

**TITLE PAGE**

***'Truman or Lincoln?': Greek Students Debate on Commemoration Decisions Made by their Community.***



**Corresponding Author**

Eleni Apostolidou  
University of Ioannina,  
P.O. Box 1186  
45110 Ioannina,  
Greece.  
[elaposto@cc.uoi.gr](mailto:elaposto@cc.uoi.gr)  
[apostolidoux@hotmail.com](mailto:apostolidoux@hotmail.com)  
Tel: 0030 265100 2624  
Mobile: 0030 693 43 53 193

Presented at the 12<sup>th</sup> International HEIRNET Conference, 7-9 September 2015, London  
Published by the International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research,  
13.2 in 2016

***'Truman or Lincoln?': Greek Students Debate on Commemoration Decisions Made by their Community.*****Eleni Apostolidou****University of Ioannina, Greece.****Abstract.**

*This paper reports preliminary findings on how students perceive public monuments based on an analysis of 136 university students' written questionnaires. Students, were called first to comment on the controversies over Truman's statue in Athens which has been vandalized by protesters in different time periods. Second, they were asked to choose between three different stances to solve the problem: keep statue in its vandalized condition, restore it to the condition it was when it was donated, replace it with a statue of Lincoln. The study is informed by previous literature in the field of History Education and Historical Consciousness, both empirical (Seixas & Clark, 2004) and theoretical (Rüsen, 2005), also by studies in material culture (Lowenthal 1985) or in processes of monumentalization (Choay, 2001). The question guiding the study is whether students perceive of the monuments as narratives about the past and also recognize their ambivalent and conflictual character. Through the process of analytic induction three patterns were located in students' answers. One, students saw the monument-statue as a relic of the past itself and not as a deliberate construction with a political meaning. Two, students perceived of Truman and Lincoln as having a unidimensional character, either good or wicked. Three, students recognized the controversies in relation to historical agents and they described them as representing policies and ideologies and in the context of their political role in the past. Finally the majority of the students opted for the replacement of the Truman statue by statue of Lincoln or another figure that would represent more 'positive' values or would prevent reactions on the part of the public. The study confirms the recommendations made by history educators that history lessons should focus more on current controversies, and their historization, as a means to understand equally past and present.*

**Keywords- Monuments, public statues, conflicts, historical consciousness, Cold War.****Introduction: Monuments, Public Memory, Education.**

According to Choay a 'monument' is 'any artifact erected by a community of individuals to commemorate or to recall for future generations, events, sacrifices, practices or beliefs ... a monument is a deliberate creation whose purpose is established a priori and at the outset', (Choay, 2001, pp. 6, 12, 13). Along the same lines Savage points out to the fact that 'Public monuments do not arise as if by natural law ... they are built by people with sufficient power to marshal public consent for their erection', (1996, p. 135). The question of this paper is whether students and prospective teachers realize this deliberate character of the monuments using the statue of US President Harry S.

Truman in the centre of Athens. 'Monuments and memorials provide an opportunity to question not only the aesthetic merits of one or the other design, but, more importantly the integrity of communities that build and preserve them and the basis for a just social order' (Taylor & Levine, 2011, p. 126). The Truman statue in Athens recalls raises conflictual memories of a divided Athenian and Greek past, during the Greek Civil War. At the same time it symbolizes the controversies its erection provoked in 1963 in relation to the American foreign policy in Greece.

Monuments are considered to be aspects of 'public memory' like memorials, parades and other ceremonies. According to Casey (2004, p. 26) public memories emerge in places where people have the opportunity to communicate and interact and this is the reason why public memories are so susceptible to change: they are negotiated all the time, they may be abandoned and resumed or conflict with each other like in the case of the Truman statue. As Tsiara mentions, 'monuments may awaken memories or suppress them no matter what the initial intentions of their creators were' (Tsiara, 2004, p. 19). The Truman statue in Athens had had a whole 'second' life after it was placed in 1963 by the Greek Americans to expose their gratitude for the Marshall Plan and the economic aid Greece received after the II World War. According to Savage, 'Monuments can be ... combated with counter monuments or taken down' (Savage, 1996, p. 143). In the case of the Truman statue all the above happened: it was pulled down many times by people participating in anti-American policy protest marches and finally it was suggested it should be replaced by a statue of Lincoln. Monuments as elements of the history produced in public can play a very important role in history education. According to Seixas and Clark:

*Public monuments, along with memorials, school history textbooks, museums, and commemorative holidays, occupy an arena where modern societies define themselves most explicitly in relation to their pasts. They are quintessential examples of what Pierre Nora (1996) has called lieux de memoire, sites of memory... the sites become particularly interesting at the moment when they inspire debate and contention. Contemporary historical consciousness is uncovered, not so much by a reading of the lieu de memoire itself, as by the analysis of its reception, (Seixas and Clark, 2004, pp. 146-147).*

Repoussi also recommends the use of monuments in school history since they are decoded and linked on the one hand with policies that established them as monuments and on the other hand with the memories that are supposed to secure (Repoussi, 2004, p. 83). The focus of the educators on monuments and public controversies about the past stems from the orientation of contemporary history didactics towards what Barton and Levstik call the 'historical contextualization' of current beliefs and actions (2004, p. 219) or the 'analysis of the present rather than the past' (Wrenn, 1999, p. 22). As Wrenn put it 'pupils ought to be supplied with a range of real, modern interpretations and to explain why particular individuals and groups construct the past differently' (ibid). Public monuments also seem to be a good teaching option for students to realize that interpretations about the past change in time: 'historic sites such as war memorials change constantly because the guardians of the sites respond to new national or popular priorities and feelings' (Wrenn, 1998, p. 25).

On the whole, if the aim of school history today is to familiarize students with the constructed and provisional character of historical accounts, then public monuments, or other elements of history in public, especially controversial ones, constitute a advantageous teaching strategy because they attract students' interest. Students identify with past issues which seem to be part of their present and seem to affect their lives, also relate to their identities (Kitson et al, 2011, pp. 149-154).

### **'The Truman Statue in Athens': Research Procedures (Sampling, Research Instruments, Methodology of Analysis).**

Truman was the president of the USA during the period 1945-1952. Events that characterized his presidency were the dropping of the atomic bomb in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the involvement of the USA in the Korean War, the foundation of NATO and finally the 'Truman Doctrine'. According to Truman Doctrine USA would support Greece and Turkey to avoid the communist danger, a decision that was interpreted as the beginning of the Cold War. In 1963 ACHEPAN (American Hellenic Progressive Association, a Greek-American society and lobbying group) donated a statue of Truman which was placed at the centre of Athens. The statue was accompanied by an inscription making reference to the financial aid given by the USA to Greece under the Marshall Plan. The statue was pulled down during protest marches leading to the American Embassy of Athens in 1971, 1986, 1997, 2007. However, it was put back on the occasion of President Clinton's visit in Greece 1999. In 1968, after the placement of a time-bomb by the statue, a proposal was made by the mayor of Athens to replace it by a statue of Lincoln which was not acted upon. This proposal provided the background to ask a sample of 140 university students of education the following question<sup>1</sup>:

*If you lived in the neighbourhood where the Truman statue was placed, what would you prefer decide in relation to the following:*

- 1) the statue should remain unchanged (vandalized, broken, painted)*
- 2) the statue ought to be repaired and brought back to its original condition*
- 3) the statue ought to be replaced with another one (Lincoln or any other). Please explain your opinion.*

The above question, combined with a briefing about the statue's history seeks to detect whether students separate the past (the events throughout Truman presidency and the ACHEPA donation to Greek people) from its representation (the statue). In addition, the question probes whether students recognize also the possibility of different interpretations of the past (i.e. those of supporters of American policy in Greece and those of its opponents). It also probes whether students discern that past interpretations might be revised due to circumstances like the 'waves' of antiamericanism in Greece, (Chapman in Davies, 2011, Stradling, 2003). Finally it examines whether students realize that 'the names of streets together with the monuments and memorial plaques ... contribute to the semiotic presence of the ruling ideology; [all this] constitute the place where the structures of the ruling ideology meet up with the practice of everyday life' (Rihtman-Auguštin, 2004, p. 180). In the end, do students perceive of the several public practices of memory as interpretations of the past with a political aim? Do they perceive of the placing of the statue and the people's attempts to remove it as a conflict

between the institutional memory and the memories of other social groups<sup>2</sup>, in our case the opponents of the American policy in Greece?

As since the question set to students relates to a material culture element (the statue) material culture theory was also used as a frame of analysis: objects, places, landscapes constitute interpretations not only of the past but also of the present<sup>3</sup> (Kotsakis in Nikonanou & Kasvikis, 2008, p. 49) they bear 'meanings', they function as testimonies in relation to the past, in consequence their 'truth' is only relevant. Are students in a position to identify the different interpretations throughout time and the meanings attributed to a memory place by the residents of a region?

The methodology in this study is qualitative: 'content analysis' was applied to students' answers while the categories used to describe their patterns of thought originated in my interpretation of their answers (Titscher, Wodak and Vetter, 2000, p.56). The categories describe thought processes, reasoning. The unit of analysis is students' thought or construct. The constructs are named either by the use of students' own words or my description and interpretation of students answers. Quantitative description of the data is also available through the frequency of the several constructs occurrence. A complete presentation of the categories/constructs and the frequencies by which they appear can be found in the APPENDIX. This study does not seek to attain a 'representativeness' of sample, rather the most complete possible description of how students perceive of the monuments or the commemorative processes in general (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 214).

### **The constructs: 'a non-historical methodology'.**

Students' excerpts of the 'non-historical methodology' category follow:

- (1) *It should be repaired and brought to its original condition, because anything connected to the past, like historic buildings or statues, ought to remain as it was initially, Evangelia.*
- (2) *It should be repaired and brought to its original condition because a statue helps us to collect a lot of information, like how they lived, what materials they used, etc., Spyridoula.*
- (3) *It should be repaired and brought to its original condition because it is a question of aesthetics, Anna.*
- (4) *It should be repaired and brought to its original condition because it is not pleasant to look at, Aikaterini.*
- (5) *It should be repaired and brought to its original condition because it will happen again, it costs too much to restore it, Alkiviades.*

The students belonging to the category 'a non-historical methodology', seem not to

realize the deliberate character of a public monument which traditionally is connected to governmental policies or other interests. Instead they take the monument as a past relic that ought to be preserved in its original condition in order to give as much information as possible. Student in excerpt (1) for example argues alike about an historic building which was probably built for practical reasons and not as a past account and a statue which constitutes a commemoration action and is based on selection. Student in excerpt (2) regards the statue as of evidence life in the past but skips its commemoration function.

In the rest of the excerpts (3, 4, 5) the statue is seen outside its context with no reference to the time or the reasons it was erected. The latter excerpts recall what Nakou has described as 'non-historical thinking' (Nakou, 2000, p. 75): 'students describe the past items as if they belonged to the present'.

### **The constructs: 'the denial of conflict'.**

The majority<sup>4</sup> of students denied the possibility of having two different stances in relation to the monument and they were expressed by the following constructs: nineteen of them assessed the conflict itself as problematic suggesting the replacement of the Truman statue by a Lincoln one (option 3) for appeasement reasons (first subcategory 'anything for the conflict to be avoided'). Thirty students suggested that the statue ought to be repaired and brought back to its original condition. In this way reverence would be exhibited to the statue itself and the past it represented (option 2, second subcategory 'memorialization: monuments selections recognized, not questioned'). Thirty six of them suggested the replacement by a statue of Lincoln with the rationale that a statue of 'faulty' and troublesome personality would be replaced by the statue of another more acceptable historical figure, (third subcategory 'Lincoln and Truman being unidimensional').

Students' excerpts of the first subcategory 'anything for the conflict to be avoided' follow:

- (6) *The statue ought to be replaced by another one* because it provokes anger, not possible to retain it, Georgia.
- (7) *The statue ought to be replaced by another one* in order not to have any other vandalisms, Anna.
- (8) *The statue ought to be replaced by another one* in order to limit tension, Dimitra.

The students belonging to the subcategory 'anything for the conflict to be avoided', excerpts (6), (7), (8), seem to feel uncomfortable in relation to conflict and not to have perceived of the public monument as a narrative supporting a specific commemoration option, i.e. of celebrating American involvement in Greek politics within the context of the Cold War. Actually the issue is broader, that of the American involvement in European politics through the recovery scheme of Marshall Plan. They also seem to overlook the

severe opposition to American involvement in Greece in the years after the Greek Civil War. In the end students do not seem to discern conflictual politics in relation to the Truman statue, but only violent and annoying episodes that ought to stop.

Contemporary history education expects from students to be able to ‘understand the nature of historical claims so that they can arbitrate between rival stories on historical grounds’ (Lee, 2007: 60). This would require from students to realize that narratives are written from various perspectives because they answer different questions and also that there is not ‘one reality and one true story corresponding to it’ (Gonzalez de Olega, 2012: 249).

The orientation of history didactics today is based upon the argumentation of theorists and philosophers of history who emphasize the perspectival nature of the discipline: Rűsen explains that ‘historical knowledge ... owes to narrativity ... qualifications ... [like] retrospectivity, perspectivity, selectivity, particularity ... (2005, p. 66) and Ankersmit asserts that ‘many narrations<sup>5</sup> lose their internal consistency when robbed of the political or ethical values’, (1983, p. 255). In other words, perspectives attribute coherence to the past accounts and they make them meaningful. Therefore it seems that reality (either that of the present or that of the past) would be ‘fractal’ if people in general, or historians, did not manage to ‘assemble the mass of events into meaningful ‘chunks’’, as Lee put it (Lee, 2007, pp.3 and 15), i.e. if people didn’t manage to form plots. Do students understand that ‘it is not possible to have a story of everything’ (Lee, 2007, p. 15)?

On the other hand, multiple perspectives and differing past accounts may create tension since they are ‘anchored in the practical [orientation] problems of the historian’s time, [the historian’s present]’ (Rűsen, 2005, p. 66): for ACHEPA members Truman or the USA protected Greece against communism. For other groups, Greek communists included, American aid was translated into intervention in the country’s politics. The students of this group repulsed conflicts as such not thinking of their causes. Apart from two students, all of them opted to replace the Truman statue by a statue of Lincoln, mainly to stop people’s reactions. Two of them opted to retain the statue vandalized because that would be the best way to avert other vandalisms.

Students’ excerpts of the second subcategory ‘memorialization: monuments selections recognized, not questioned’ follow:

- (9) *The statue ought to be repaired and brought back to its original condition because it would be irreverence otherwise, Anna.*
- (10) *The statue ought to be repaired and brought back to its original condition because they helped us (the USA), Lambrini.*
- (11) *The statue ought to be repaired and brought back to its original condition, it is our heritage from the Greeks of the USA, Iliana.*

- (12) *The statue ought to be repaired and brought back to its original condition, since they made it, there must have been a good reason, Dona.*

The students belonging to the subcategory 'memorialization: monuments selections recognized, not questioned', represented by excerpts (9), (10), (11), (12), used a vocabulary relating to 'origins' and repetitions of obligations' (Rüsen, 2005, pp. 29-30). More specifically, they used the word 'irreverence' (excerpt 9) and they spoke about 'heritage' (excerpt 11). They also spoke of the duty to repair the statue given to Greeks by their benefactors (the ACHEPA, or the Americans, excerpt 9). Students' speech could relate to Rüsen's 'traditional' type of historical consciousness and to Nietzsche's 'antiquarian' type (1997, pp. 72-73). Nietzsche speaks about the 'antiquarian's' type 'veneration' towards the past, while this is the actual word students used ('irreverence', excerpt 9).

On the other hand, students' focus on the initial event, the donation of the statue by Greek-Americans to Greece, ignoring the political significance of the donators gesture and the changing mood of the recipients because of politics<sup>6</sup>, implies incapability on the part of students to perceive of the 'historical identity' of the statue, an incapability to realize change in time (Lorenz, 2012, p. 75).

'Objects acquire meanings in time different from their initial historical social context; meanings are broadened from the life of the object in time' (Nakou, 2001, p. 99). Along the same lines Tilley and other material culture theorists<sup>7</sup>, states that 'the interpretation and the meaning of material culture is a contemporary activity ... [and that there is] the politics of the present ... writing [the past] is a form of power' (Tilley, 1994, pp. 73-74). In other words, the reasons why institutionalized memory, as represented by national or local authorities, is expressed by the erection of a statue or the creation of a monument, is related more to current politics than to the past the statue or the monument represent. Additionally, the public's reception of the monument, its appreciation or rejection, or what Drompouki calls 'competing civic presents' (2014, p. 149<sup>8</sup>), also constitute the history or historical identity of a monument, in our case of the statue. Students from this sample seem not to be able to see the statue in its diachrony and remain focused on the moment the statue was created and not to what followed in the context of the post Greek Civil War period or the Cold War period speaking of Europe. Students do not see memory places as 'social texts' and open to more than one 'readings', (Young, 1993, pp. 1-15) and seem to be repulsed by the public's differing reactions to them. They are more interested in stopping the argument than explaining it.

The last excerpt (12) '*The statue ought to be repaired and brought back to its original condition, since they made it, there must have been a good reason*<sup>9</sup>, could be read through Nemko's category of 'memorialization' (Nemko, 2009, p. 38). Students actually see the statues as a deliberate construction made by an authority but they do not feel inclined to question it. Cognitively, this stance could be related to Lee's first category of children's causal explanation in history, where the facts or the giving of information are not



distinguished from the explanation itself, and where in the end there is nothing to be explained: 'things just happen', (Lee et al, 1996).

Students' excerpts of the third subcategory 'Lincoln and Truman being unidimensional' follow:

- (13) *The statue ought to be replaced by another one of a real benefactor*, Eleftheria.
- (14) *The statue ought to be replaced by another one of someone more positive*, Constadine.
- (15) *The statue ought to be replaced by another one more worthy to be in this place*, Demina.
- (16) *The statue ought to be replaced by another one because Truman provoked disasters*, Efstathios.
- (17) *The statue ought to be replaced by another one because we must glorify heroes and fighters and not the ones that provoke sufferings*, Agathi.
- (18) *The statue ought to be replaced by another one because statues are models for children and give them messages that will help them in their life*, Irene.
- (19) *The statue ought to be replaced by another one, possibly Lincoln, because Lincoln is not controversial*, Irene A.

The students who viewed 'Lincoln' and 'Truman' as being unidimensional' used an absolutist vocabulary that sees human personas intrinsically right or wrong: in this case Truman must have been seen as the wicked one and Lincoln more favourably. There seem to be two implicit ways of thinking here: an overdependence of history on personalities, basically important men and at the same time a tendency to see the above important men in a rather Manichaeian way.

Students' tendency to form personalized explanations in history rather than structuralistic ones has been located many times so far by researchers (Halldén, 1998, Jacott et al, 1998, Lee et al, 1997). On the other hand, since students were actually asked in personalistic terms, i.e. 'Truman or Lincoln', it would be fairer to comment more on their Manichaeian way of seeing things and their implicit dismissal of a more situational analysis in relation to the personalities involved in other words, on their overlooking of the context and the constraints in which either Truman or Lincoln supposedly acted.

Students' absolutism could be related to their understanding of historical accounts, or of how history evolves, not in terms of interpretations or points or 'points of view', but in terms of 'information'. 'Stories [accounts] are about the same thing: the story is equivalent to something 'out there' ... stories are fixed by the information available, there is a one to one correspondence' (Lee, 2004, p. 154). Students do not seem to be able to understand the perspectival nature of the historical account and they actually underestimate the role of the historian or whoever accounts for the past. According to students what one does is to accumulate facts to provide evidence of a worth or value. Facts are black or white: students in this mode cannot understand the opposition to

Truman's policy from an alternative ideological stance, Truman's policy is either bad, in which case the statue ought to be replaced, or good in which case the statue ought to be restored.

Finally in excerpts (17) and (18) one identifies the use of a didactic vocabulary, for example 'we must glorify fighters', 'statues are models, they give messages'. It is interesting to note that students see authority behind the statues, they recognize their selective character and at the same time they do not question those selections. According to them statues embody lessons, 'emplot the story of ennobling events, of triumphs over barbarism, and recall the martyrdom of those who gave their lives in the struggle for national existence' (Young, 1993, p. 2). Students do not protest like the First Nations communities in Canada for not being included or represented in a fair way by public monuments (Seixas & Clark, 2004). They object only to the criteria by which national heroes are selected, they have to be the best and more important not controversial personalities (excerpt 19).

### **The constructs: 'conflict accepted'.**

This category is expressed by two subcategories: 'conflict as part of history' and 'Lincoln and Truman in their context'.

Students' excerpts of the first subcategory 'Conflict as part of history' follow:

- (20) *The statue should remain unchanged* for the people to be informed about the conflict, Theodora.
- (21) *The statue should remain unchanged for people to see what changed throughout time ('museum' sample)* Irene.
- (22) *The statue should remain unchanged* because the reasons why the statue was disfigured are equally important, Argyro.
- (23) *The statue should remain unchanged* because it symbolizes non-tolerance in relation to the USA foreign policy, Athanasios, K.
- (24) *The statue should remain* as it is, vandalized, broken, painted, *vandalization is part of its history*, it is important to get to know what forced citizens exercise violence on it, Argiri.
- (25) *The statue should remain unchanged* because vandalization shows the *other view* Spyridoula.

Students viewing 'conflict as part of history' consider both conflicts and conflictual interpretations of the past as part of history or historical accounts about the past. In Lee's words they realize that the past 'is (re-) constructed in answer to questions in accordance with criteria' (Lee, 2004: 154). A criterion could be an ideological stand point like in excerpt (23) where for some people vandalism against the Truman statue

symbolizes no tolerance in relation to the USA policy in Greece. Students classified in the 'conflict as part of history' instead of being disturbed by the violent episodes in the city try to explain them, seeing them as the 'other' view (excerpt 25) which is 'equally important' (excerpt 22).

On the other hand, the students who contributed excerpts (21) and (24) seem to have internalized that objects, monuments and landscapes can be 'read' many times and that their readings and uses by people of different time periods, constitute their historical identity. The definition Lorenz (2012) gives to historical identity sounds similar to what the student articulates in excerpt (21) about 'what changed through time'. 'Historicity of objects does not originate only in their links with those societies that invented them, made them, used them, left them, but also with those societies that 'discovered' them or studied them as evidence about the past', (Nakou, 2001, p. 57). Nakou also notes that actually the 'polysemy' of objects or material culture stems from their 'journey' in time. It is encouraging that some of the students, thirty five out of 136 that participated in the study, appeared to be comfortable with the polysemy of the Truman statue. Students, attempting to contextualize historically and politically the recent conflict around the Truman statue in Athens, seem to have been receptive to diversity both in the past and the present.

Students' excerpts of the second subcategory 'Lincoln and Truman in their context' follow:

- (26) *The statue should remain unchanged because Truman was a controversial persona, there were different and conflictual interpretations of his work from an economic or ideological point of view, Lambrini.*
- (27) *The statue should remain unchanged because it is not a question of persons but of the USA foreign policy, people do not care about the statue but about what, they think, it symbolizes, Athanasios.*
- (28) *The statue should remain unchanged, vandalism indicates the way of thinking and the ideology of a people about political and national events, it is a conflict of ideologies, even today there are opponents and supporters of the American policy, Aikaterini, O.*
- (29) *The statue should remain unchanged, it is about right and left, Loukia.*
- (30) *The statue ought to be placed next to the Lincoln's statue, the two statues ought to coexist, two different pictures of the USA in the same place, Ioli.*

The students belonging to the subcategory 'Lincoln and Truman in their context' realize two very important moves from a cognitive point of view: first they manage to see the statue itself in relation to what it represents for the past it refers to, and for the people in the present. Nakou defines as 'disciplinary' Historical Thinking the thinking that sees relics in their human and social context while it serves as evidence to form an historical account (2000, p. 83-84). Second, students see the protagonists of this conflict, 'Truman' and 'Lincoln' in their own historical context and as representing mentalities, ideologies and policies. For example excerpt (27) reads 'it is not a question of persons'.

Students in this case manage to see historical agents within their constraints: 'actions are to be understood not simple in terms of desires ... but as opportunity *situations* to which actions are responses', (Lee et al, 1997, p. 238). Lee et al also remind us of Popper and his reference to 'social situations' that may defeat individual intentions: 'We may know or understand a man's system of dispositions pretty well; that is to say, we may be able to predict how he would act in a number of different *situations*' (Popper, 2012, p. 13). To conclude students of this sample managed to move from a personalized historical analysis to a more complex one that contextualized agents in their constraining situations, roles, problems and time.

### **Conclusion.**

One hundred and thirty six students had the opportunity to contemplate in relation to the Truman statue in Athens and the relevant public debate. Only thirty five managed to articulate arguments in terms of historical thinking. The main weaknesses in students' thinking appear to be the following: first they overlooked the deliberate character of the statue which was a public statue and a selection made by the country's and the city's authorities. Second, they could not interpret the public debate in relation to the statue or the conflicts and the violence around its placement in the centre of the city. Instead they rather saw the opposition to the statue as an abnormal situation that ought to be corrected by its replacement. Finally they interpreted 'Truman' and 'Lincoln' in an individualistic way, outside of their social and political context.

On the whole students were not found aware of the history produced in public within the civic landscape in which they lived and could not make sense of it. The above study supports recommendations made by other studies and history educators in favor of current affairs and present accounts produced in public about the past, which when contextualized historically, could contribute to the development of students' historical thinking.

### **Correspondence**

[elaposto@cc.uoi.gr](mailto:elaposto@cc.uoi.gr)

### **References.**

- Ankersmit, Fr. (1983) *Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Philosophy Library.
- Barton, K. & Levstik, L. (2004) *Teaching History for the Common Good*, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Casey, E. (2004) 'Public Memory in Place and Time' in K. Phillips (ed) *Framing Public Memory*. The University of Alabama Press, (pp. 17-44).
- Chapman, A. (2011) 'Historical Interpretations' in I. Davies (ed) *Debates in History Teaching*. London and New York: Routledge, (pp. 96-108).
- Choay, F. (2001) *The Invention of the Monument*, Cambridge University Press.
- De Olega, G. (2012) 'Historical Narratives in the Colonial, National and Ethnic Museums

- of Argentina, Paraguay and Spain', in M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (eds) *History Education and the Construction of National Identities*. Charlotte, North Carolina, (pp. 239-256).
- Drompouki, A.M. (2014) *Mnimeia tis Lithis*, [The Monuments of Oblivion]. Athens: Polis.
- Halldén, O. (1998) 'Personalization in historical descriptions and explanations' *Learning and Instruction*, 8, (pp.131-139).
- Jacott, L. et al (1998) 'Generating Explanations in History' in J. Voss & M. Carretero (eds) *Learning and Reasoning in History*. Woburn Press, (pp.294-306).
- Kitson, A., Husbands, C. & S. Steward (2011) *Teaching & Learning History 11-18*. Open University Press.
- Kotsakis, K. (2008) 'Ylikos Politismos kai Ermineia sti Synchroni Archaologiki Theoria' [Material Culture and Interpretation in Contemporary Theory of Archaeology], in N. Nikonanou & K. Kasvikis (eds) *Ekpaideftika Taxidia sto Chrono* [Education Travels in Time]. Athens: Patakis, (pp. 30-65).
- Lee, P. et al (1996) 'There Were No Facts in Those Days: Children's Ideas about Historical Explanation' in Martin Hughes (ed) *Teaching and Learning in Changing Times*. Oxford: Blackwell, (pp. 169-192).
- Lee et al (1997) "'Just Another Emperor': Understanding Action in the Past", *International Journal of Educational Research*, 27(3), pp.233-244.
- Lee, P. (2004) 'Understanding History' in P. Seixas (ed) *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*. Toronto University Press, (pp. 129-164).
- Lee P. (2007) 'From National Canon to Historical Literacy' in M. Grever & S. Stuurman (eds) *Beyond the Canon*. Palgrave-Macmillan, (pp. 48-62).
- Lorenz, Chr. (2012) 'Towards a Theoretical Framework for Comparing Historiographies: Some Preliminary Considerations', *Historyka. Studia Metodologiczne*, special issue (pp. 67-90).
- Nakou, I. (2000) *Ta Paidia kai I Istoría* [Children and History], Athens: Nisos.
- Nakou, I. (2001) *Mouseia: Emeis, Ta Pragmata, kai o Politismos* [Museums: We, Objects, and Culture], Athens: Nisos.
- Nemko, B. (2009) 'Are we creating a generation of 'historical tourists'? Visual assessment as a means of measuring pupils' progress in historical interpretation', *Teaching History*, 137, pp. 32-39.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1997) 'On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life' in D. Breazeale (ed) *Untimely Meditations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (pp. 57-124).
- Pearce, S. (1994) *Interpreting Objects and Collections*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Popper, K. (2012) 'A Realist View of Physics, Logic and History' in Yourgrau, W. & Breck, A. (eds) *Physics, Logic and History*. Springer, (first published in 1966, pp. 1-38).
- Repoussi, M. (2004) 'Mnimeia kai mnimeiakoi topoi' [Monuments and Monumental Sites] in K. Aggelakos & G. Kokkinos (eds) *I Diathematikotita sto Synchrono Scholeio kai I Didaskalia tis Istorias me ti Chrisi Pigo* [Interdisciplinary Approaches in Modern School and Teaching History Using Sources]. Athens: Metaichmio, (pp 81-99).
- Rúsen, J. (2005) *Narration-Interpretation-Orientation*. New York-Oxford: Bergham Books.
- Rihtman-Auguštin, D. (2004) 'The Monument in Main City Square: Constructing and Erasing

- Memory in Contemporary Croatia' in M. Todorova (ed) *Balkan Identities*. London: Hurst & Company, (pp. 180-196).
- Savage, K. (1994) 'The Politics of Memory: Black Emancipation and the Civil War Monument' in J. Gillis (ed) *Commemorations*. Princeton-New Jersey: Princeton University Press, (pp 127-149).
- Seixas, P. & Clark, P. (2004) 'Murals as Monuments: Students' Ideas about Depictions of 'Civilization' in British Columbia' *American Journal of Education*, 110 (2), pp.146-171.
- Stradling, R. (2003) *Multiperspectivity in History: A Guide for Teachers*. Council of Europe.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998) *Basics of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Taylor, M and Levine, P. (2011) *The Prospects for an Ethics of Architecture*, Routledge.
- Tilley, Chr. (1994) 'Interpreting Material Culture' in S. Pearce (ed) *Interpreting Objects and Collections*. London and New York: Routledge, (pp. 67-75).
- Titscher, S., Wodak, R. and Vetter, E. (2000) *Methods of Texts and Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage.
- Tsiara, S. (2004) *Topia Ethnikis Mnimis* [Landscapes of National Memory], Athens: Kleidarithmos.
- Young, J. (1993) *The Texture of Memory, Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. Yale University Press.
- Wrenn, A. (1998) 'Emotional Response or Objective Enquiry? Using Shared Stories and a Sense of Place in the Study of Interpretations for GCSE', *Teaching History*, 91, pp. 25-31.
- Wrenn, A. (1999) 'Substantial sculptures or sad little plaques? Making interpretations matter to Year 9' *Teaching History*, 97, pp. 21- 28.

---

<sup>1</sup> The students responded on a volunteer basis.

<sup>2</sup> 'Cultural' memory, in Drompouki, 2014

<sup>3</sup> Also in Tilley in Pearce, 1994, p. 67, και Ames in Pearce, 1994, p. 112.

<sup>4</sup> 85 students out of 136 that was the whole of the sample.

<sup>5</sup> 'narratios' as used by Ankersmit.

<sup>6</sup> The statue was placed where initially erected on the occasion of president's Clinton visit to Athens in 1999 and pulled down many times afterwards.

<sup>7</sup> See the Pearce 1994, *Interpreting Objects and Collections*, London and New York: Routledge.

<sup>8</sup> At this point Drompouki cites Deborah Stevenson, 'Cities and Urban Cultures', Maidenhead-Philadelphia: Open University Press.

<sup>9</sup> Subcategory, 'memorialization: monuments selections recognized, not questioned'

## APPENDIX.

Table n. 1: Frequency of Constructs/Categories

CATEGORIES-CONSTRUCTS		FREQUENCY of APPEARANCE
<b>(A) 'a non-historical methodology'</b>		<b>16</b>
<b>(B)'the denial of conflict'</b>		<b>85</b>
B1. 'anything for the conflict to be avoided'	19	
B2. 'memorialization: monuments selections recognized, not questioned'	30	
B3. 'Lincoln and Truman being unidimensional'	36	
<b>(C) 'conflict accepted'.</b>		<b>35</b>
C1. 'Conflict as part of history'	19	
C2. 'Lincoln and Truman in their context'	16	
		<b>136</b> <b>(students in total)</b>