked to policy making of the modern Nigerian state. A commentator from the audience wondered whether there is a difference in perspective in the experience of the borders between the policy makers of the capital of Nigeria and the border communities themselves. The first question was followed by a follow up question about what role professor Asiwaju sees that an organization such as the ECOWAS should play in the borderland regions.

Asiwaju replied to both questions by explaining that he has experienced that there is a standard criticism towards the policies made by the people who lived far away from these border areas. Asiwaju reminds the audience that this was not only an issue of Nigeria but can be applied to all places with borderland regions. This tension between the policy makers and people in the border regions requires a certain strategy in policy making. According to Asiwaju the tension creates a constant need for data to be gathered and collected from the borderlands and to be first transported for the scientists, who analyses and interpret the data. Thereafter the scientists inform and bring the results to the attention of the policy makers. *What Asiwaju suggests that an organization such as HWB can offer is to engage in a dialogue with the political decision makers and offer in depth analysis of the past and history of the borderlands.*

Regarding the second question Asiwaju points out that from an organizational perspective ECOWAS is analogous to the EU and that since an organization such as ECOWAS is able to apply a certain degree of enforcement control of the borderlands *it becomes of crucial to make sure that the people who work with these border enforcement questions are educated in the specificities of the regions concerned and especially since the borderland regions are full of different form of agencies with different motives to participate in these regions.*

One of the comments from the audience wanted to raise the point that also slavery should be included in the discussions since it was such essential part of colonialism. Professor Yegenoglu replied by pointing out that *slavery indeed is an essential part of colonialism and racism.*

From a short discussion on slavery the discussion went on towards questions about economic aspects on colonial history. A comment from the audience wanted to point out *the importance of economic exploitation as a part of the colonial legacy.* The commentator raises the important point that imperialism and colonialism was also closely linked to capitalism and industrialization.

The comment was followed up by a question regarding the borders. Many previous colonial regions have suffered from the same fact that in many cases the borders were artificially drawn and redrawn. Therefore it becomes *important to study and investigate why these borders were drawn in the way they were drawn, what were the motives behind this decisions and who were behind drawing these artificial borders.* This would help us to better understand the specific context in which these artificial borders were created.

Asiwaju replied to the comment that for the purposes of the conference he left less space for economic questions although the economic side of borderlands is more elaborated in his paper. Asiwaju agrees that economic aspects of colonialism are of course crucial and important. Professor Yegenoglu continues the reply, by pointing out that the economic dimension can't be exaggerated. As a matter of fact in her book she has called the European colonialism a two handed machine,

where one hand is focused on plundering the local economies and the other hand developed and fuelled industrialization. However in this talk Yegenoglu wanted *to focus on colonialism and the connection to knowledge production*.

Knowledge production was an essential tool of colonialism. Whole disciplines such as, ethnology, anthropology, etc. were developed in order to learn about the so-called "other". Knowledge is an essential tool of dominance and ultimately colonialism. In the Middle East with Syria for example all the sources of the problems is rooted in colonialism in the artificial drawing of borders

From economics of colonialism the discussion shifted towards the tricky question of *who is the one that actually writes the colonial history*. A question from the audience was raised asking if in the case of Africa, Africans are writing their own history and the example of Northern Mali was given as a showcase that there is a challenge with the fact that northern Mali does not have any own historians which creates issues in the way who tells the history of this region. The commentator asks whether the panellists have an opinion *who is it that writes the history, is it the winners or someone else?*

Asiwaju offers a reply by stating that yes indeed there are African scholars who have been working with these postcolonial perspectives and questions. He lifts up as an example the edited eight volume UNESCO General History of Africa, purely written by African scholars.

Yegenoglu follows by stating that she thinks it *is important to address how history is written and rewritten*. The winners write the dominant historical narrative. But there are also alternative narratives. In India for instance there is the sub-alter studies group, who are committed to tell the story of the voiceless. *But also the history of Europe can and should be rewritten, which is the other side of the coin*. Yegenoglu reminds the audience that at the end of the day the question is always whose history is recognized?

The discussion started to shift towards questions and ideas on direct and indirect colonialism. Several people from the audience were making points that some regions might have not been officially colonized but were still a part of the colonial world in various ways. Asiwaju made the point that some cases such as Ethiopia was never formally colonized but was nevertheless deeply involved with Italians and English colonizers who did indeed formalize colonies elsewhere. This resulted in indirect connections with significant impacts on the colonial history. A commentator from the audience added that perhaps it is more beneficial to leave the formal / indirect form of being colonized since all these regions and areas were effected by colonialism, therefore it would be smart to see these areas and regions as a part of colonial systems. Another commentator from the audience reminded *the importance of dependency and the different trajectories the colonial powers took*. It was mentioned that the colonial policies of for example Britain and France differed significantly and also how they dealt with their colonial past. From the audience it was also reminded that it is difficult to always point out who writes the history, whether it is the winners or losers since also what winning and losing mean might change depending who is asked.

Yegenoglu makes an important point in stating that in the colonial context it is indeed true that also there were great differences between different types of colonization. There were naturally clear differences between the plantation colonies, settler colonies and other forms of colonization. Despite these differences Yegenoglu argued that *there is still a more structural idea of colonialism and*

this aspect is crucial in trying to observe these patterns which had an impact in views of for example racism in present Europe.

A certainly important question was raised from the audience. A question was asked whether Asiwaju and Yegenoglu could comment on the importance of personal experience in the discussions on colonialism. Yegenoglu responded through raising the point of personal testimonies and why they are so important to include. Yegenoglu explains that it is important to hear the voice from the ones who often are neglected from the official material or sources. She raised the example of historians going to the archives since that is supported by the dominant culture on what historians should do. *The historian is allowed to study the material of the archives and base their analysis on this material. This however is problematic since the ones in control of the archives also have the power to erase sensitive material from the archives. This is the reason why personal testimonies become so important.* Yegenoglu reminds the audience that historical events are not simply the findings in the archives but as a matter of fact also the experience of people is important. Asiwaju continues with explaining that archives are important but are most of the times organized by the colonizers and you can read between the lines the colonized experiences. *In order to be able to find the experience of the colonized a historian need to borrow skills and tools from other disciplines such as ethnology and anthropology.* Asiwaju continues by telling us that folksongs can also be used as material to understand the experiences of the oppressed people.

Towards the end of the session two commentators from the audience also pointed out that in societies school textbooks could be used to explain colonial events but not always from the best point of view, but rather from an almost colonizing perspective, emphasizing the dominance over others. Yegenoglu agrees with the comments from the audience and concludes that *textbooks can also be seen as tools of colonizing, because they eventually are representations of a political task.*

At this point we were reaching the end of the session. Many insightful comments and question were brought up and both speakers further developed on the ideas and made it clear in various ways that there is a close connectedness between colonial history and present day politics and society. The panel gave some preliminary answers on what type of topics and aspects should be kept in mind regarding colonial history and how important the colonial period still is. The wide range of topics and comments have shown that there is a need to keep an open dialogue between the different parts involved and furthermore nevertheless if a region was directly or indirectly involved this panel has shown that the colonial history is an essential part of also the historians without borders organization. The moderator ended the panel at 12.10.

IDENTIFIED THEMES FOR FURTHER WORK:

- *to focus on colonialism and the connection to knowledge production: whose history is written, whose is forgotten*
- *to focus on colonialism as part of European history*
- *to focus on the production and contents of history textbooks as colonizing tools*
- *the question of colonial archives and colonial archival material: whose history and whose legacy?*
- *to engage in a dialogue with the political decision makers and offer in depth analysis of the past and history of the borderlands*
- *to engage in colonial legacies and their links to contemporary racism, such as slavery and economic exploitation*

TURKS AND ARMENIANS, 1915 AND AFTER

Moderator: Dr. Suvi Kansikas

Rapporteur: Dr. Ira Jänis-Isokangas

The panel entitled "Turks and Armenians, 1915 and After" dealt with the use and misuse of history in the debate that deals with how to call the events in 1915 in Eastern Anatolia, at the time part of the Ottoman Empire.

The panellists, Professor Oran and Dr Iskandaryan discussed the use and misuse of "1915" in current Turkish and Armenian politics. Both panellists, who represent political sciences, explored the meanings and consequences of the 1915 events. There exist different interpretations on the events of 1915 amongst historians. The two scholars have also personally experienced how the attempts to open discussion on this issue may lead to problems. Not being historians by training, the panellists did not intend to ask what happened in 1915.

A major theme in Professor Oran's presentation, entitled "The Use and Abuse of 1915 in Turkey's Context" was how much the events of 1915 have created conflicts, and on the other hand, to what extent they have created cohesion. For Armenians, especially for those who live outside the Republic of Armenia, the 1915 events have been crucial for identity building.

According to Oran, there exist "two Turkeys" with regard to knowledge on the 1915 events: people living west of Ankara did not know about the events, because these were never publicly discussed. However, to the east of Ankara, everyone knew about the events through oral history accounts of the local people. Knowledge on the 1915 events started spreading more generally in Turkey only after ASALA, the Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia, started to assassinate Turkish diplomats in the mid-1970s.

In the first decade of the 21st century, knowledge on the 1915 events has begun to spread more widely as Turkish academics and other socially active people have started to organise seminars and campaigns to raise awareness over the controversy. In 2005, on the 90th anniversary of 1915, Turkish academics set to organise a seminar on the topic. Despite some administrative pressure, the organisers managed to pull through, and a conference was organised in September 2005, at the Bilgi University. Furthermore, in 2008, Turkish academics and activists launched an Internet campaign entitled "I apologize". This pledge, circulated in the Internet, shows repentance on behalf of Turkey because Armenia's requests for recognition of the 1915 genocide have been suppressed within Turkey. The campaign provoked also counter-campaigns with people pledging for "I don't apologize", or "I expect apology from Armenians". Initiators of this project were called "traitors" and they even received death threats. Nevertheless, these actions did provoke a small "rapprochement" between Armenia and Turkey.

However, the dispute over history has been politicized to the extent that it also has had other, foreign policy related consequences. One consequence has been the creation of stronger ties between Turkey and Azerbaijan. Turkey and Armenia's rapprochement in turn provoked a reaction from Azerbaijan, which connected the question with the conflict it has with Armenia over Nagorno-Karabakh. In addition, Turkey also saw the possibility of repercussions in

rapprochement, since the opening towards Armenia could also provoke a “Kurdish opening”. The domestic situation in the Erdogan’s Turkey did not support new initiatives either.

Dr Alexander Iskandaryan’s discussed his topic, “History and Identity in Armenia and Diaspora”, from the point of view of contemporary politics and perceptions. His aim was not to go into the historical background of the 1915 events but rather to explore how the focal narrative of 1915 defines the Armenian nation. According to him, Armenian ethnic identity is hard to describe, but it is based on the network of multicultural and multilingual communities of up to 11 million people. An important factor is that more Armenians live outside the Republic of Armenia than within it. This reflects also onto the discussion of the 1915 events.

In Armenia, the events are commemorated in many ways. There are public monuments, an academic institute for the study of the genocide, and April 24th is an official day for commemoration. In many ways, the Armenian state’s attitude is similar to the way Israel considers the Holocaust. However, Iskandaryan stressed that there are also crucial differences. The Israeli state was established shortly after the Holocaust whereas the Armenian state was established only after the collapse of the USSR.

The Soviet period influenced the commemoration and discussion on the 1915 events in many ways. Discussion on the 1915 events was banned and only after Stalin’s death, discussion on the events began. However, school teaching and textbooks did not mention the event and knowledge on the events survived through the narratives of relatives. The first public commemoration took place in Yerevan in 1965, which was also a sign of Armenian ethnic identity and growing civic activism in the USSR.

The status of the 1915 events in the Armenian diaspora is somewhat different. For many emigrants, Armenia was never their homeland, whereas Turkey as the successor state of the Ottoman Empire can be considered as such. For them, the 1915 events are the key factor in their identity formation. Paradoxically, Turkey’s denial of the Armenians’ sentiments leads to a stronger construction of the Armenian identity around the events of 1915. Iskandaryan stressed that open discussion on the events is important because it is not only a part of Armenian history but also a part of Turkish history. There are several recent movements such as a campaign entitled “I remember and demand” that aim to keep the discussion on 1915 alive in Armenia and in Armenian diaspora.

The discussion after the panellists’ presentations highlighted the importance of the historical context in evaluating the events of 1915 and the requirements of objective historical analysis. Many commentators urged to break the boundaries of Armenian and Turkish history writing, but at the same time, the heated discussion showed how difficult this could be in the end.

Concerning the need to take into account the context in which the 1915 events took place, some commentators put emphasis on international politics starting as early as the mid-19th century. The role of religion in the Balkans and in the Ottoman Empire was also debated, as was the role of Armenia in Turkish identity formation in the late 19th century. Another topic raised was that in order to create a balanced narrative on 1915 there is a need to also take into consideration the Ottoman rulers’ perspective on the events.

An important question in terms of acquiring a balanced historical understanding of the events concerned the possible use of archival sources. One problem in this context seems to be that the archives in Armenia are not open, and moreover, that events similar to those that occurred during 1915, do not usually produce much archival sources. One commentator referred to the requirement of historical research to contextualize what happened with utmost scrutiny as well as to deconstruct myths that have been constructed about the past. Accordingly, the Ottoman Empire and its Armenian population were not isolated from what happened around them. In this context, it was also brought up that external forces, especially European and Russian, and their influence on the conflicts between the Turks and Armenians, need to be analysed.

Other participants wanted to pay attention to use of the words holocaust, genocide and massacre and the meanings of these words. Accordingly, it is necessary to reassess the use of the legal term "genocide" and consider how problematic its use is for engaging in future conversation between the two sides.

In their replies to the questions from the audience, the panellists stressed that the aim of this panel was not to discuss what happened in 1915, but how these events were used in current politics in Turkey and Armenia and what kind of consequences it has had on Turkish and Armenian identity formation. Professor Oran highlighted the fact that he had never used the word genocide but "the events of 1915". This is because in his view, both Turks and Armenians stop listening when they are confronted with this word. In order to have a discussion, it is useful to proceed with less loaded words. Moreover, genocide is a legal term with its own definitions and consequences.

For Dr Iskandaryan, an interesting fact in the panel discussion and in the comments was that it was not so much about differences between the Turkish and Armenian interpretations, but the discussion and interpretations between the Turkish participants. For him, this shows that there is a progress in this issue in Turkey. According to him, the dispute is not so much about the facts but the wordings: when words become politicized. At the end of the discussion, Iskandryan underlined that scholars should not be restricted by any borders, when discussing such events as 1915, not at the level of topics, wordings and concepts – not to speak of the political and social issues involved. There should be a dialogue instead of a monologue and Armenians should also listen to different discussions the Turks have had and to work with the reality.

The significance of the topic was accentuated by the fact that there were not enough seats in the room to accommodate all interested participants, and some were left standing. Many scholars pointed out that they had travelled a great distance in order to participate in the panel and several of them did not even get the chance to give their comments because the panel ran out of time. The topic of the panel was a highly political one, and consequently, also the discussion became much politicized. In some of the comments, the participants brought up their definitions of how the topic should have been discussed, their views on who had been asked to be the panellists, and in general, what the goals of the Historians without Borders organization should be. The panellists remained unprovoked by a participant in the audience who intervened in the discussion in a rather inappropriate style. Ultimately, due to several interruptions from the audience, there was not enough time to have an in-depth discussion on many important issues related to the topic.

The rapporteurs consider that it might have been worthwhile to consider different formats for discussing issues such as this. A roundtable discussion would give more panellists the opportunity to participate in the discussion. Moreover, the theme could be divided into further sub-groups, because, as manifested by the lack of time, the topic is simply too big for a two-hour panel. The theme could be divided into questions such as these:

How to define the concepts that are used, such as genocide? How to define the context of the events that we are discussing? How have the governments in office since the events in both Armenia and Turkey been involved in building the narratives on the year 1915? How do the narratives influence contemporary politics and how have they been misused in the societies? How can we find reconciliation between the historical narratives prevailing in Armenia and Turkey?

In conclusion, the rapporteurs would encourage national historians from both countries, as well as from abroad, to find a way to begin a dialogue on the year 1915. Moreover, a dialogue between historians and political scientists, and scholars from other disciplines, is a necessity.

4. FURTHER WORK OF HISTORIANS WITHOUT BORDERS

CLOSING PLENARY

Chair: Dr. Erkki Tuomioja

Rapporteur: Ms. Emma Hakala

The final session of the conference began with Tuomioja thanking all speakers and participants in the role of the President of the Board of Historians without Borders in Finland. He pointed out that while the conference was ending, actual work with regard to setting up the international network of Historians without Borders was only beginning. He then suggested that the final session will proceed as proposed in the agenda handed out to all participants at the beginning of the session.

1. REPORTING ON THE CONFERENCE

Tuomioja explained that a summary of the conference sessions and workshops will be sent out to all participants in about two weeks, with the moderators and assigned rapporteurs editing the reports. These will include a summary of the introductory speeches (or full text if they are available); however they will not be verbatim reports of the discussions. A particular focus will be on proposals for ways the Network could engage in future work on the issues addressed.

In addition, the report will include a concise summary about the coverage of and comments about the conference in the media. Participants were also asked to send the secretariat links to any media items from their home countries on the initiative and conference.

Tuomioja encouraged the participants to share the forthcoming report with interested parties in their networks and in general to spread information about Historians without Borders.

2. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A NETWORK OF HISTORIANS WITHOUT BORDERS AND A PRESENTATION OF THE PLANS FOR THE NETWORK

Tuomioja explained the the draft declaration distributed to all participants is meant to be the founding charter of the network. The Network will be open to all historians who are ready to sign the declaration. All participants are welcome to sign the document, and it is also possible to do so later.

The network will consist of those historians who have signed on to the declaration as individuals. In addition, interested parties who are not academic historians but wish to be involved are invited to join. The signatories to the declaration are encouraged to promote the aims of the network in their countries and international contacts and may organize themselves in a suitable fashion and engage as collective actors in furthering the aims of the network.

The network will not be an organization, although it may later be decided to organize it formally as an INGO. For the time being, however, it does not have the judicial status of legal person and therefore cannot enter into formal agreements. Therefore, Historians without Borders in Finland will act as the provisional Secretariat for the Network. As a registered organization, it also has the possibility to enter into judicial arrangements on behalf of the Network.

The Network will have a coordinating committee consisting of something in the order of 5 – 9 members, who will be elected at the end of the final session. The coordinating committee will:

- continue work on the initiative with the aim of calling an international meeting open to all signatories to the declaration within a year to review progress and take decisions on further development of the Network;
- develop the ideas and proposals that have come out of the conference and panels;
- open an internal website for the signatories which will be used to report on and discuss the activities of the committee and to disseminate proposals, views and reports from the signatories;
- engage with historians, diplomats and other international actors in promoting the aims of the network;
- work to find independent sources of international funding for the Network, especially core funding, external to the financing secured by HWB in Finland for maintaining its own activities;
- establish a roster of historians who have signed on to the network, enabling those who have put their names forward to identify their specific fields of research, knowledge, experience and interest and be in principle ready to be called on to serve as members on or experts for historical committees, commissions, working groups and the like that international organisations, governments or independent actors wish to establish while promoting the aims of the Network as set out in the draft declaration, namely to:
 - deepen general and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of history;
 - promote open and free access to historical material and archives;
 - encourage interactive dialogue between different views and interpretations of history to assist in the process of mutual understanding;
 - support efforts to identify the abuse of history in fostering and sustaining conflicts,
 - help defuse conflicts and contribute to conflict-resolution processes
 - the committee can also prepare initiatives and make proposal on how work for furthering the aims of the network and, resources permitting, also engage as a network in this work

After these remarks, Tuomioja opened the discussion on the contents of the Declaration. Some points had already been made prior to the final session. In particular, it had been proposed that an acknowledgement of promoting a “culture of peace” would be added to the paragraph concerning the roster of historians. In addition, the inclusion of a point about the teaching of history to the proposed areas of work of the Network. Both of these proposals were accepted and included in the Declaration.

During the session, Prof. Christina Twomey suggested that the Declaration should take into account the role of women in peace-building; a topic that had been discussed in some of the panels. This was also decided to be added as an additional point to the areas of work of the Network.

Prof. Tuomo Melasuo proposed that the Declaration should also mention protection for historians under persecution. It was, however, decided that this is implicitly included in several fields of activity and therefore did not need to be added.

Prof. Romila Thapar pointed out that there are existing organisations dealing with similar issues as Historians without Borders; such as the Network of Concerned Historians. These should be informed about the establishment of the HWB Network, which could also maintain a website listing all the relevant organisations acting in the field. In addition, the Network of HWB could act as a clearinghouse for concerns about misuses of history or the persecution of historians, meaning that it could be informed about such cases, assess if there are concrete grounds for concern and take measures accordingly, e.g. by leveraging political pressure until the case is resolved.

Tuomioja agreed with the need to contact and potentially cooperate with other organisations working in the field of history politics, as well as with other 'without Borders' organisations. He added that a large number of these had already been contacted and invited to the conference, but only few of them had so far replied. Tuomioja encouraged all conference participants to inform HWB in Finland about such organisations in their own networks and to pass on information about HWB to them.

In the ensuing discussion, several ideas concerning the future work of the HWB Network were proposed. Carolina Torrico Sanchez, representing Euroclio, again brought up the importance of teaching history at schools, while Dr. Jukka Kortti from the University of Helsinki emphasized the need to address the role of media in the interpretations of history. Dmitry Frolov from the Finnish National Archive also pointed out the importance of archives for historical research and history politics, while Fanny Johanssen from the University of Helsinki brought up the participation of the younger generation of scholars, which the Network could potentially promote. While acknowledging the relevance of all these topics, Tuomioja noted that it would be better not to add a vast number of separate issues into the Declaration, as it would still be impossible to include each and every topic. Rather, he suggested keeping the Declaration relatively simple and general in order not to preclude anything and to keep the door open for new initiatives.

With regard to the wordings of the Declaration, Dr. Tom Wolff from the University of Minnesota suggested removing the word 'cultured', describing the approach to historical monuments and traces, arguing that it is too loaded with meanings to be used in this context. Several views were presented on this. Prof. Christina Twomey agreed with Dr. Wolff and questioned the need to address the preservation of monuments in the Declaration in the first place. Prof. Vijaya Ramaswamy from Jawaharlal Nehru University suggested using the word 'sensitized' in the place of 'cultured'. Dr. Emilia Palonen from the University of Helsinki proposed using concepts and terminology that is as general as possible, leaving room for ambiguity. After some further discussion, it was finally agreed that the description 'understanding' would be best fitted in the context, and the change was made to the Declaration accordingly.

DECISION ON THE PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH THE INTERNATIONAL NETWORK OF HISTORIANS WITHOUT BORDERS

A joint decision was taken to establish the International Network of Historians without Borders.

DECISION ON ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT DECLARATION

The Declaration was adopted with the amendments accepted during the final session.

ELECTION OF THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Tuomioja explained that the members of the Coordinating Committee would be expected to promote the objectives of Historians without Borders in their own networks and to participate in about 2-3 meetings every year, thus also requiring some travel. The idea is that the Coordinating Committee would be geographically and culturally as representative as possible, in order to ensure varied perspectives.

Some names had already been put forward prior to the final session and had indicated their readiness to be nominated as members. These are as follows: Prof. Jan C. Behrends (Germany), Carl Bildt (Sweden), Dr. Vasu Gounden (South Africa), Prof. Margaret MacMillan (United Kingdom), Dr. Erkki Tuomioja (Finland), Prof. Christina Twomey (Australia) and Dr. Sergei Zhuravlev (Russia).

It was proposed that the Coordinating Committee would be given right to co-opt 2-3 members, taking further into account the geographical and gender balance. Issues concerning the organization of the Committee will be decided in its first official meeting.

The proposed composition of the Coordinating Committee was elected and given the right to co-opt 2-3 additional members.

CONCLUSION OF THE CONFERENCE

In conclusion, Tuomioja urged everyone to sign the Declaration who wished to do so. The members of the Network are encouraged to consider setting up Historians without Borders initiatives in their own countries and, in case they choose to do so, to be in contact with the Secretariat in HWB in Finland for support and advise. Network members are allowed to use the Historians without Borders logo.

Tuomioja also encouraged all participants to remain actively engaged in the future activities of the Network, to inform HWB in Finland about potential contacts and proposals, and to spread the word in their own communities.

As the discussions during the conference have shown, a lot still remains to be done even among historians themselves in order to make sure history is being used in a good, constructive manner.

MEDIA SUMMARY

Prepared By Ms. Kaisa Läärä

The international conference was preceded by a publication event on 20th of April of the Finnish anthology published by the Finnish initiative Historians without Borders in Finland. In total 22 journalists confirmed their participation to the publication event advance. The invitation to the event was emailed to 700 members of the Finnish media. The attending journalists were given more information about both the anthology and the upcoming conference including the invitation to register without a fee to the conference.

Media coverage regarding the anthology (in Finnish and English):

- Helsingin Sanomat 19.5. Venäläisprofessorin mukaan Venäjällä pelataan vuosien 1989–1991 jälkipeliä, <http://www.hs.fi/arviot/kirja/a1463541988019>
- Helsingin Sanomat 15.5. Moskovan ehdotukset yhteisistä juhlista olivat Suomelle perin kiusallisia <http://www.hs.fi/paakirjoitukset/a1463199017629>
- Ilkka 21.5.2016 Historialla ei ole määrättyä suuntaa <http://www.ilkka.fi/mielipide/yleis%C3%B6lt%C3%A4/historialla-ei-ole-m%C3%A4%C3%A4r%C3%A4tt%C3%A4-suuntaa-1.2053152>
- The Heritage Portal, 16.3.2016 Historians without Borders: The Use and Abuse of History in Conflict, International Conference, <http://www.theheritageportal.co.za/notice/historians-without-borders-use-and-abuse-history-conflict-international-conference>
- Talouselämä 1.5. Holokaustin kieltäminen on väärää historiaa <http://www.talouselama.fi/uutiset/holokaustin-kieltaminen-on-vaaraa-historiaa-6545914>
- Agricola julkaisut 2.5. Kuka viimeksi käytti historiaa väärin? <http://agricola.utu.fi/julkaisut/kirja-arvostelut/index.php?id=3933>
- HBL bloggen 20.4., Historiska karameller, <http://tyskland.blogg.hbl.fi/2016/04/20/historiska-karameller/>
- Politiikasta.fi 22.4. Menneisyyttä ei voi hallita, <http://politiikasta.fi/menneisyytta-ei-voi-hallita/>
- Yle, Ykkösaamu, Historia politiikan käytössä, <http://areena.yle.fi/1-3330146?start=04m50s>
- Pax.fi, Historioitsijat rauhaa rakentamassa <http://www.pax.fi/node/25565>

Approximately 1300 members of the Finnish media and press were invited to the conference via email, four of which participated also to the publication event on April. The invitation consisted of a draft of the conference program, information sheet regarding the initiative, biographs of the keynote speakers and the welcome note to the conference. A follow-up was sent to all journalists and members of the press who registered to the conference to thank and to invite them to the press luncheon arranged on the first day of the conference. The social media channels, including Facebook and Twitter, were updated at least once a day before the conference started and multiple times during the conference. For example the Twitter live feed was provided during the whole conference, including the overlapping workshops.

In total 36 members of the media enrolled to the conference, three of whom were photographers. International press members participated to the conference as well, in total 12 of them were present during the conference representing for instance AFP, AP, Egyptian TV and Iraqi News

Agency. All in all 24 journalists confirmed their participation to the media luncheon. During the conference the communications coordinator took care of the wants and needs of the press and of the material distribution to the media organizations (press releases, photos etc.). The communications coordinator also was responsible of guiding and executing the social media updates during the conference both on Facebook and on Twitter. The twitter posts were done in coordination with the volunteers who wanted specifically to gain communications experience. The declaration and decision of establishing an international network Historians without Borders were accepted in the closing plenary of the conference. The declaration and a press release of the establishment were sent in total to 1400 members covering both domestic and international journalists and media. In addition an article has been written to be offered to the internal website of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.

Media coverage regarding the conference (in Finnish and English):

- Helsingin Sanomat 22.5. Oxfordin professorin esimerkkejä historian väärinkäyttäjistä: Isis, Hitler ja Trump, <http://www.hs.fi/ulkomaat/a1463801288445>
- Yle Uutiset 20.5. Historioitsijat järjestäytyivät rauhan puolesta http://yle.fi/uutiset/historioitsijat_jarjestaytyivat_rauhan_puolesta/8897872
- Daily Sabah OP-ED 18.5.2016, Abuse of history and Historians without Borders, <http://www.dailysabah.com/op-ed/2016/05/18/abuse-of-history-and-historians-without-borders>
- Åbo Akademi 24.5., Historiekunskap loser fredkonflikter? <http://blogs.abo.fi/historia/>
- Helsinki Times 22.5. Social media is a powerful tool in conflicts, warns Ahtisaari, <http://www.helsinkitimes.fi/finland/finland-news/domestic/13988-social-media-is-a-powerful-tool-in-conflicts-warns-ahtisaari.html>
- Agjencia Telegrafike Shqiptare 23.5. FOKUS – FINLANDE – Krijohet rrjeti ndërkombëtar i Historianëve pa Kufij, <http://www.ata.gov.al/fokus-finlande-krijohet-rrjeti-nderkombetar-i-historianeve-pa-kufij/>
- Universiteit Leiden 26.5. Introducing Historians Without Borders, <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/news/2016/05/historians-without-borders>
- History of Truth.com: Abuse Of History And Historians Without Borders- ARTICLE BY HAKAN YAVUZ, <http://www.historyoftruth.com/headline-news/20209-abuse-of-history-and-historians-without-borders-article-by-hakan-yavuz>
- Uusi Suomi, 19.5. Martti Ahtisaarelta varoitus sosiaalisesta mediasta: "Voimakas väline konflikteissa", <http://www.uusisuomi.fi/kotimaa/195860-martti-ahtisaarelta-varoitus-sosiaalisesta-mediasta-voimakas-valine-konflikteissa>
- Uusi Suomi 19.5. Historioitsijat siirtolaiskriisistä: Unohdetusta aallosta vain 20 vuotta Saksassa – sama viha nousi taas, <http://www.uusisuomi.fi/kotimaa/195891-historioitsija-siirtolaiskriisista-unohdetusta-aallosta-vain-20-vuotta-saksassa-sama>
- Suomen YK-liitto: Ambassador Gambari: Zero Tolerance on Sexual Abuse in Peacekeeping, <http://www.ykliitto.fi/uutiset-ja-tiedotus/uutisarkisto/ambassador-gambari-zero-tolerance-sexual-abuse-peacekeeping>
- Реквизит 21.5., В Хельсинки создали организацию «Историки без границ», <http://rekvizit.info/2016/05/v-helsinki-sozdali-organizatsiyu-istoriki-bez-granits/>

- HBL 25.5, Historiker utan gränser, <https://www.hbl.fi/artikel/historiker-utan-granser/>
- The Ulkopolitist. 18.5. Kun sota pitää juhlia: miten nyky-Venäjä tulee toimeen menneisyytensä kanssa, <https://ulkopolitist.fi/2016/05/18/kun-sotaa-pitaa-juhlia-miten-nyky-venaja-tulee-toimeen-menneisyytensa-kanssa/>
- Poleemi 02/2016, https://issuu.com/poleemi/docs/polhory_poleemi_216_issuu_sivut_10-16
- Yle Radio 1 Tiedeykkönen 31.5.2016. Historian käyttö ja väärinkäyttö konflikteissa. <http://areena.yle.fi/1-3394283>