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Abstract

The Interpretation of dissonant heritage in museum institutions in Russia and Germany

The master thesis is devoted to interpreting dissonant heritage as a historical and cultural phenomenon in two countries: Russia and Germany. The research structure includes an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion, a list of references. The first chapter is devoted to theoretical issues: the most famous and critical concepts from the areas of memory studies and trauma studies are highlighted that influenced the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage in Russia and Germany: the concepts of J. and A. Assman, P. Nora, B. Giesen, and M. Hirsch. The second and the third chapters are devoted to analyzing the museum interpretation of difficult heritage in museum institutions in Germany and Russia within the framework of cultural concepts. Two attitude models to the past are considered - triumphal (typical for Russia) and tragic (spread in Germany). Finally, the study concludes with generalizations regarding the similarities and differences in museum interpretation of the difficult heritage in museums in Russia and Germany.
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Introduction

In Russia, the problem of difficult heritage - heritage, a minus sign aimed at preserving the tragic pages and events of history, began to be touched upon in museum practice since the 1990s. However, the first attempts at theoretical understanding of difficult heritage in Russia were made only in 2010, when publications of museologists (M.B. Gnedovsky 2010 and N. Okhotin 2011) appeared, in which difficult heritage was distinguished as a new type of heritage, and the specificity of its existence in foreign and Russian museums was considered. Today, dissonant heritage is actively discussed at scientific conferences and seminars at the regional and all-Russian levels; articles, collections, and monographs of interdisciplinary orientation are devoted to this topic.

In particular, in December 2020, at the online seminar "Museum and Memory: Anthropological Aspects of Representation," organized by the Department of Museum Management and Protection of Monuments, St. Petersburg State University, the topic of dissonant heritage was also mentioned. Essential in this discussion was the formulation of the question - is it possible or impossible to show material evidence related to dissonant heritage in museum exhibitions? Furthermore, the general message of the answers voiced by the researchers can be interpreted as - no, it is better not to show such heritage. This formulation can be viewed as an indicator of the attitude towards dissonant heritage in Russian museum theory and practice: difficult heritage is generally recognized, but no visible steps are taken to interpret and conceptualize it from the point of view of museology. They are more noticeable in cultural literature (Bonami 2019, Dybina 2019, Hlevnyk 2019, Epple 2020). At the same time, new museum projects regularly appear in the country's museum landscape, revealing specific themes of the country's dissonant heritage: in 2019, the Museum of the Defense and Siege of Leningrad (Saint – Petersburg, Russia) and the Museum complex of Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya (Petrishchevo, Russia).

This gap between museum theory and practice in the field of Russia's dissonant heritage can be reduced by revising the vector of consideration of the topic - moving from the question "is it possible or not?" to the question "how to interpret the" dissonant "heritage?" This question stimulates theoretical and practical searches for ways of visual and verbal interpretation of "complex" topics in the museum, prompts to turn to the experience of other countries, concepts that have influenced museum interpretation. This study aims to identify the main cultural
concepts of interpreting dissonant heritage, analyzing the practice of their application in museums in Russia and Germany. This study, in turn, is vital for understanding the ability of museums of a new type and type, which include museums working with difficult heritage, to be influential (in Kenneth Hudson’s terminology) and to determine the development of the museum world in the 21st century.

**Scientific elaboration of the topic**

Difficult heritage and its historiography are related to the problems of museology, which have not yet exhausted their research potential. Since the study of dissonant heritage takes place in an interdisciplinary field - at the junction of cultural studies and museology, characterizing the degree of scientific elaboration of the topic, we will divide the literature into two groups.


Among domestic studies in memory studies, the works of Y.A. Safronova (2018, 2019), D. Hlevnyuk (2010). One of the first to outline the problems of trauma studies in Russia was L.P. Repina (2003). Later, the development of this direction was continued in the works of S. Yshakin (2009), O.V. Moroz E. V. Suverina (2014), D. A. Starikashkina (2016). Finally, the monograph by N. Eppele (2020), dedicated to preserving the memory of state crimes in different countries, deserves special attention. The prerequisites for the study of the topic of dissonant heritage in the discourse of museology are laid in works devoted to new and critical museology: J.A. de Rheivièr, M. Belleg-Scalber (1985), P. Meyran (1985), as well as more recent studies by O. Navarro (2010), J. Harris (2012), J. Kavanagh (1999). E.N. Mastenitsa (2009), I.A. Kuklinova (2014), M.E. Kaylen.


The object of the research is dissonant/difficult heritage in the discourse of museology. The subject of the research is the interpretation of dissonant heritage in the museums of Russia and Germany.

The goal of master thesis is to show the similarities and differences in the interpretation of dissonant heritage as a historical and cultural phenomenon in Russia and Germany. Achievement of the research goal is ensured by solving the following objectives:

1. To identify the main cultural concepts influencing the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage in Russia and Germany;
2. To analyze the interpretation of difficult heritage in museum practice in Germany;
3. To analyze the interpretation of difficult heritage in the museum practice in Russia.

Research methods

The study is based on the problem-chronological principle; for its implementation, such research methods as bibliographic literature search were used, as a result of which a layer of interdisciplinary literature was identified, as a result of comparative analysis, the literature was divided thematically into cultural and museological, and geographically to the works of domestic and foreign authors. The historical and typological method was used to study the conceptual
comprehension of the "dissonant" heritage. The interdisciplinary analysis and comparative study of the topic underlie the identification and study of cultural conceptual frameworks in the museum's interpretation of the "dissonant" heritage. This method is used in chapter 1 to identify points of contact (markers) of cultural concepts and museum practice and to study the peculiarities of the interpretation of the "difficult" heritage through the highlighted concepts in museums in Russia and Germany in chapter 2 and 3.

The structure of the master thesis corresponds to the set goals and objectives, the consistent solution of which is reflected in the introduction, three chapters, conclusion, and bibliography. The first chapter, "Museum Interpretation of Difficult Heritage: Basic Cultural Concepts," examines the features of the museum's interpretation of difficult heritage, identifies models of attitudes towards the past based on narratives of triumph and trauma. In cultural concepts, I and A. Assman, B. Giesen, P. Nora, and M. Hirsch stand out ideas that have influenced the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage in Russia and Germany. The second chapter, "Interpretation of dissonant heritage in museum spaces in Germany," and the third chapter, "Interpretation of dissonant heritage in Russian museums," are devoted to the analysis of museum interpretation of difficult heritage in museum institutions in Germany and Russia within the framework of cultural concepts outlined in the first chapter.

The master thesis is presented on 44 pages, 80 references are included.
Chapter 1. Museum Interpretation of Difficult Heritage: Basic Cultural Concepts

In this chapter, we will consider some key provisions from the works of Y. and A. Assman, B. Giesen, P. Nora, M. Hirsch, which, from our point of view, had a direct impact on the museum practice of interpreting difficult heritage and set a specific theoretical framework for the museum showing different aspects of tragic historical events. We will try to determine which particular cultural ideas influence levels of museum interpretation and through which visual markers are manifested in exhibitions.

1.1 The museum interpretation of dissonant heritage

The range of museums that preserve dissonant heritage is quite extensive - these are traditional historical and memorial museums, "museums of conscience," memorial complexes and documentation centers, and many others. Despite the differences between these museum institutions, all of them are united by the framework of the museum interpretation. It is a complex, multi-level process of interpreting cultural and natural heritage objects in the context of a museum collection, exposition, or museum discourse in general (Dictionary of actual museum terms, ed by M. Kaylen 2009). The focus of interpretation is on a museum piece - a true testimony of the past. However, interpretation permeates the entire process of learning and working with a museum object, from the acquisition of funds, the design of the exposition, and the museum's cultural and educational activities.

The methods of interpreting the heritage are the primary means of interaction between the museum and the visitor and their perception of the museum object in various forms: visual (exposition), verbal (cultural and educational activities), printed (results of scientific research of the museum’s collections, designed in the form of catalogs, articles, collections) and informational (presentation of information about the museum, its collections, and expositions on the museum website). Knowledge obtained in a museum differs significantly from classical scientific knowledge. It is based on immersion, experience, and empathy with museum objects, biographies of people, and historical contexts (Mastenitsa 2009). The visual interpretation has the most significant impact on visitors and can trace the global trend towards visualizing all spheres of life, including culture. Visualization of culturally significant information in a museum is carried out by creating visual images through museum design in expositions and exhibitions (Rois 2013).
The founders of trauma studies S. Felmann and K. Laub (1993), argue that evidence is the “key method” of interaction with tragic historical events that underlie dissonant heritage. Characterizing testimonies as fragments of memory, they emphasize that testimony is not just a statement about an event but its materialization through the speaker's speech. In museum expositions dedicated to dissonant heritage, video and audio evidence are supplemented by a few material evidence: the scale of the destruction and tragedy of World War II was so enormous that only a limited number of items have survived to this day. At the same time, the display of objects (as well as documents and photographs) associated with tragic historical events - dissonant heritage, makes suffering and trauma an object of museum interpretation. Recognizing, understanding, and accepting these injuries and causes as a result of museum interpretation allows individual groups (for example, survivors and their descendants) and society as a whole to free themselves from the consequences of traumatic events, even if many decades have passed since then (Knigge 2013).

The museum interpretation reveals the information fields and cultural biography (I. Kopytoff) of the object, in which the imprint of the trauma has been preserved, allowing the thing to go beyond its material embodiment - an everyday object, memorial object, work of art, or craft, and visualizing the tragic context of the existence of the thing. When traumatized, the object also acquires an intangible component (the generally recognized interpretation of intangible heritage is based on the customs, rituals, dances, and other traditional components. In our case, the intangible component is suffering, humiliation, oppression, discrimination).

The extraordinary nature of a museum object, referred to as dissonant heritage, must be considered in museum interpretation. However, unfortunately, theoretical museology does not yet give an unambiguous and generally accepted answer to the question of how to interpret in museum expositions the material embodiment of suffering, the trauma of people (often not surviving trials) in a museum, and how to deal with objects that did not belong to victims of tragic historical events, but on the contrary, guilty and criminals. At the same time, since the 1990s, new forms of museum institutions working with difficult heritage have been actively created: places of memory and museums on the territories of former concentration camps, documentation centers. Conceptually, these museum forms and their interpretation of dissonant heritage grow out of theoretical searches in memory and trauma studies' socio-humanitarian directions.
1.2. The narrative of triumph and the narrative of trauma

Before considering the conceptual level of the museum's interpretation of difficult heritage, it is necessary to identify the models that set a specific relationship to the past. Based on the purpose of the study, we are interested in the narratives that have developed in the collective memory of Russia and Germany. At the level of the country's collective memory, historical narratives largely reflect the cultural policy of the state, its more or less ideologized attitude to the past, especially to painful historical stages and periods. The first narrative, used to the museum's interpretation of complex historical themes and plots, is triumphal or heroic. This model has existed for many centuries and remained the only option for states to relate to the past. It is also characteristic of modern Russia and often sets a framework into which museum interpretation of dissonant heritage concepts in Russian museums is embedded.

The second narrative – traumatic is a hallmark of state and cultural policy in Germany. The model of negative memory, based on the recognition and acceptance of guilt for historical crimes, developed in Germany in the 1990s, is a unique example of a departure from the traditional triumphal or heroic narrative. A. Assman notes in this regard that the "German model" of attitude to one's past, especially its tragic pages, was the beginning of the transition to a more dialogical memory in other countries (A. Assman 2014, 2016, 2017).

Why is the division of narratives done in this way? B. Giesen notes that there are fundamental, "limiting" events in every person's life - his birth and death (Giesen 2004). However, in his own life, a person cannot track and reflect on these events. Therefore, ideas about them can only be formed through observing the birth and death of other people. In everyday life, we rarely encounter the extreme points of life, but global events affecting the lives of millions of people make it possible to experience something similar to death or birth (Hlevnyuk 2010). If external events show us the fragility and vulnerability of human life and our mortality, they are recorded in the collective memory as traumatic. The memory of them becomes a trauma. The extreme events that we managed to survive to be perceived as moments of triumph and are associated with birth, the joy of a new life. At the same time, at the moment of experiencing, a person is not aware of either negative or positive experiences. The event becomes a triumph or a trauma only in memory after some time (Giesen 2004:8).

Highlighting the cultural concepts that influenced the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage, we will be interested in their influence and significance for museum practice and not in the sequence of their emergence. In addition, museum comprehension of difficult
historical periods using different concepts of memory studies and trauma studies has been happening almost simultaneously since the 1990s. At the same time, within the framework of one exposition, several theoretical concepts can be combined to show individual topics, aspects of difficult heritage. Therefore, our task is to show the main conceptual elements of a complex, multi-level "mosaic" of meanings, which are museum expositions of Russia and Germany, interpreting dissonant heritage.

1.3 The concept of J. and A. Assman

Now we turn to the first conceptual element of this "mosaic." The model of treating the past as a triumph, formed in the 19th century, has been a reasonably popular, traditional framework for showing tragic historical events and periods in museums in some countries, including Russia. However, at the present stage, the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage within the framework of the narrative of triumph is based mainly on the concept of "cold" and "hot" memory, expressed by J. Assman in his work on cultural memory in ancient cultures (Safronova 2018, 2019).

J. Assman emphasizes that in his concept, he continues the ideas of the French ethnologist K. Levi-Strauss, who divided societies into "cold" and "hot": "cold" societies value their stability and balance above all else. They are ready to fight and even destroy the influence of historical factors if they impact their stability, and "hot" societies are ready and willing to develop and evolve, mainly due to the driving force of history (Safronova 2018). Based on such a division of societies, J. Assman formulates the critical difference between them, which consists of different ways of dealing with and dealing with the past, conditioned by different types of memory. The researcher considers “cold” and “hot” to be peculiar options of culture - political strategies of memory (Assman 2004: 73). Assman's analysis of culture options results in the conclusion that the culture of memory does not have to be only "hot" or only "cold"; both of these elements can be combined in one country and society (Safronova 2019:87).

The "cold" option aims to fix the repeating past and show the integrity, continuity, and silence of breaks and contradictions. Assman notes that "cold" memory is the memory of power that strengthens itself by appealing to an unshakable past, for example, the "myth of the founding" of the state. To illustrate the action of "cold" memory, J. Assman cites as an example the Ancient Egyptian lists of rulers that span millennia. On the one hand, they show the inviolability of power and the availability of the past, but on the other hand, they do not dispose to study it. In a museum exposition that interprets dissonant heritage, the model of a "cold"
attitude to the past is manifested through several visual and meaningful markers: showing history in the interests of the state and power, on its behalf, biographies of state leaders, military leaders, endless lists (lists) are essential: names, dates, events, statistics, photographs. Behind this volume, people, facts, and events are lost - the size of the list or enumeration shows only the scale. It also suppresses visitors, does not dispose to study it.

Analyzing "hot" memory, J. Assman notes that it aims to reveal uniqueness in the past, whether positive or negative. This model of attitude to the past is characteristic of the oppressed strata of society, ordinary people. Assman characterizes "hot" memory by the ability to use the past to form ideas about modernity. The "hot" memory exists as a story actualizing the past for the sake of needs in the present (Safronova 2019). A “hot” attitude to the past, or, as Russian researchers also call it, “an alternative historical narrative” (M. Gnedovsky), sets the vector of the museum's interpretation of difficult heritage through the personal stories of ordinary people. However, in the exposition, the marker of "hot" memory is not just a dry display of biographies of people (on which fronts he served, listing the award list), but "storytelling" - a living, valuable narration on behalf of a person, or about him with the help of personal belongings, photographs, letters, verbal means. In the future, the idea of “cold” and “hot” memory of J. Assman will be continued by the British researcher G. Kavanagh, who in her concept of “history-memory” will transfer it to the discourse of museology (Kavanagh 1999). Kavanagh views the museum as a place for the production of memory through the meeting of official discourse (history) and individual images of history (histories) (Bezzybova 2017:161).

1.4. The concept of B. Giesen

Having formed as a reaction to the Nazi crimes at the end of the twentieth century in Germany, the model of negative memory grows out of the socio-humanitarian direction of trauma studies. Among the numerous works in this area, the concept of B. Giesen (2004) of collective memory and trauma in post-war Germany has had the most significant influence on the museum's interpretation of difficult heritage. The concept proposes four figures involved in the community's collective memory - the triumphant hero, the tragic hero, the victim, and the perpetrator. Their allocation occurs, firstly, according to the parameter of finding a person in the position of a subject or object, and secondly, according to the person's ability to overcome obstacles (Giesen 2004:6). B. Giesen gives the figures the following characteristics: the winner copes with difficulties and remains the subject, the defeated hero remains the subject, but his collapse becomes a trauma for the community that constructed this image. In the process of
confronting external events, the victim becomes an object for the actions of criminals, which in turn deprives the criminals of the status of a subject (Giesen 2004: 7). Exploring the figure of a criminal as the basis of a new, post-war national identity in Germany, B. Giesen singles out in it the memory of the organizers and perpetrators of Nazi crimes, the memory of observers - witnesses, and the memory of descendants, subsequent generations (Giesen 2004).

The work of A. Assman, published for the first time in 2006, largely continues the concept and ideas of B. Giesen. A. Assman notes the change of the structural opposition "winners/losers" to "victims/criminals" in the memorial culture of Germany. On the one hand, A. Assman notes the appearance of sacred elements of the memory of victims - glorification and victimization, and on the other hand - feelings of collective guilt, the practice of repression, suppression, and substitution of memories among criminals (Assman 2014:65-74).

B. Giesen's concept, published in 2004, can be viewed as a theoretical and conceptual generalization of the processes taking place in cultural policy and museum practice in Germany since the late 1990s. In particular, the symbolic representation of the four sacred figures designated by Giesen is directly reflected in the museum landscape and interpretation. Furthermore, at the level of the country's museum discourse, the concept theoretically supported the creation of new forms of museum institutions - "Memorable places" (Gedenkstätte) and "Documentation centers" (Dokumentationszentrum) on historical sites, typologically divided into “Places of memory of victims” and “Places of perpetrators of crimes” (Opferort and Täterort). This typology was expressed by the German researcher F. Dahm in the concept of creating the Documentation Center for National Socialism in Munich (Dahm 2002).

1.5. The concept of P. Nora

The ideas of irretrievable loss, inexpressibility, inconceivability, the “gone human” (V. Sebald) have been repeatedly expressed by foreign and domestic researchers (Bezzybova 2016, 2017, Yshakin 2009) concerning the representation of difficult heritage in one form or another. Most often, the Holocaust is viewed in this context, but the museum's interpretation through the display of "loss" applies to other tragic historical events. At the same time, such an interpretation of difficult heritage is applied in societies with a traumatic model and societies with a dominant triumphal narrative.

The concept of places of memory of P. Nora is the next element guiding the vector of visual interpretation of dissonant heritage in museum exhibitions. P. Nora distinguishes three
aspects of the place of memory: it is not only something material, topographic (such as archives, the Pantheon in Paris, monasteries), but also symbolic, intangible (Marseillaise, French flag), as well as practical - specific actions, traditions, rituals. Based on this, the places of memory for P. Nora are monuments, commemorations, territories, words, religious minorities, space-time divisions, and much more (Nora 1999, Sabansheev 2018). Trubina E. notes the critical purpose of places of memory – the stopping time, blocking the mechanisms of oblivion. However, when places of memory are dedicated to tragic events for society, they do not always fulfill their task since it is easier to remember the glorious pages of history than the traumatic ones (Trubina 2000).

The display of material and symbolic losses in museums means blocks the mechanism of oblivion. The concept of places of memory for the museum's interpretation of the lost, destroyed component of difficult heritage sets a very figurative, metaphorical, artistic language of visualization in the museum's space. The first marker of this concept in a museum exhibition can display many similar things (for example, shoes or clothes belonging to prisoners of concentration camps) - visualization of the loss of a considerable number of human lives through devastating material. The second marker manifests itself in the combination of small, broken museum items with empty display cases - a visualization of "empty emptiness," how little evidence has survived. The third marker is the design of a unique space for the exhibition, the museum building. Finally, the use of installations for the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage as a display of "loss" allows the museum to block the mechanism of forgetting tragic events at the material level (building, museum space), a symbolic level (artistic image, installation metaphor) and functional level - conceptually inherent actions (or deliberate inaction) of visitors with a museum installation.

The concept of places of memory of P. Nora has points of contact with the ideas of new museology. The transfer of this concept to the museum field allows the museum to express the ineffable loss with the help of symbolic, artistic means. Nevertheless, this does not pass without leaving a trace for the museum. They become a source of emotions and affect. Such a transformation of museum space and the significance of museum objects is in the vision of the new museology. Modern researcher J. Harris notes that now a new type of museum is being formed, allowing visitors to "reflect on their own life experience, including traumatic" (Bezzybova 2017:160), allowing them to feel like a part of the community. In new museums, reception of the past and invitation of visitors to active discussion come to the fore. Prominent examples of these
new museums are the Gedenkstätte (Memorial) and Dokumentationszentrum (Documentation Centers) in Germany. Some Russian museums are also moving in this direction, but so far, it happens within the framework of traditional historical and memorial museums.

1.6. The concept of M. Hirsch

The final element, which in the framework of this study we single out in the conceptual "mosaic" of museum expositions, interpreting dissonant heritage, is the concept of "post-memory" of M. Hirsch. Published in 1992, simultaneously with the work of J. Assman, the concept of "post-memory" was positively accepted by the scientific community, which contributed to its relatively quick inclusion in the museum interpretation of difficult heritage - just in the 1990s, active creation of museums, document centers that preserve dissonant heritage in different countries (primarily in Germany). M. Hirsch introduces the concept of "post-memory" to denote the mechanism of memory transfer between generations: from parents who survived trauma (for example, the Holocaust) to their children, just for the second generation, the memory of parents becomes post-memory (Safronova 2019:161). M. Hirsch emphasizes that post-memory is "the result of traumatic memory at the intergenerational level" (Hirsch 2008). Building his research on the analysis of the graphic novel by A. Spiegelman, "Mouse: Notes of a Survivor," M. Hirsch singles out visual intermediaries of communication between two (or more generations): these are photographs of places of committing crimes against humanity, family portraits. Other essential tools for the formation of post-memory M. Hirsch considers paintings, monuments, literary works, and other art objects (Safronova 2019:163). The primary way of transferring post-memory is oral family history in the format of personal conversation. However, post-memory is not strictly individual, and it can spread not only to the descendants of survivors but also to a much larger number of people united by a shared history, images, and generational structures (Safronova 2019). The transfer of post-memory in a distant form is carried out with the help of memory institutions - museums, memorial complexes, documentation centers.

The possibility of personal identification with someone else's memory can be realized with the help of the museum's interpretation of difficult heritage through the display of personalized family stories, relationships between people before, during, and after tragic historical events. Markers of this concept in the museum's exposition can be stands, showcases, exposition complexes with objects (children's things, trinkets), photographs (family portraits), documents (letters, diaries) dedicated to the stories of spouses, parents with children, or families. In addition, the concept of "post-memory" sets the vector of the verbal interpretation
of dissonant heritage in the framework of the cultural and educational activities of museums. Personal, family stories become an effective tool for adapting difficult topics to different audiences' age and psychological needs within the framework of lectures, museum classes and lessons, and excursions in foreign and domestic museums.

Studying the cultural concepts that influenced the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage, two main models of attitudes toward the past characteristic of Russia and Germany are distinguished - the model of triumph (glorification) and the model of trauma (victimization). The concepts we have considered may be present in museum expositions of both state narratives. However, the concept of "cold" and "hot" memory of J. Assman is more often found in museums built within the framework of the narrative of triumph dominating in Russia. In contrast, the concept of sacred figures of "victims" and B. Giesen's "criminals" is characteristic of Germany's memorial culture and the trauma narrative. Finally, the concepts of "places of memory" by P. Nora and "post-memory" by M. Hirsch allow interpreting dissonant heritage in the context of humanism, universal human values outside of politics. The next chapters are devoted to analyzing the interpretation of dissonant heritage in museum practice in Russia and Germany through the identified conceptual framework.
Chapter 2. Interpretation of dissonant heritage in museum spaces in Germany

This chapter focuses on the interpretation of “difficult” topics in museum institutions in Germany through analyzing the conceptual framework outlined in previous chapter. A consistent examination of the experience of Germany and Russia will allow us to highlight the specifics of the museum interpretation of dissonant heritage as a historical and cultural phenomenon in both countries, which is the purpose of this study.

2.1. The «hot» and «cold» memory in museums and memorials of Germany

The expression "never again" is strongly associated with the process of working through the memory of National Socialism, the formation of the vector of cultural policy in Germany. This ethical imperative directly impacts the memorial culture of the country and the interpretation of the "difficult" theme of the crimes of Nazism. For the first time publicly, this idea was expressed by T. Adorno in a speech and article in 1966 as a call for an education system that would not allow repeating the crimes of National Socialism. In 1968 the phrase "never again" was placed on the memorial in former concentration camp Dachau (Eppe 2020:9). In subsequent years, this statement spread throughout the world (USA, Latin America, Africa) and was used in the context of discussion, condemnation (including legal), publicity of crimes against humanity. Nowadays, the phrase "never again" has acquired the status of the motto of museums interpreting dissonant heritage. First of all, this applies to museum institutions in Germany.

Earlier, we examined the elements of a complex, multilevel "mosaic" of meanings containing museum exhibitions interpreting dissonant heritage. The first conceptual element we identified was the concept of “cold” and “hot” memory of J. Assman. To trace the influence of "cold" and "hot" memory on the museum's interpretation of the "difficult" heritage in the expositions of Germany, we will allow turning to the history of the emergence of the first museums and memorials in this country. The first years after the end of World War II, the sites of crimes against humanity in Germany were designated as points of veneration for the dead (in the form of burials, monuments). State structures and institutions were located on the territories of the former concentration camps. In divided Germany, places of memory about crimes of National Socialism existed in two different narratives. In the FRG, it is a "selective perspective of suffering, along religious and ethnic grounds" (Knoch 2013), and in the GDR is the heroic narrative of the victory of socialism over fascism (Cherkaeva 2019). The first memorial museums in the former concentration camps of Buchenwald and Sachsenhausen (GDR) opened in the late 1950s.
Their expositions, based on the display of the anti-fascist movement, can be regarded as an example of "cold" memory: there is still no place for a human storyteller, witness or survivor, of his personal history.

In the early 1960s, the growing interest in modern German history among the younger generation, the opening of the Institute of Contemporary History in Munich, as well as trials on Nazi criminals (in particular, Adolf Eichmann in 1962) contributed to the opening of the first places of memory in the FRG in concentration camps. The museum and memorial in Dachau opened in 1965, for a long time, remained the only one in Germany (Zarusky 2015:147). Unlike the DDR, this process took place with the participation of the public. N. Frei, director of the Center for the Study of 20th Century History in Jena, characterizes the 1960-1970s as "memory created based on empirical knowledge" (Frei 2013). Thus, in the FRG, there is a gradual rooting of the culture of memory and studying history (van Alphen 2015, Frei 2013).

In the 1980s in the Federal Republic of Germany, the scientific community and the public focused on places where the preparation and planning of crimes took place. Since the 1990s, there was a new "memorial boom" concerning the period of National Socialism. Attempts to understand the reasons for the rise to power of the National Socialists and their popularity are reflected in the creation of documentary expositions (at first temporary) devoted to the organizers' problems and perpetrators of Nazi crimes. An essential stage in understanding the crimes of Nazism in united Germany was the exhibition "The War of Destruction: the Crimes of the Wehrmacht in 1941-1945", which opened in 1995. The exhibition developed by the Hamburg Institute for Social Research destroyed the myth that existed in society about "criminals" and "honest soldiers doing their duty" (Eppe 2020:179) through the display of private photographs in which the German military took part in crimes. This exhibition sharpened the public debate about the perpetrator of Nazi crimes and became a catalyst for forming a "hot" memory in Germany about dissonant heritage. Gradually, in the center of "hot" memory, along with the figures of the victims (far from all of them can be identified at least by name, not to mention the restoration of biographies, personal stories), is the figure of the criminal - the perpetrator of crimes Nazism of different levels. The figure of the perpetrator directly affects the museum's interpretation of the theme of National Socialism in Germany - at the beginning of the 21st century, names, stories, and motives of criminals are increasingly found in museum expositions.
2.2. Terms «Opferort» and «Täterort» as a new stage in the interpretation of difficult heritage in Germany

In the 1990s, B. Giesen formulated the concept of sacred figures. The introduction of this concept into museum practice was preceded by the separation of “places of remembrance of victims” and “places of perpetrators of crimes” (Opferort and Täterort). This concept was expressed by the German researcher and museum curator F. Dahm in the project of the new Documentation Center for National Socialism in Munich (Dahm 2002:3). Despite some conventionality of this concept (places of memory of victims without criminals do not exist), it helps to divide historical places and determine the attitude towards them. F. Dahm writes that the places of memory of the victims, as a rule, include concentration camps, labor camps, places of public killings. Their markers are references to victims, those whose names have been documented, and those who will remain anonymous forever. On the other hand, perpetrators' sites are places where crimes were planned and organized and places of particular importance to criminals, such as places of worship that were not the location of the state apparatus.

The places of the victims of crimes and the perpetrators of crimes evoke different emotions and therefore have different educational functions. Places of crime victims are addressed, first of all, to the feeling of compassion of visitors, and this limits the application of a multilevel approach to the topic, as it should be in modern history (Dahm 2002:3-4). Thus, in places of memory of victims, it is almost impossible to demonstrate totalitarian regimes' attractiveness and centralizing abilities. By necessity, all scientific, documentary, and didactic activities are concentrated to a greater extent on observation. In crime scenes, the focus is on the characters. Such places make possible a multi-perspective presentation of past events and stimulate the cognitive activity of visitors. Thus, the places of perpetrators of crimes expand the possibility of historical and political education and give a chance to impress people who were previously distant from such memorial sites (Dahm 2002:3-4). In the topographic division of “places of memory of victims” and “places of perpetrators of crimes,” there is the idea of preserving the memory of two opposite groups - victims and criminals, which B. Giesen concretized.

Let us consider the influence of B. Giesen's concept of sacred figures on modern trends in the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage of Germany. Analyzing the depiction of Nazi crimes in expositions of museums in Germany, S. Kleinmann identifies several contexts at the level of museum discourse, in which the interpretation of crimes and criminals is built:
1. The context of taking responsibility for the crimes of National Socialism by the state;
2. The context of the history of Germany after 1945, including the history of the FRG and the DDR;
3. The stratification and the expansion of research (including the lack of many objects of museum collections), study and museum interpretation of different periods of one historical place (for example, Sachsenhausen);
4. The heterogeneity of the museum landscape (typology of "places of memory of victims" and "places of perpetrators of crimes," as well as memorial complexes and documentation centers);
5. Gradual completion of the period of living evidence and the transition of the period of National Socialism from communicative to cultural memory.

At the level of the content of museum expositions, the interpretation of difficult heritage in Germany is solved by showing the personal responsibility of criminals. Responsible for creating one or another concentration camp, another place for committing Nazi crimes have been named. S. Kleinmann notes that criminals and passive observers, the owners, and sites adjacent to the crime scene, photographing strangers and many others, are presented in the expositions. To designate these people in the expositions, the expressions "committed a crime" are used, names, positions, types of activities, political and personal history, and area of responsibility are named. The researcher emphasizes that in museum expositions, those responsible for crimes are presented mainly as "quite normal" men and women who participated in a crime initiated and sanctioned by the state. But at the same time, they had space for choice, and no image unequivocally indicates that this is a criminal from whom we can distance ourselves to the best of our knowledge and beliefs.

The exhibition "Retinue of the SS: Overseers of the Ravensbrück Women's Concentration Camp" (open on 08.08.2020) shows the transformation of ordinary women into overseers and the space of their choice in the concentration camp. S. Erpel states that after the war, many overseers explained that they were forced to serve in a concentration camp, that if they avoided

---

1 The report of Dr. S. Kleinmann at the online seminar “Understand and Depict. Guilt and responsibility for the past in the expositions of German and Russian-speaking museums ” (Sachsenhausen Memorial Complex and Museum, November 6, 2020)
2 S. Apel, the report “Blind Spots ..”, at the Online Seminar “Understand and Depict. Guilt and responsibility for the past in the expositions of German and Russian-speaking museums ” (Sachsenhausen Memorial Complex and Museum, November 6, 2020)
it, they would be in danger. Nevertheless, some women were not allowed by their conscience to serve in the camp and refused this service, which had no consequences for them.

The visual interpretation of the criminal figure in the exposition is aimed at the most accurate display of events, forming an understanding of the responsibility of criminals and compassion for victims among visitors. This display is facilitated by the laconic and documentary aesthetics of the exhibition spaces - restrained colors and design. Exhibits related to those involved in the crime or the crime itself are presented in a carefully described context, and multilevel exhibition complexes are created. Persons involved in the crime and their views are contrasted with the experience and perspective of victims and survivors.3 The main goal of the verbal interpretation of the figure of a criminal in museums' cultural and educational activities is to immerse visitors in the historical context in which they independently form their opinion. For this, when working with groups of schoolchildren and youth, at the beginning of a lesson or excursion, the image of a perpetrator that has developed in the audience is identified through conversation 4. Then, in the exposition, they come across authentic biographies, motives, responsibility, space for choice, specific persons. In the end, through immersion in the context, they form their opinion (guides are directly forbidden to give value judgments about the persons indicated in the exposition). Therefore, as S. Erpel notes, "to understand involvement in a crime does not mean to sympathize with it and underestimate it."

Analyzing the interpretation of the figure of victims in German museums and memorials (Dachau, Ravensbrück, Buchenwald and Mittelbau-Dora, Sachsenhausen, Bergen-Belsen), we highlight some features. The first feature at the level of the content of modern museum expositions is the refusal to disclose the topic of victims through the display and description of "camp horrors." Exploring the peculiarities of knowledge transfer in an authentic place of historical events, the American researcher G. Marcuse writes about the "clean" and "dirty" images. By "dirty," he means demonstrating shocking photographs with dead people and their numerous reproductions in the media (Marcuse 1993). In his 1993 article, he offers a multidimensional representation of the "dirty" camp through the exhibition of a broad historical context, biographies, memoirs. Today, within this approach, the victim's figure is interpreted in

---

3 The report of Dr. S. Kleinmann
4 A. Pannen, the report "Between sadism and submission: criminals as seen by schoolchildren visiting the Sachsenhausen Museum" at the Online Seminar "Understand and Depict. Guilt and responsibility for the past in the expositions of German and Russian-speaking museums " (Sachsenhausen Memorial Complex and Museum, November 6, 2020)
German museums and memorials. The second feature is the disclosure of the victim’s figure in the German society of the period of National Socialism. This approach allows us to show the crimes of Nazism on the part of prisoners, victims, and from the side of the society that allowed them. The main goals of the visual and verbal interpretation of the figure of the victims are to show irrefutable evidence of the crimes committed, which would make it impossible to deny them and preserve the memory of all groups of victims.

Similar to the figures of victims and criminals in museum spaces in Germany is the interpretation of the "difficult" past period of National Socialism through the personification of history: historical tragic events are shown through the fates, biographies of specific people, both victims, and criminals. If the amount of information and material allows, the biographies of people are placed in a family context, and here the concept of "memory" by M. Hirsch is fully realized. Also, these sacred figures are interpreted in exhibitions using many eyewitness memories (from both sides). Typically, these memories are presented in audio format. "Places of memory of victims" and "places of perpetrators of crimes" are also united by the obligatory presence of space for reflection - a unique space located at the end of the exposition or outside it (for example, a garden, a terrace), where visitors can think over and reflect on what they have seen, be alone with you before leaving the exhibition.

2.3. Interpreting difficult heritage through showing "losses"

Now we observe the interpretation of the "dissonant" heritage in museums, memorials, and documentation centers in Germany through the concept of "places of memory" by P. Nora and the display of "loss" or "gaps." In support of the feeling of loss concerning the heritage and memory of tragic historical events (in particular, the Holocaust), the researcher L. Langer in 1995 declared the “presence of absence” - a hole and abyss in world history, in the culture and social fabric of Europe (Langer 1995). Investigating this process, K. Poluektova-Krimer writes that since the 1980s, the idea of a civilizational gap, emptiness, has become the basis of the emerging language of memorial projects about the Holocaust. The "counter-monuments" and "anti-monuments" are the most famous in Germany; instead of filling the loss, absence of dead people, their culture with a new material object, they violate harmonious city landscapes and declare the danger of oblivion of crimes (Poluektova-Krimer 2021).

Although museums and memorials have less freedom of artistic expression than plastic forms, the idea of "gap" was realized by museum means; as a result, a kind of museum interpretation of "anti-monuments" arose in some German museums. The Bergen-Belsen
Museum and Memorial is a prime example of the expression of “loss” and devastation. The most important object of display here (as in other former concentration camps) is the actual place of historical events. As Sh. de Jong notes, it legitimizes and explains an exposition or exhibition's very existence and attracts visitors (de Jong 2013). The difference between Bergen-Belsen and other concentration camps is that remarkably few authentic sites have survived on its territory. After the camp's liberation, the barracks for prisoners and other buildings were burned to prevent the spread of infectious diseases.

The new building of the museum, opened in 2007, ideally fits into the natural landscape of the area - the Luneburg Heath, in which only special tablets and cleared foundations to remind of the former camp buildings. The museum’s exposition is part of the overall landscape solution aimed at conveying the feeling of loss and devastation. It shows video evidence of former prisoners of the camp with the help of copies of photographs, documents, and objects, the history of the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp is revealed. The exposition ends with a glass wall, which opens a view of the camp territory - forest and fields. Floor display cases are placed in front of the glass wall, displaying objects discovered in the camp during archaeological work (de Jong 2013). Some of the showcases were deliberately left empty to emphasize that compared to the size of the camp and the thousands of people imprisoned in it, only a few material pieces of evidence have survived.

Museum interpretation of loss and devastation is carried out through a synthesis of video evidence, objects, and natural landscape - together, they focus on irreplaceable gaps resulting from the massacres and the demolition carried out after the camp's liberation. In the context of the idea of "lost human" by W. Sebald, objects are interpreted as devastated objects, which involuntarily indicate themselves as "empty." Comparing them with video evidence and landscape, visitors realize how few stories survived (de Jong 2013).

Museum architecture is another effective tool for the museum's interpretation of "dissonant" heritage through the display of loss and devastation. The most striking example of the implementation of this approach can be considered the Jewish Museum in Berlin. M. Wenzel, characterizing the idea underlying the concept of the museum, notes that the Holocaust is "unimaginable" in its essence; therefore, artistic means were chosen for its museum interpretation (Wenzel 2009). The first such artistic tool was the new building of the museum, designed by D. Libeskind. In the architecture of the building, five-light wells were designed at the height of the building. For their designation, D. Libeskind used the word "Void," for the architect,
it meant the expression of the idea of a hole, loss which was left in the social and cultural fabric of Europe by the extermination of six million Jews (Poluektova-Krimer 2021). Thus, with the help of light wells, a "devastated void" was built in the museum, a space that symbolizes the void in history formed after the tragic death of people, things, and places, and avoids in Berlin that cannot be filled (Bezzubova 2017, Poluektova-Krimer 2021).

The second artistic instrument widely used in the museum to show devastation and loss is installations. In one of the voids of the Jewish Museum, there is the world-famous installation "Shalekhet." The concrete floor is strewn with metal discs with schematic images of human faces distorted by suffering. Visitors are allowed to walk on them while a metallic rattle is heard - the choice of action or inaction makes each visitor a participant in the installation (Bezzubova 2017, Poluektova-Krimer 2021). Other outstanding installations of the Jewish Museum are dedicated to the losses that the Holocaust left in museum collections and the material culture of the Jewish people. A unique gallery houses three sound installations dedicated to the destroyed objects of Jewish cultural heritage: the Encyclopedia of Judaica, the sculpture "New Man" (1912), and the head of the sculpture "Hygiene" from the former Jewish hospital in Frankfurt (Poluektova-Krimer 2021).

No less difficult and controversial is the question of material evidence related to the organizers of crimes against humanity. If, in the case of objects belonging to victims, the main task is museum interpretation without traumatizing visitors, then in the case of antagonists of victims, questions arise regarding the ethics of displaying certain personal belongings. Museum staff and exhibition designers in Germany are committed to deliberately reducing the number of personal items belonging to the top leadership of the National Socialist regime. In the Obersalzberg Documentation Center (Serikova and Andreeva 2017) in Bavaria, it was precisely the “not showing” of objects, personal belongings that belonged to the leadership of the fascist regime that was chosen, although the place itself, its history, seem to be pushing for this. Thanks to the refusal to display and interpret them in the museum, a kind of emptiness are created - the deliberate deprivation of visible material evidence by criminals (Serikova 2020). S. Kleinmann notes another example of the interpretation of such objects: the museum of the Nazi past in Wewelsburg uses "containment and fencing" of personal belongings that belonged to those involved in Nazi crimes with the help of large enough texts placed on a transparent film right in front of subjects, which partially limits their view.
Summing up the analysis of the museum interpretation of Germany's dissonant heritage, the diversity of forms, practices, and approaches used in museums for the most objective presentation and understanding of "difficult" topics should be noted. For quite a long time, the museum landscape of Germany has developed in parallel along with two narratives of attitude to the past, one of which, although it has undergone some transformation, still sets the vector for the interpretation of difficult topics in Russia. In Germany, the country's unification meant accepting a joint, tragic attitude model to the past. As a result, conceptual comprehension of sacred figures found wide distribution in museum practice: it manifested itself in the typological division of "Places of memory of victims" and "Places of those guilty of crimes," in the peculiarities of the interpretation of figures of victims and criminals in museum exhibitions, in the display or deliberate non-display of preserved objects. In the case of the victim's figure, the surviving objects are used to show how significant the human and material losses are, and the things that belonged to the criminals, on the contrary, are limited in the museum space.
Chapter 3. Interpretation of dissonant heritage in Russian museums

In this chapter, we will trace the influence of the concepts formulated in the framework of socio-humanitarian areas of memory studies and trauma studies on the interpretation of dissonant heritage in Russian museums, as well as highlight ideas and concepts specific to Russia that set the vector of museum interpretation of difficult heritage of the 20th century - the Great Patriotic War and the memory of the GULAG. These themes imply two models of attitudes towards the past: the first requires a model of triumph, in which the country's past appears as “the victory march of 'our' state” (Yudin 2021), the second implies interpretation through the narrative of trauma, in which it is necessary to recognize crimes (repression) and collective remorse.

3.1. The memory of the Great Patriotic War as a theme of dissonant heritage in Russia

Dissonant heritage, being the material embodiment of the collective and cultural traumas of society, in Russia is woven into a very complex context. On the one hand, as the researchers note (Yudin 2021, Epple 2020, Dubin 2013, and many others), history as a whole, and especially the history of the twentieth century, became political resources in Russia, happened “the historicization of politics” (Yudin 2021). However, on the other hand, there is a process of politicization of history, which directly affects historians, researchers of other humanitarian areas, employees of public organizations (for example, Memorial), who risk being held accountable for inaccurate wording in publications or public speeches. These processes also affect museums, probably even more than researchers. These cultural institutions are financed from the state's budget, which sets the interpretation of history and incredibly complex topics of the 20th century in museums within the state model of attitude to the past.

Researchers (Scherbakova 2016, Epple 2020, Yudin 2021, Dubin 2013) and the public agree that the major event in the history of the twentieth century for Russia is the victory in the Great Patriotic War. Sociological polls conducted since the late 1980s by Y. Levada confirm that the memory about the war is still one of the cementing components of memory in today's Russia and one of the pillars of national identity (Gydkov 2005, Feretti 2005). B. Dubin notes that there is a memory of the victory in the war, namely about the victory, not about the war (Dubin 2013). The researcher singles out the heroic aspect, including the theme of suffering and trials. Considering the victory as a symbol, B. Dubin notes that it did not become a general, international
symbol, as happened with the memory of the Holocaust. Instead, the memory of victory "became" our "symbol, a segregation symbol separating" us "from" them "(Dubin 2013)".

L. Gudkov, relying on sociological data, characterizes the "Victory" as a symbol that acts for most of the simplified and Russian society as a whole, the crucial element of collective identification, a reference point, a measure that sets a specific optics of assessing the past and, in part, understanding the present and the future (Gudkov 2005). This description traces the contours of the "Myth" highlighted by J. Assman in the concept of cultural memory. According to his definition, a myth is "a story that is told in order to understand its place in the world, a truth of a higher order, which not only corresponds to reality but claims to be normative and has a formative power" (Assman 2004). The myth can be based on an entirely fictional event or a real one. The Holocaust, as a historical fact, is a myth for modern Israel, from which the state draws its legitimacy through a reminder of this event in educational programs, ceremonies, rituals, monuments, museums (Safronova 2019:89]. J. Assman singles out justifying and counter-representational functions in myths, while the choice of a myth's function depends on “the formative representation and the meaning that it has for the present, which guides the activity” (Assman 2004)—continuing the study A. Assman concretizes the concept of myth. She adds that this is a view of history through the prism of identity; this is effective assimilation of the past (Safronova 2019:99), the potential of historical experience for social interaction is essential.

For Russia, the “Victory” in the Great Patriotic War can be considered as a legitimizing state myth "about the foundation." Researcher N. Epple notes that the idea of victory in the Great Patriotic War as a "new founding myth of the Russian state" (Epple 2020:46) was expressed in 2007 by the historian N. Narochnitskaya. Furthermore, the myth can direct the activity of the culture within which it functions - J. Assman calls this process "mythomotor" (Assman 2004). One of the manifestations of this process is the museum's interpretation of historical events.

3.2. The “hot” and “cold” memory in museum interpretation of the Great Patriotic War

Being the critical point (myth) of the model of treating the past as a triumph, the memory of the Great Patriotic War sets the framework for interpreting these events in the museum space. As we have already noted in chapter 1, the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage within the framework of the narrative of triumph is primarily based on the concept of “cold” and “hot” memory expressed by J. Assman; this concept is also relevant for Russia. B. Dubin's statement very accurately conveys the division of the memory of the Great Patriotic War into the memory of victory and the memory of the war itself. This division is also present in the museum
interpretation: the memory of victory is preserved and interpreted in the form of "cold" memory, the memory of the war crystallizes in "hot" memory.

The "hot" memory, which includes experiences, wartime traumas, the everyday life during the war and in the post-war period (work in production, hunger and poverty, overcrowding, and much more), the memory of disabled people with disabilities who returned from the war, is almost wholly ousted from the collective memory. However, fragments of it can be found in museum exhibitions. First of all, this is personification - showing tragic historical events through biographies, stories of specific people, participants, or eyewitnesses of those events, and the texts of personal letters, diaries, and unofficial photographs recorded every day life.

Transferring the "hot" memory in museum exhibitions is crucial to have a "living" language of narration. At the same time, it is not only historical information and images, but also values, emotional charge, experiences that people experienced and experienced during the war years. This approach to the museum interpretation of difficult past with one common and one form or another personification can be found in most museums fully or partially devoted to the theme of the Great Patriotic War: Central Museum of the Great Patriotic War 1941-1945, Historical and Memorial Museum-reserve "Battle of Stalingrad," Museum of Defense and Siege of Leningrad and others. Nevertheless, in the overwhelming majority of personal stories and biographies presented in the expositions, "storytelling" is almost absent - a living, valuable story about a person's experience of experiencing the most challenging trials. Instead, biographies are most often a short retelling of the award list of a person, his movements along the front (Museum complex "Memory Road"), sometimes supplemented by personal items and photographs. This formalization of showing the fate of people reaches its peak when a large number of biographies are included in the exhibition (or its separate section), focused on the awards of people and not the stories behind them.

The "cold" memory as the memory of authorities, which strengthens itself through an appeal to the triumphant past, is reflected in the museum's interpretation of the Great Patriotic War memory as a victory. Vivid examples of this approach to difficult heritage are the Central Museum of the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945, the Museum Complex "Memory Road," the Museum Complex of Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya, and many others. Showing the scale of the Great Patriotic War as a historical event is mainly solved by creating large lists, enumerations with crucial numbers and dates, and a massive display of photographs (portraits) of wartime.
Examples of this are the Faces of Victory Hall in the Victory Museum and a photo panel in the exposition of the Memory Road Museum Complex.

The museum's interpretation of the memory of the Great Patriotic War is aimed at affecting visitors emotionally. The reason for this is to form a new cultural strategy, in which the museum focuses not on cognition but the sensory, emotional impact on the visitor (Bezybova 2017, Bonami 2019). In this process, museums (primarily, of course, art) are influenced by new forms and trends of contemporary art to create impressions (Bezyboba 2017, Bonami 2019, Rois 2013). The position of a museum item in a museum that preserves the memory of tragic historical events is even more complicated. Memorial museums (or "museums of conscience") are often focused on storytelling and engaging visitors, developing a sense of empathy and empathy in them. Museum architecture and design, audio-visual accompaniment, photography, and theatricalization are the dominant places. Appropriate use of emotionally directed techniques and the affection of visitors is justified by the principle and message of such museums - “never again” (Serikova 2020).

3.3. The museum interpretation of “gaps” of the Great Patriotic War

The following approach suggests showing "losses" in the context of P. Nora's concept of "places of memory," realized through "devastated material" - visualization of the loss of a vast number of human lives, "devastated emptiness" - visualization of loss in material culture. In particular, it is used not only in museum practice in Germany but also in Holocaust museums (Yad Vashem, Holocaust Museum in Washington, Imperial War Museum in London). However, this concept is rarely used to interpret the memory of the Great Patriotic War. Examples of the interpretation of difficult heritage through the display of losses are an installation made of brass pendants located on the ceiling in the “Hall of Memory and Sorrow” of the Victory Museum and a dynamic composition on the theme of Psalm 87, and a sculptural composition "Remember shadows "(artist Igor Baskin) at the Museum of Memory of Victims of Nazism (Military Medical Museum, St. Petersburg). An example of the implementation of the concept of "places of memory" by P. Nora for showing "loss" through museum items is a showcase in the State Museum of Defense and Siege of Leningrad (St. Petersburg), dedicated to the evacuation of children through Ladoga: it contains broken toys of children transported through Ladoga the lake and those killed in the shelling, the toys were then lifted from the bottom of the lake.

In Russian museums devoted to "difficult" topics, the source of the affect is often not genuine evidence and museum objects that reveal within the framework of the museum
interpretation “the affective radicalism of front-line perception” (Gubkov 2005), but specially created decorations, art installations, supplemented by the audio-visual accompaniment. Furthermore, the affect is projected at the stage of scenery development - vivid, memorable images. Although, when visiting the exposition, visitors' attention is attracted precisely by artificial images (often with mannequins of people expressing emotions), genuine evidence - documents, photographs, museum objects - appear on the periphery of perception. Therefore, the ratio of recreated historical decorations, special effects, projections, sound accompaniment, and genuine museum evidence in the museum's exposition topical is questionable and requires discussion on this issue in the museum community.

Proposing a preliminary generalization of the museum's interpretation of the memory of the Great Patriotic War as one of the themes of dissonant heritage within the framework of this study, it is necessary to note the dominance of "cold" memory over "hot" memory. At the same time, one can observe a fragmentary substitution of the "hot" memory for the "cold" one during the museum interpretation. This happens when the "quality" of personal stories in a museum exhibition turns into "quantity" - a mass character, behind which people, their injuries, and personal experience of war are lost. Thus, "hot" memory is transformed into "cold" memory - the memory of power, while (often irrevocably) individual memory and experience of war are lost. The individual experience, even experienced by many people simultaneously, can become part of historical memory only after it has been institutionalized and consolidated (Gudkov 2005), including in museum exhibitions, which does not always happen. For emotional connection with the memory of the war, genuine museum items, documents, and evidence are essential; they require more exposition work to interpret and disclose their informational potential, attractiveness than creating decorations. A museum object also requires greater readiness for perception on the part of the visitor. However, when visiting an exposition, entirely or to a greater extent, created from specially designed decorations, the emotional connection with the past and its affective impact on the visitor is very short-lived (Dubina 2019:174).

The memory of the Great Patriotic War is twofold; as B. Dubin notes, the victory did not last in the sense of increasing freedom in society (Dubin 2013), but on the contrary, became a prerequisite for the tightening of the dictatorship in the postwar period and a repeated round of repression within the country (Dubin 2013, Feretti 2005). The memory of the Great Patriotic War and the memory of the GULAG are closely related to each other; they are two important and most traumatic events of the 20th century in the country's collective memory. Therefore, having
analyzed the museum’s interpretation of the memory of the Great Patriotic War, it is necessary to turn to the second crucial topic of dissonant heritage in Russia.

### 3.4. The memory of GULAG as a theme of dissonant heritage in Russia

At the end of the 19th century, the French philosopher E. Renan formulated the thesis that suffering and mourning unite and consolidate society more than triumph. This idea, intuitively expressed by the researcher, subsequently received scientific confirmation and retained its relevance for discussing the museum’s interpretation of Russia's dissonant heritage. Contemporary Russian (S. Chuikina, V. Dubina, L. Gudkov, A. Roginsky) and foreign researchers (A. Etkind, A. Assman, A. Applebaum), studying the problems of repression and the Gulag in collective and cultural memory Russia, agree that the preservation of the memory of the victims of the Soviet regime lies to a greater extent on civil society, in the person of public organizations, museums, than on the state (Chyikina 2015). Researcher V. Dubina notes that by the type of remembrance, the memory of the GULAG is entirely consonant with the unspoken motto of German memorials and documentation centers - "never again" (Dubina 2019:166). The second problem of preserving this “difficult” theme is that it is forced to integrate into the existing model of treating the past as a triumph; at the level of non-core museum expositions, this is manifested in less attention to the topic of repression. All other things being equal, it will be easier for the museum management to hold an exhibition or cultural and educational event dedicated to the aspect of the Great Patriotic War than in memory of the victims of repression. Therefore, a small number of museums fully dedicated to this topic play a key role in preserving the memory of the GULAG in Russia.

V. Dubina notes the importance of preserving the emotional connection of the memory of the GULAG with certain geographic places, his history (Dubina 2019:170). Museumification of authentic places of historical events contributes to such emotional involvement and empathy among visitors. In Russia, museumification in difficult heritage is complicated by the tremendous geographical remoteness of such objects. Nevertheless, the former corrective labor colony BC-389/36 was preserved, where the Museum of the History of Political Repressions (former Museum "Perm-36") was created, and the former NKVD remand prison in Tomsk. There are also examples of "new" memory places about repressions and the GULAG, in particular, the Museum of the History of the Gulag (Moscow), whose activities aim at an essential understanding of the past without reference to a specific historical place (Dubina 2019:170).
3.5. The interpretation of the GULAG memory in Russian museums

Analyzing the museum's interpretation of the GULAG memory and repressions from the point of view of cultural concepts, let us single out the presence of the marker of "cold" memory (J. Assman): One of the critical visual ways of interpreting this theme is the walls of memory from portraits of the repressed and memory lists - names. The use of these elements in the context of commemorating the dead is an essential point of contact between the museum's interpretation of the memory of the Great Patriotic War and the memory of repressions. In both cases, the memory and attitude towards the ancestors are recorded. J. Assman writes that "the memory of the dead is a paradigmatic case of memory" creating community " (Assman 2004). N. Eppe supplements the idea of the memory of the dead as the basis for constructing society's identity with the fact that acknowledgment of one's duty to specific names always hides the recognition of one's sociopolitical identity (Eppe 2020:53). Visually, there are elements of "cold" memory in almost all exhibitions dedicated to the memory of repressions and the GULAG. However, they do not dominate over "hot" memory, which manifests itself through disclosing personal stories, experiences, and traumatic experiences of people who have experienced the repressive apparatus. Such exhibition complexes often include personal belongings, family relics of the repressed, photographs, and documents (the most vivid examples are presented in the expositions of the Museum of the History of the GULAG and the Memorial Museum of the History of Political Repression "Investigative Prison of the NKVD").

Within the framework of the concept of "post-memory," M. Hirsch reveals the theme of the family, family, and interpersonal relations during the period of repression. A striking example of such an interpretation of difficult legacy is the exhibition "The Right to Correspondence" (International Memorial, Moscow, 2015), based on the interpretation of letters between prisoners and their families. The documents presented at this exhibition are valuable and unique in that they are a source of a personal nature that was created at the very moment when the person was imprisoned, and not years later (Chyikina 2015), as is often the case with memoirs and memoirs. The concept of "places of memory" by P. Nora to show human and material "losses" is also used to interpret the theme of the GULAG. In the interpretation of the Great Patriotic War memory, installations and architectural and artistic solutions of the museum space are used. An example of loss and devastation in museum design and emotional impact on visitors is the Museum of the History of the GULAG (Moscow). In the Hall of Memory, names of the repressed are heard and finished the exposition.
In the museum's interpretation of the GULAG memory, the image of a criminal is also visualized, referring to the concept of sacred figures by B. Giesen and its wide application in museum spaces in Germany. It should be noted that when interpreting the memory of the Great Patriotic War, the figure of a criminal is found in exhibitions quite rarely: as a rule, the display is limited to examples of German weapons, everyday things that belonged to the Nazis, posters, and leaflets of Nazi propaganda, less often - a military uniform (such an example can be found in Museum of Defense and Siege of Leningrad, St. Petersburg). The criminal, the enemy, appears impersonal in the exhibitions. This trend applies to the criminal figure in the case of the museum's interpretation of the memory of the repressions. Studying the visualization of the image of a criminal in museum exhibitions. I. Flige identifies three ways: using examples of Soviet propaganda - posters, slogans, disclosing the image of a criminal through a historical reconstruction of the chief’s office, in which decisions on repression were made, and displaying historical documents. Highlighting the main trends in the visualization of the theme of the GULAG and repression in domestic museums, I. Flige notes three images that are most often found in museum expositions of provincial museums: the image of a "road to nowhere" (photographs of labor camps and roads leading to them, built by prisoners of railways, supplemented with working tools), the image of a "tribe of prisoners" (showing the meager, deprived of basic amenities, the life of prisoners through household items, reconstruction of barracks, drawings), the image of "heroizing prisoners 'labor" (showing prisoners' labor as a labor feat with the help of Soviet posters, slogans, statistical data)s.

The peculiarity of the existence of dissonant heritage, particularly the theme of the memory of repressions about the GULAG in the Russian museum discourse, is the possibility of influencing their interpretation of concepts formulated outside the framework of the framework academic community. One of them is the concept of "reconciliation," formulated by Metropolitan Tikhon Shevkunov and implemented in the exhibition “My History. XX century. 1914-1945. From Great Upheavals to the Great Victory ”, opened in Manezh (Moscow) in 2015. This exhibition became the third project of T. Shevkunov in the series "Russia is my history" before these exhibitions were created "The Romanovs" (2013) and "Rurikovichi" (2014) (Epple 2020:47). At the 2015 exhibition, the concept of "reconciliation" of the memory of the 20th

---

5 I. Flige, the report “Executioner-hero-victim: visual images in museum exhibitions " at the online seminar “Understand and Depict. Guilt and responsibility for the past in the expositions of German and Russian-speaking museums "(Sachsenhausen Memorial Complex and Museum, November 6, 2020).
The 20th century was proposed: according to it, the 20th century was a time of "successes" for Russia (for example, industrialization, victory in the Great Patriotic War) and "tragedies" (revolutions, Civil War, repressions of 1930s), while the authors of the exposition insist on a non-judgmental examination of the history of the twentieth century. N. Epple emphasizes that neutrality in the story of the tragedies and successes of the country is the main conceptual innovation of the exhibition since this approach puts the memory of the GULAG, the detailed elaboration, and comprehension of which did not take place, on a par with other difficult periods in the history of the 20th century (for example, red and white terror during the Civil War) (Epple 2020:48). The balancing act found support from the state, which resulted in a network of permanent exhibitions "Russia is my history" throughout the country. However, N. Epple notes that such a concept is fraught with dangers: the first of them lies in the "normalization" of Soviet repressions (which arises as a result of the lack of condemnation), and the second consists in balancing success with tests (Epple 2020:48). The extent to which the concept of balancing will penetrate the exhibits of other museums that touch on dissonant heritage remains to be determined.

However, the interest in dissonant heritage in Russia, the request for its elaboration, discussion, legal and moral assessment, reflects processes similar to those that took place in Europe in the social sciences since the 1990s during the "memorial boom" or "Memory boom," which resulted in a turn from a triumphant model of memory to a tragic one. The reaction to these processes on the part of the museum community was the active creation of memorial complexes and documentation centers in Germany. The primary value of the tragic model of attitude to the past is human life and not the interests and greatness of the state (Epple 2020:56). For the movement of Russia in this direction, it is necessary to evaluate, study and comprehend repressions, including within the framework of museum exhibitions.

Summing up the analysis of the museum interpretation of dissonant heritage in the museums of Russia, it is necessary to note two key "difficult" topics for modern Russian society - the memory of the Great Patriotic War and the memory of the GULAG. The first theme of dissonant heritage underlies the state model of attitude to the past - the narrative of triumph. The second topic needs to be comprehended and worked out within the tragic attitude model to the past. Nevertheless, so far, it has to exist in the narrative of triumph, which does not always contribute to its objective interpretation in museum exhibitions. The memory of the Great Patriotic War consists of the memory of victory and the war; they are unevenly presented in museum expositions, which sometimes finds expression in the dominance of artistic means,
decorations over a museum object - the original of historical events. The problem of showing the figure of a criminal in exhibitions is dedicated to both themes of dissonant heritage in Russia, the domestic concept of "balancing" also used for interpretation of the "difficult" past of the 20th century.
Conclusions

Main findings: This master thesis aimed to show the similarities and differences in the interpretation of dissonant heritage as a historical and cultural phenomenon in Russia and Germany. The main objectives of the master thesis were: to identify the main cultural concepts influencing the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage in Russia and Germany; to analyze the interpretation of difficult heritage in the museum practice of the two countries. The purpose and objectives of this research were successfully achieved based on the ideas of modern museologists in the field of preservation and representation of tangible and intangible cultural heritage and the works of memory studies trauma studies.

To identify the main cultural concepts that influence the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage in Russia and Germany. The results of selecting cultural concepts that influenced and set the vectors for the interpretation of dissonant heritage in museums were the concepts of J. and A. Assman, P. Nora, B. Giesen, and M. Hirsch. It is noted that museum practice is ahead of museum theory and conceptualization of dissonant heritage. Therefore, the conceptual interpretation of dissonant heritage in museums grows out of theoretical searches in the socio-humanitarian directions of memory studies and trauma studies. At this stage of the study, two models of attitudes towards the past were identified and considered - triumphal (typical for Russia) and tragic (spread in Germany). When analyzing cultural concepts, not only were they noted their positions that are significant for museum interpretation, but also greater gravitation towards one or another model of attitude to the past, as well as markers by which they can be identified in the exposition or deliberately laid at the design stage.

Summarizing the study of the main cultural concepts used in the museum interpretation of dissonant heritage, we have to note that they can simultaneously be included in one museum exposition and act as conceptual elements of different exposition parts, making it possible like a "mosaic." At this stage, we have identified four of the most famous concepts from memory studies and trauma studies. However, continuing research in this direction can significantly expand the list of concepts and deepen understanding of the museum's interpretation of difficult heritage.

To analyze the interpretation of difficult heritage in the museum practice of the two countries. Based on the analysis of the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage in Russia and Germany, several generalizations can be made: markers of "cold" and "hot" memory have
significant distribution in the expositions of both countries. In Germany, they are harmoniously combined in museum expositions, helping to interpret dissonant heritage objectively. The situation is similar in the museum interpretation of the memory of the GULAG in Russian museums. However, when interpreting the memory of the Great Patriotic War, there is a significant dominance of "cold" memory and the excessive use of audio-visual aids and decorations in the expositions of some museums. The concepts of "post-memory" by M. Hirsch and "places of memory" by P. Nora as a display of "loss" are pointwise, fragmentary, present in the museum's interpretation of dissonant heritage of the two countries.

The main difference between the museum interpretation in Russia and Germany lies in the position of the criminal figure. In Germany, with the tragic model of attitude to the past, the disclosure of the personalities of criminals (both high-ranking and grassroots executors of criminal orders) in exhibitions is part of the state policy of memory. Therefore, in domestic museums, the criminal figure, firstly, is given much less attention than in German museum institutions. Secondly, both in exhibitions dedicated to the memory of the Great Patriotic War and in exhibitions that preserve the memory of repressions, the figure, and image of the criminal remain impersonal.

Analyzing dissonant heritage in Russia, we tried to highlight the tendencies and peculiarities of museum interpretation of “difficult” topics in Russian museums and identify problems in this area that require discussion and additional research. In conclusion, we note that researcher G. Yudin cites the data of a sociological survey of the "Path to a Common History" project. According to this survey, the models of triumph and trauma cannot fully meet the needs of Russian society. For example, the model of triumph with victory in the Great Patriotic War as a crucial event of the twentieth century is suitable for discussing the "positive agenda" and, in part, the topic of rallying before an external enemy (Eppe 2020:19), but does not imply a discussion (and even less comprehension) of the "difficult past" (Yudin 2021). In contrast, the trauma model, based on the experience of Germany, in contrast, presupposes a critical attitude towards the past, the key event of which is considered to be the repression of the 1930s. However, the focus on the figure of the "criminal" can lead to a split in society and be used to find internal enemies (Eppe 2020:19, Yudin 2021). Thus, both models create groups of "traitors" or "executioners" in society, which makes it necessary to form a new model of attitude to the past based on the value of human life and human rights. A step in this direction on the part of
museology is the identification and discussion of concepts, ideas that set the vectors for the interpretation of dissonant heritage in Russian museums.

**The practical significance** of this master thesis lies in highlighting the cultural concepts that set the directions for the interpretation of dissonant heritage in the museums of Russia and Germany. Their clear understanding will allow museum staff to purposefully and with a high level of conceptualization design museum projects to comprehend the "difficult" topics of Russian history in the exhibition or cultural and educational direction of museum activities.

The master thesis not only offers generalizations but also raises **new research questions**, in particular: a detailed study and discussion in the museum scientific community require the problem of the relationship in the museum exposition of recreated historical decorations, special effects, projections, soundtrack, and genuine museum evidence. In the context of this problem, we would like to separately note the issue of the expediency of the widespread use of mannequins of people expressing vivid emotions - sometimes instead of museum items. Equally interesting is the question of compliance (or non-compliance) with the humanistic mission of difficult heritage, the approach of domestic museums to the understanding of “difficult” topics by museum pedagogical means in the mainstream of military-patriotic education. Finally, the most exciting vectors for studying dissonant heritage in Germany are the management and marketing of objects of difficult heritage in this country and the peculiarities of the cultural and educational activities of documentation centers and places of memory.

**Approbation of research results.** Specific provisions of the research were tested in reports at seven scientific and scientific-practical conferences, and seven publications were made. On the topic of the research, competitive works were published that won prizes in competitions of the all-Russian and international level: the work "Dissonant" heritage in museums of Russia: concept, mission, interpretation " received the II degree prize in the nomination" Museology, conservation and restoration of historical and cultural objects ”of the VII All-Russian competition of young scientists in the field of arts and culture; the essay “Reification of trauma:” difficult "heritage in the museum," nomination in the competition of the international project "World War II: Memory, Rituals and Myths. An experience of critical reflection "(2020).
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