



History beyond borders: Peace education, history textbook revision, and the internationalization of history teaching in the twentieth century

Henrik Åström Elmersjö
Umeå University, Sweden

ABSTRACT: This article summarizes the findings of the "History beyond borders: The international history textbook revision, 1919-2009" project, which explored the internationalization of history education. The different studies within the project focused on ideas of peace education, relations between different revisioning projects, the interaction between different historical cultures, and the relation between guidelines from international organizations and national curricula and syllabi. The findings indicate that there were pronounced connections between peace associations and history teaching, and that the national perspective was built in to methods of internationalization. The process of implementation was extended throughout the twentieth century. The different arenas, projects and organizations that engaged in the process were also connected in the making of a European educational space which they both influenced, and were influenced by.

KEYWORDS: History Textbooks, Peace Education, Internationalization, History Teaching.

Introduction

It has been stated that history education in general, and history textbooks in particular, showcased extreme nationalism around the world until sometime after World War II, and even as long as until the 1970s. In some sense, history education and history textbooks are still nationalistic today in terms of their framing and narrative. However, very few scholars would say that the nationalistic content of today is the same as it was in the beginning of the twentieth century. The idea of a new kind of history after World War II emanates from the notion that the nationally centered narratives of history education began to be questioned as a result of the war and that nationalistic sentiment started to fade in the 1960s and 1970s (Tingsten, 1969; FitzGerald, 1979; Giordano, 2003). It has also been argued that history education has been debated far longer, and that the national focus in textbook narratives has been – at least to some extent – questioned and debated since the latter part of the nineteenth century (Carlgren, 1928; Andersson, 1979; Moreau, 2003; Macintyre & Clark, 2003). It has also been stated that international collaboration on different levels – both formal and informal – was a key feature in changing education, especially during the interwar period (Kolasa 1962; Iriye, 2002; Fuchs, 2007). However, it could also be claimed that the transnational connections between ideas and practice in changing history education have not been investigated adequately.

PLEASE CITE AS: Elmersjö, H. A. (2014). History beyond borders: Peace education, history textbook revision, and the internationalization of history teaching in the twentieth century. *Historical Encounters: A journal of historical consciousness, historical cultures, and history education*, 1(1), 62-74.

ISSN 2203 7543 | © Author | This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/)
Publication Date: 30 June 2014 | Available Online: <http://hej.hermes-history.net>

How did this alleged international collaboration on textbooks and curricula influence history teaching during the twentieth century? Which individuals and organizations were involved in the process, and under what ideological principles did they discuss history teaching? These were questions that the international project on educational history and history didactics, “History beyond borders: The international history textbook revision, 1919–2009” – financed by The Swedish research council and Umeå University, and directed by professor Daniel Lindmark – wanted to answer. The project was a major success in uncovering new insights into networks in the history of education and the measures taken in the internationalization of the school subject of history.

The project was carried out in collaboration between the Swedish universities in Umeå and Karlstad and the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research in Braunschweig, Germany. Four dissertations in history and history didactics (Nygren, 2011a; Faure, 2013; Elmersjö, 2013a; Nilsson, 2014) and a number of articles in international peer-reviewed journals and yearbooks (for example Elmersjö & Lindmark, 2010; Lindmark, 2010; Holmgren & Lindmark, 2011, Faure, 2011; Nygren, 2011b; 2011c; 2012; Elmersjö, 2013b) were the result of the research conducted for this project between 2008 and 2013. The scientific results covered several fields as the project grew larger over the years.

From the onset, the purpose of the project was to establish new knowledge on the development of history teaching by focusing on the history of textbook revisions in Europe and the connections between different multilateral textbook collaborations. However, the project also turned towards the ideas of “nation” within the peace education discourse in the interwar period, the history of textbook revision and its relation to textbook research, and the intersection of historical cultures within the context of history textbook revision. This article aims to encapsulate the project’s contributions to the field of educational history and history didactics.

Previous research on the history of history education in different countries seems to indicate an almost universal development of the teaching of history in the last fifty years. (Asher, 1978; Davies, 2000; Marsden, 2001; Cajani, 2006). The nation, as the main protagonist in the historical narrative, has been undermined from two directions. First, it has become more common to study history below the national level, for example by using social groups as the historical narrative’s central characters. Second, transnational entities, such as Europe or even the world on a global scale, have also gained in importance. This is not to say that the history of the nation has been deemed unimportant, only that its importance has been significantly reduced (Soysal & Schissler, 2005).

The negotiation of history in an international context, and to what extent that negotiation has been embraced in a simultaneous context of national negotiation, has not been properly examined. Furthermore, the ethical, ideological, and scientific logic behind such negotiations has not been investigated sufficiently. When the relationship between history textbook revision, national peace education, and the implementation of transnational ideas into history education has been explored, it has often been in the form of accounts by scholars or organizations that themselves were involved in producing history teaching with a certain ideological or ethical framing (Schüddekopf, 1967; Stobart, 1999; Pingel, 1999; 2000; Korostelina & Lässig, 2013). The project “History beyond borders” was developed to contribute to this field by providing outside scrutiny of the relationship between textbook revisions, international organizations, and national history education in the twentieth century.

Ideas of peace education and their relation to history teaching before 1939

At the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, the movement for peace was – in large part – driven by female schoolteachers (Storr, 2010; Goodman, 2012) and they were often opposed by (male) historians and accused of being driven by political (pacifist), not scientific, sentiments (Elmersjö & Lindmark, 2010; Elmersjö, 2013a). World War I served as a catalyst for these debates. In the interwar period historians could no longer avoid taking a stand against the most glorifying and belligerent parts of the national narrative, where their own nation was described as the most prominent of nations and where its historical wars were described as heroic, well-needed, defensive resistance against still present enemies that threaten national sovereignty. Still, the nationalistic sentiment had to be preserved in the intellectual climate of the time and a “patriotic pacifism” was voiced (Cooper, 1991; Siegel, 2004). International organizations had, already before the war, started to investigate how history could be taught in schools in a way that would satisfy the need for national social cohesion without violating the national pride of other nations, but these investigations became more organized and more targeted in the interwar period. In Sweden, the history subject taught in schools was the target of numerous publications by liberal politicians and schoolteachers as early as the 1880s, and this escalated in the wake of the war. The politically and military-centered history was being questioned, and demands for a more culturally oriented history education for children were put forward (Thelin, 1996; Nygren, 2011b; Nilsson, 2014). One of the subprojects of “History beyond borders” specifically examined the ideas of peace education in the interwar period and their relation to the Swedish history subject in schools (Nilsson, 2014).

In 1919 the Peace Association of Swedish Schools (*Svenska skolornas fredsförening*) was formed when an already-established peace organization for female teachers (*Svenska lärarinnornas fredsgrupp*) began to include male members. However, the new association continued to have a predominantly female board and could be described as part of a women’s movement for peace, even with male members. The association had a special interest in history education focusing on how the history of wars was presented in schools. In accordance with ideas from the end of the nineteenth century, the belief that history education for young children should focus more on culture and the cultivation of peaceful sentiment was firmly established in the association. They also focused on the concepts of patriotism and chauvinism and promoted a sense of nation that included a “sensible patriotism” without aggrieving other nations. The idea that history teaching had contributed to a view of war as necessary – and even longed-for – was not so much linked to the overall nationalism conveyed in history textbooks. Instead the criticism focused on how the histories of the wars themselves were taught; the criticism especially concentrated on the abstract, mythical, and romantic narratives of war in history textbooks (Nilsson, 2014).

Sweden was to some degree seen as a vanguard for peace education in the early interwar years (Nilsson, 2014). Toward the end of World War I, the public school debate in Sweden had turned in favor of the peace activists and the new curriculum for elementary schools from 1919 included instructions for history education that emphasized ideas from the peace activists’ agenda and the need for more cultural history and a focus on the heroes of peace and social justice was acknowledged. As these ideas made their way into the new curriculum they could be used to change the focal point of history education toward modern and contemporary history, focusing on the rise of a peace movement in an international context and on the creation of the League of Nations. The pacifistic sentiment of the history syllabus in the curriculum for elementary schools was admired by peace advocates from other countries, but it was only a guiding principle for Swedish history education and not normative. It also took

until 1935 for similar ideas to make it into the history syllabus for the State Grammar Schools at the upper secondary level (Elmersjö & Lindmark, 2010; Nygren, 2011b; Nilsson, 2014).

The framework of discussions – the hegemonic idea of national cohesion – ultimately did not allow for the abandonment of the nationally centered and romantic history even though the views on the history of war had changed. Calls for peace education were instead accompanied by a strong sense of patriotism. The demand for international understanding was not put up against nationalism, but was a part of a “sensible patriotism”. This was evident in both the Swedish curriculum for elementary schools as well as in the demands for reform put forward by the Peace Association of Swedish Schools. It seems the key issue was to unite the peace efforts with the overarching and hegemonic nationalism of society at large, not to replace it. The same goes for the international aspects; they too were supposed to be united with a “sensible patriotism”, not replace it (Nilsson, 2014).

Multiple subprojects in the “History beyond borders” project found clear connections between the peace activists’ promotion of peace education and the history textbook revisions that started under the auspices of the League of Nations and various international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the interwar period. For example, it was a distinct demand from the Peace Association of Swedish Schools that the history textbooks were to be revised in some way, either by the government agency for schools or by some NGO, but there was little interest in having the mostly female elementary schoolteachers as advisors or revisers on any textbook commissions. The revisions of textbooks in the interwar period – and by associative extension the revisions in the postwar period – were to a great extent influenced and to some degree even forced by the school peace activists, but the revision of history textbooks was conducted by male teachers at higher educational levels and by male scholars in universities (Nilsson, 2014; Elmersjö, 2013a).

Networks of revision

In a wider context, textbook revisions – and especially revisions of history textbooks – can be seen as a form of cultural diplomacy; an institutionalized form of cultural relations (Iriye, 1997; Faure, 2013). Numerous regional, bilateral, and multilateral commissions were set up in Europe after World War II – not only in Western Europe, but from the 1960s onwards also in the socialist countries and as collaborations between Western and Eastern European countries. In one of the subprojects of “History beyond borders”, the field of textbook revision – especially in Europe – between 1945 and 1989 was reconstructed by investigating commissions, conferences, and other venues for discussions on textbooks. This endeavor led to the creation of a database that allowed not only the analysis of the distribution of forums for debates on history textbooks in space and time, but also weighting the contribution of different people and institutions involved in textbook revision (Faure, 2013).

Almost immediately after the end of World War II, textbook revisions were set up in contexts seemingly isolated from each other: in the Nordic countries, in occupied Germany, and under the auspices of UNESCO. Within a very short period of time, links were set up between these different initiatives (Luntinen, 1988; Faure, 2011; 2013; Elmersjö, 2013a). In 1950 a UNESCO conference was held in Brussels, and this marked the starting point for even more elaborate cooperation and exchange of ideas between different actors. Utilizing the database developed as part of the “History beyond borders” project, obvious connections could be shown between the European networks of historians, teachers, and authors investigating history textbooks and the revision of history textbooks conducted in the Nordic countries by the Norden Associations, which had already started in the interwar period.

The Norden Associations are NGOs – formed in 1919 – dedicated to facilitating Nordic cooperation through cultural exchange (Andersson, 1991; Janfelt, 2005). When UNESCO and the Council of Europe started to investigate history textbooks in the end of the 1940s, the revision of textbooks in the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden) was already established (having started in 1919) and institutionalized with permanent commissions in 1933. This process was under the clear influence of the so-called Casares procedure, proposed by the League of Nations in the 1920s, and was clearly affected by the idea of “sensible patriotism” that was being promoted by peace activists in the interwar period (Stöber, 2013; Elmersjö, 2013a, Nilsson, 2014). The method for textbook revision that the international community embraced in the 1950s can, therefore, be described as a variant of a scheme put together by the League of Nations in the 1920s and that had been further developed by the Norden Associations in the 1930s. Manuscripts and already published textbooks were sent between commissions that acted on the behalf of their respective nations as advocates for the nation’s proper treatment in other nations’ textbooks. This method had very specific national implications embedded in it, and the national commissions not only held the task of scrutinizing other nations’ textbooks but also to defend their own country’s textbook narratives (Elmersjö, 2013a). This corresponded very well with the ideas in the peace movement in the interwar period to unite international and national perspectives and promote a “sensible patriotism”.

The analysis of the revision projects database suggested a periodization of the networks of textbook revisions in the postwar era (Faure, 2013) with the first period stretching from 1945 to the mid-1960s. This period was characterized as mainly consisting of Western European collaborations on history textbooks with close ties to the United States. The work conducted in this period was described as mainly directed towards post-conflict reconciliation in Europe. The reconciliation process probably benefited from – and also contributed to – Western European integration (Elmersjö, 2011; Faure, 2013). The first phase was also considered to be characterized by a certain amount of cooperation between Western European countries and countries from other parts of the world. A second phase, which began in the second half of the 1960s, was considered to be represented by the shift to two other areas: (1) Joint forums with participation of Eastern and Western European countries in the wake of the thaw after the Cuban missile crisis and (2) the emergence of textbook talks within the Eastern bloc as part of Eastern European integration. Developments that led to a third phase, beginning at the end of the 1970s, were considered to include the deteriorating relationship between East and West as a consequence of the political climate of the time. Western European and transatlantic activities instead started to increase again in this period. Finally, a fourth phase was distinguished during the final years of the Cold War when textbooks talks between Eastern and Western Europe were taken up again as a result of a new thaw in relations (Faure, 2013).

This periodization says little about the different approaches that the revisions took on an ideological level. However, it could be concluded that from 1953 onward UNESCO started to focus attention on eliminating the Eurocentric view of history education. This occurred at the same time that the Council of Europe was trying to strengthen a European identity in history education by focusing *more* on European history and “the European Idea” (Elmersjö, 2011, Nygren 2011a, Faure, 2013). This dissonance in the objectives for textbook revision was seldom evident in the results of discussions where representatives from the Council of Europe and UNESCO met. Instead, the outcomes of different revisions, under the auspices of UNESCO and the Council of Europe, were often very similar. A feasible reason for this is that the actors involved in different revision projects frequently were the same persons (Faure, 2013).

In the end, the networks on history textbook revision seem to have been very much dependent on certain individuals even if the networks existed within a large institutional

framework. Individuals involved were very much part of the same generation, and when this generation retired it sealed the fate of the large-scale transnational textbook revision, at least in the form it had taken under the auspices of the League of Nations during the 1920s, developed further by the Norden Associations in the 1930s, and put to large-scale use by UNESCO and the Council of Europe in the 1940s, 50s, and 60s (Faure, 2013; Elmersjö, 2013a).

Investigations into the networks of history textbook revisions showed that not only can the revisions be understood as a kind of cultural diplomacy, the networks of revision also illuminate how this cultural diplomacy was interconnected through a number of different arenas. Thus it is possible to unveil some of the logic behind transnational cultural exchanges, for example how the national framework influenced the view of both the international arena and other nations in that arena (see also Glover, 2011). In this respect, findings in the investigation of networks within the history textbook revision showed that the experience gained in a relationship between two or more parties could connect to other relations. This *transrelationality*, or transfer of relational experience (Faure, 2013), directs attention to the connections between relations. Transrelationality was constructed by the actors of history textbook revision through the intertwining of different forums and arenas, which consisted of relational arenas such as UNESCO, the Council of Europe, and the Norden Associations. The transrelational space was never institutionalized, and the circulation of ideas and experiences varied greatly over time because it was dependent on what arenas and forums were available and how they were connected to each other at a specific moment in time. However, the transrelational features of revisional connections led to a process of increasing coherence between different kinds of textbook revisions, even in the absence of any institutionalization and even though the ideological motifs were very different between the revisions (Faure, 2013).

The intersection and change of historical cultures

A thorough investigation into the discussions on shared and nationally exclusive history in Scandinavia within the Norden Associations' revision of history textbooks made it possible to explore the challenging research area of intersecting historical cultures. The history of the Scandinavian nations has a lot of intersecting historical subject matter that is important as symbolic foundations for more than one of the national narratives of the region (Sørensen & Stråth, 1997; Björk, 2011). Scholars interested in historical cultures have long made assumptions on how historical cultures change, often with the help of extensive contextualization where different political or societal events have been utilized to explain changes in public and scholarly views on historical events. The notion that upheavals during times of societal crisis have the most impact on reshaping historical culture is a valid point (Rüsen, 2001; Karlsson, 2003), but this notion seems to underestimate the importance of the continuous and slow change of historical cultures. Perhaps this is because this very slow change is, in general, more difficult to perceive.

Because the revision of history textbooks by the Norden Associations was continuous for over 50 years, from the interwar period to the 1970s, it offers a window into how historical cultures influence each other, and under what premises they are debated and changed, at a slow pace over a long period of time and not specifically related to any specific orientational crisis (Elmersjö, 2013a). By studying the discussions, and the textbooks that were discussed, it could be shown that the Norden Associations' history textbook revision had problems in altering the historical narrative in the different countries. This was not always because they had difficulty reaching agreement within the group of scholars revising the textbooks – even though that was often the case – but because there were often not enough advocates for a

different narrative within each of the nations (Elmersjö, 2013a). Both the production and consumption of history textbooks were (and still is) national and – at least to some extent – subject to free-market principles. One could argue that the Norden Associations' textbook revision shows how historical cultures can only change from within and that external pressure has problems of perceived legitimacy. Experiences from recent years with joint textbook projects in East Asia, the Middle East, and the South Caucasus show that this problem is still a major obstacle for revision of history education and in the planning of joint history textbooks (Ahonen, 2012; Korostelina & Lässig, 2013).

The discussions within the “Norden revision” showcased a few clues into the logic that is followed in the negotiation of historical narratives. For instance, after World War II – and especially from the 1950s onward – there was a shift in the participants' ability to acknowledge suffering on the part of other peoples under the rule of their own nation. There was some hesitance regarding remorse and actually recognizing guilt, and an emphasis was placed on historical contextualization that essentially limited liability. In other words, the reasoning fixated on historical exculpation with arguments explaining away perceived oppression by relating it to historical times when that was “just the way things were done”. Even so, this seems to be in line with a policy of regret that earlier research has suggested took place in the 1980s and 1990s (Olick, 2007; Barkan, 2009; Ahonen, 2012). It is a seemingly teleological conclusion, but there are some indications pointing in the direction of a “regret-policy-embryo” as early as the 1950s when narratives that had previously articulated pride in domination over other cultural groups were abandoned. However, the abandonment of the narrative was not associated with an apology or the direct admission of guilt.

Epistemological shifts were also evident within the “Norden revision”. In the interwar period, there was an overall positivistic view on history that made multi-perspective history problematic. In some cases it was stressed that multiple perspectives on events involving more than one of the nations in Scandinavia should be included in the textbooks, but at the same time the narratives revealed the idea that “other's” perspectives led to wrong conclusions. The lesson given to students – at least in the interwar period – was that others might have reasons to interpret historical situations in other ways, but those ways are nevertheless wrong. The epistemological implications of multiple narratives were not given enough room to lead to the conjecture that there could be different subjective perspectives that was equally “true”. The explicit declaration of the wrongfulness of other perspectives was, however, abandoned by revisers in the 1960s (Elmersjö, 2013a). This might be said to showcase ambivalence as to what it actually meant for history education to be multi-perspective, and the idea of what multi-perspective meant apparently changed over time.

There has long been an idea flourishing in history textbook research that history textbooks are lagging in relation to new discoveries in historical research, and that this fact explains the national bias in the 1950s and 1960s (Tingsten, 1969; Asher, 1978; FitzGerald, 1979; Cajani, 2006; Thornton, 2006). This idea might stem from the fact that ideas that are now well established in the scholarly community have a long history. The problem is that these ideas might have been around and debated for decades before becoming firmly established. To say that textbooks do not fit historical research in a given time is to diminish the scholarly debates over historical issues, which sometimes take a very long time. There also seems to be an underestimation of the dissimilarity between historical research on very specific topics and the overview-character of the textbook narrative. Moreover, one could argue that the idea that textbooks are lagging also stems from the assumption that historians are not affected by the political dimension of historical culture but reach historical conclusions based on pure cognitive reasoning. It was evident in the negotiations within the Norden Associations' revision – especially on matters of national bias – that this assumption is false.

The investigation into the discussions on textbooks in the context of the Norden Associations' revision showed that historians actually agreed with much of the national narrative found in the textbooks. The discussions were, in fact, influenced more by cultural politics than they were by scientific scrutiny, source material, historical theories, or methodology. There was no problem for the associations to recruit renowned historians who would support what could be described as a nationally biased history of their respective nations. Needless to say, these historians were conservative and perhaps part of an older generation of historians who were in constant dispute with younger scholars who questioned the national narrative. Nevertheless, these older historians held key positions at the universities in Scandinavia well into the 1960s and were not marginalized in the discussions. The Norden Associations' textbook revision seems to have been an arena for national defense – stemming from the interwar period – against pressure to incorporate a deeper international approach to history. It could be argued that by incorporating some Nordic historical features pressure to extend the narrative to a global perspective was sidestepped. Representatives of the Norden Associations openly expressed concerns that Nordic and even national history was threatened by European and global perspectives in history education (Elmersjö, 2013a).

The internationalization of history teaching

Another question that needed answering in light of the revision projects and the discussions on internationalization of history education was how the guidelines, stemming from the early peace movement and produced by international organizations in the interwar and postwar periods, were met and incorporated into the actual history education in the classrooms of Europe. The internationalization of the history subject during the interwar period intensified after 1945 and its relation to the guidelines discussed and proposed by international organizations, such as UNESCO and the Council of Europe, was studied in a Swedish context in one of the “History beyond borders” subprojects. These studies showed that internationalization of history education was both a top-down enterprise as well as a bottom-up initiative (Nygren, 2011a).

Utilizing Goodlad's (1979) view of curricular realities on different levels, it was shown that guidelines about history teaching, on an ideological level, influenced other curricula levels through transactions and interpretations. However, the guidelines themselves were also influenced from other levels of curricular reality through direct and/or indirect interactions. For example, teachers and students were affected by the different international networks they were a part of and the political climate in which they lived and they were able to influence ideological discussions on curricula. They could also implement international and more global perspectives in the classroom long before these ideas made it into the formal curricula (Nygren, 2011a).

Investigating the actual choices students made when faced with a choice of essay writing as part of the general examination showed that even though teachers were less impressed by the internationalization in the interwar period, the League of Nations' guidelines seem to have coincided with students' own ideas of history and/or influenced students to change their ideas. Furthermore, the choices students made were later used by teachers' associations in order to influence curricular change in an international direction (Nygren, 2011c). It was also shown that history on all curricular levels has tended toward a focus on contemporary times ever since the 1950s (Nygren, 2012). Swedish students' interest in contemporary history has been indicated in earlier research (Långström, 2001; Hansson, 2010), but this has not been linked to the ideological and very conscious strategy of the League of Nations, the Council of Europe and UNESCO. These organizations specific interest in history education have also been studied, but without always taking into account their guidelines' explicit and concrete

consequences for history teaching (Luntinen, 1988; Duedahl, 2011). The international organizations emphasized in their guidelines that history education for a peaceful future should focus not only on cultural diversity but also more on recent historical events. As indicated by their choices in essay writing, students also seemed to have been more aware of contemporary global politics in the 1960s through technological and communicational advances and media reports on the decolonization of the southern hemisphere (Nygren, 2012).

In line with the guidelines put forward by international organizations, local history and cultural diversity received significantly more attention in the wake of World War II. Unlike earlier research, Nygren (2011c) concludes from scrutinizing the students' own work over a period of 70 years that even though students were inclined to elaborate on subjects of war and dictatorship, they showcased a peaceful sentiment in regards to their descriptions of war. An interest in cultural diversity coupled with the aim of exposing colonialism seems to have been a strong sentiment in at least some Swedish students early on, as shown by the students own work and choices in essay writing. However, this interest in cultural diversity decreased among students during the 1990s even though it was reinforced in the curriculum as well as in international guidelines at that very time (Nygren, 2011c).

During the twentieth century, both students and teachers were co-creators of the school subject of history and played a significant role in influencing the Swedish history subject to take an international direction. Their contribution was likely as great as that of international organizations. The course that the subject took was influenced by guidelines from UNESCO and the Council of Europe, changes in educational policy on a national level, strategies for teaching, and by the contemporary events through which the students and teachers lived. This also means that all these factors influenced each other. The scope of history became larger, both in terms of geography and perspectives, during the twentieth century, but it was not only something that affected students and teachers because they in turn effectively affected this development (Nygren, 2011a).

Conclusion

In light of the findings of the "History beyond borders" research project, it is possible to propose a very long process of change in history education in Europe in general, and in Sweden in particular, that started in the last years of the nineteenth century and made its way into the League of Nations' International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation. From there the ideas influenced the Nordic history textbook revision in the 1930s, at which time the League of Nations was weakened by the extreme nationalist sentiment that was growing across Europe and the world. However, the international and European community benefited from the Norden Associations' harboring of the ideas of the League of Nations, and these organizational features were "given back" to the international community after World War II. A defense of nationally inclined history education was embedded in these organizational features, but this streamlined explanation hides the fact that the different actors also influenced each other on different levels and that they were in turn influenced by the hegemonic discourse of national interpretations of history.

Because the peace education ideas of the interwar period were influenced by the hegemonic nationalistic sentiment of the time, the national perspective was embedded in all international practices. Subsequently, the international organizations that were established after World War II and sought to revisit history textbook revision and take it further in an international direction were also affected by the highly nationalistic methods for textbook revision available in the 1940s and 1950s. One could argue that the political nationalism in the interwar period survived as a more methodological nationalism – an apolitical and

unexpressed assumption of the nation as the terminal unit of social inquiry. However, because the methodological nationalism is a consequence of hegemonic, political nationalism, it is also – in a sense – political.

The connections between the different organizations trying to influence history education during the twentieth century, and – at least in the postwar era – between these organizations and the actual history teaching and learning taking place in classrooms, has been shown to be very pronounced. However, these connections were not straightforward in the sense that they all pointed in the same direction. On the contrary, the Norden Associations' textbook revision could be considered a countermeasure against too much international influence, and the Council of Europe and UNESCO had conflicting aims when it came to Eurocentric history. However, even if there was no single direction, all of these organizations and individual actors were – perhaps through transrelationality – connected in the making of a European educational space, and they all affected some aspect of the whole, which they were also influenced by. With the methods shared and transferred in this educational space as the benefactor, the national perspective was – as a consequence of nation-building hegemony – perhaps the largest beneficiary because the national narrative persisted first as a single narrative and later as the most forceful part of multi-perspective history education.

References

- Ahonen, S. (2012). *Coming to terms with a dark past: How post-conflict societies deal with history*. Frankfurt, Germany, Peter Lang.
- Andersson, H. (1979). *Kampen om det förflutna: Studier i historieundervisningens målfrågor i Finland, 1843–1917*. Turku, Finland: Åbo Akademi University.
- Andersson, J. A. (1991). *Idé och verklighet: Föreningarna Norden genom 70 år*. Stockholm, Sweden: Föreningen Norden.
- Asher, E. L. (1978). Nationality and history education: The social uses of history in the school curriculum. *The History Teacher* 12(1), 57–64.
- Barkan, E. (2009). Historians and historical reconciliation. *The American Historical Review* 114(4), 899–913.
- Björk, R. (2011). The overlapping histories of Sweden and Norway: The union from 1814–1905. In T. Frank & F. Hadelér (Eds.), *Disputed territories and shared pasts: Overlapping national histories in modern Europe* (pp. 17–34). New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cajani, L. (2006). Italian history textbooks on the brink of the twenty-first century. In J. Nicholls (Ed.), *School history textbooks across cultures: International debates and perspectives* (pp. 27–41). Oxford, UK: Symposium books.
- Carlgren, W. (Ed.). (1928). *Report on nationalism in history textbooks*. Stockholm, Sweden: Bergwall.
- Cooper, S. E. (1991). *Patriotic pacifism: Waging war on war in Europe, 1815–1914*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Davies, I. (2000). Citizenship and the teaching and learning of history. In J. Arthur & R. Phillips (Eds.), *Issues in history teaching* (pp. 137–147). London, UK: Routledge.
- Duedahl, P. (2011). Selling mankind: UNESCO and the invention of global history. *Journal of World History* 22(1), 101–133.

- Elmersjö, H. Å. & Lindmark, D. (2010). Peace education, nationalism, and history textbook revision in Scandinavia, 1886–1940. *Journal of Educational Media, Memory, and Society*, 2(2), 63–74.
- Elmersjö, H. Å. (2011). The meaning and use of “Europe” in Swedish history textbooks, 1910–2008. *Education Inquiry* 2(1), 61–78.
- Elmersjö, H. Å. (2013a). *Norden, nationen och historien: Perspektiv på föreningarna Nordens historieläroboksrevision 1919–1972*. Lund, Sweden: Nordic Academic Press.
- Elmersjö, H. Å. (2013b). En nordisk historia eller nationalism på ett nytt sätt?: Ömsesidig läroboksrevision i föreningarna Nordens regi, ca 1930–1965. *Uddannelseshistorie* 47, 81–101.
- Faure, R. (2011). Connections in the history of textbook revision, 1947–1952. *Education Inquiry* 2(1), 21–35.
- Faure, R. (2013). *Netzwerke der Kulturdiplomatie: Die Internationale Schulbuchrevision in Europa 1945–1989*, (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Braunschweig, Germany: Technische Universität Carolo-Wilhelmina zu Braunschweig.
- FitzGerald, F. (1979). *America revised: History schoolbooks in the twentieth century*. Boston, USA: Atlantic.
- Fuchs, E. (2007). The creation of new international networks in education: The League of Nations and educational organizations in the 1920s. *Paedagogica Historica* 43(2), 199–209.
- Giordano, G. (2003). *Twentieth-century textbook wars: A history of advocacy and opposition*. New York, USA: Peter Lang.
- Glover, N. (2011). *National relations: Public diplomacy, national identity and the Swedish Institute, 1945–1970*. Lund, Sweden: Nordic Academic Press.
- Goodlad, J. I. (Ed.). (1979). *Curriculum inquiry*. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Goodman, J. (2012). Women and international intellectual co-operation. *Paedagogica Historica* 48(3), 357–368.
- Hansson, J. (2010). *Historieintresse och historieundervisning: Elevers och lärares uppfattningar om historieämnet*. Umeå, Sweden: Umeå University
- Holmgren, A., & Lindmark, D. (2011). Methods in Swedish history textbook research. *Yearbook: International Society for History Didactics (2011)*, 89–101.
- Iriye, A. (1997). *Cultural internationalism and world order*. Baltimore, USA: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Iriye, A. (2002). *Global community: The role of international organizations in the making of the contemporary world*. Berkeley, USA: University of California Press.
- Janfelt, M. (2005). *Att leva i den bästa av världar: Föreningarna Nordens syn på Norden 1919–1933*. Stockholm, Sweden: Carlssons.
- Karlsson, K-G. (2003). The holocaust and Russian historical culture. In K-G. Karlsson & U. Zander (Eds.), *Echoes of the holocaust: Historical cultures in contemporary Europe* (pp. 201–222). Lund, Sweden: Nordic Academic Press.

- Kolasa, J. (1962). *International intellectual cooperation: The League experience and the beginnings of UNESCO*. Wrocław, Poland: Polskiej Akademii.
- Korostelina, K. V. & Lässig, S. (Eds.) (2013). *History education and post-conflict reconciliation: Reconsidering joint textbook projects*. New York, USA: Routledge
- Långström, S. (2001). *Ungdomar tycker om historia och politik: En studie i pedagogiskt arbete*. Umeå, Sweden: Umeå University.
- Lindmark, D. (2010). Fredsfostran, fredsundervisning och historieboksrevision: Exempel på pedagogiskt fredsarbete i Sverige och Norden 1886–1939. In A. Larsson (Ed.), *Fostran i skola och utbildning: Historiska perspektiv* (pp. 23–59). Uppsala, Sweden: Föreningen för svensk undervisningshistoria.
- Luntinen, P. (1988). School history textbook revision by and under the auspices of UNESCO, part I. *Internationale Schulbuchforschung* 10(4), 337–348.
- Macintyre, S. & Clark, A. (2003). *The history wars*. Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Marsden, W. E. (2001). *The school textbook: Geography, history and social studies*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Moreau, J. (2003). *Schoolbook nation: Conflicts over American history textbooks from the civil war to the present*. Ann Arbor, USA: The University of Michigan Press.
- Nilsson, I. (2014). *Nationalism i fredens tjänst: Svenska skolornas fredsförening, fredsfostran och historieundervisning, 1919–1939*. Umeå, Sweden: Umeå University. In print.
- Nygren, T. (2011a). *History in the service of mankind: International guidelines and history education in upper secondary schools in Sweden, 1927–2002*. Umeå, Sweden: Umeå University.
- Nygren, T. (2011b). International reformation of Swedish history education 1927–1961. *Journal of World History*, 22(2), 329–354.
- Nygren, T. (2011c). UNESCO and Council of Europe guidelines, and history education in Sweden, c. 1960–2002. *Education Inquiry*, 2(1), 37–60.
- Nygren, T. (2012). The contemporary turn: Debate, curricula and Swedish students' history. *Journal of Educational Media, Memory, and Society*, 4(1), 40–60.
- Olick, J. K. (2007). *Politics of regret: On collective memory and historical responsibility*. New York, USA: Routledge.
- Pingel, F. (1999). *UNESCO guidebook on textbook research and textbook revision*. Braunschweig, Germany: GEI/UNESCO.
- Pingel, F. (2000). *The European home: Representations of 20th century Europe in history textbooks*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- Rüsen, J. (2001). *Zerbrechende Zeit: über den Sinn der Geschichte*. Cologne, Germany: Böhlau.
- Schüddekopf, O-E. (1967). History of textbook revision 1945–1965. In O-E. Schüddekopf (Ed.), *History teaching and history textbook revision* (pp. 11–44). Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- Siegel, M. (2004). *The moral disarmament of France: Education, pacifism, and patriotism, 1914–1940*. New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.

- Sørensen, Ø. & Stråth B. (Eds.). (1997). *The cultural construction of Norden*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
- Soysal, Y. N. & Schissler, H. (Eds.). (2005). *The nation, Europe, and the world: Textbooks and curricula in transition*. New York, USA: Berghahn.
- Stobart, M. (1999). Fifty years of European cooperation on history textbooks: The role and contribution of the Council of Europe. *Internationale Schulbuchforschung* 21(2), 147–161.
- Storr, K. (2010). Thinking women: International education for peace and equality, 1918–1930. In J. Spence; S. J. Aiston & M. M. Meikle (Eds.), *Women, education, and agency, 1600–2000* (pp. 168–186). New York, USA: Routledge.
- Stradling, R. (2001). *Teaching 20th-century European history*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- Stöber, G. (2013). From textbook comparison to common textbooks? Changing patterns in international textbook revision. In K. V. Korostelina & S. Lässig (Eds.), *History education and post-conflict reconciliation: Reconsidering joint textbook projects* (pp. 26–51). New York, USA: Routledge.
- Thelin, B. (1996). Early tendencies of peace education in Sweden. *Peabody Journal of Education* 71(3), 95–110.
- Thornton, S. J. (2006). What is history in US history textbooks? In J. Nicholls (Ed.), *School history textbooks across cultures: International debates and perspectives* (pp. 15–25). Oxford, UK: Symposium books.
- Tingsten, H. (1969). *Gud och fosterlandet: Studier i hundra års skolpropaganda*. Stockholm, Sweden: Norstedts.

About the Author

Henrik Åström Elmersjö, PhD, is a postdoctoral fellow in history and education at the Department of Historical, Philosophical, and Religious Studies, Umeå University, Sweden. He has previously been a teacher of history, geography and international relations in Swedish upper secondary school. His current research is focused on history didactics as well as educational history.

Author Email: henrik.astrom.elmersjo@umu.se