

ar all,

The outline of my paper will be something like this:

1. Western historiography since 19th century (appr. 1850-1950): focused on the nation state; historians created different national bodies of historical knowledge; the majority of these narratives had the political nation-state as the most important object of historical writing. The encyclopedic approach of the 'world' (Enlightenment) was compressed to coherent historical narratives based on the nation state. Both influences are visible in all kinds of historical writing and dealing with the past.
2. After 1960 critiques: Annales; social science approach; women's history and labour history. More room for suppressed voices, mentalities, layered approach of historical time. Yet, these contributions were still embedded in the discourse of modernity: progress and completeness.
3. Since 1980s and 1990s: linguistic turn, postmodernism (death of grand narratives) and recently memory turn. Introduction concept lieux de memoire (Pierre Nora). What is the significance of the concept? What are the effects? The concept is still limited to the nation, often based on canonized commemorations and memory sites. Although the linearity of historical writing has been replaced by a kaleidoscopic presentation of mirco-narratives, a deconstruction of the traditional whiggish approach did not take place. Hence, the memory turn seems to continue traditional and canonized narratives.
4. Dynamic approach (Kansteiner and De Certeaux): producing and consuming collective memories and historical narratives; appropriation and re-appropriation of collective memories and historical narratives. This approach offers more opportunities for women's history and other voices.

With regard to the following papers: \* International Museum on Women: in collaboration with different kinds of groups all over the world historical and actual exhibits of women's issues will be presented for different audiences. \* virtual lieux de memoire in Europe: it's a proposal to create portals of memory sites on a local basis in Europe on the internet, which seems to offer possibilities for participants to respond, to appropriate and to re-appropriate.

There remain some difficult questions. What does it mean that an international museum is located in the most powerful nation of the world? To what extent does this institution produce narratives 'for' others? To what extent do the organizers stimulate a dynamic approach? Are there possibilities for audiences to produce their narratives and memories or is it just presenting different exhibits and narratives to different audiences? What do the historians of the third paper mean with 'Europe': just the geographical scope or the making of a coherent framework for historical narratives instead of the nation? What are the consequences for the making of a pluriform (multiform) narrative?