Public Memorials: Living, Breathing Reflections of Society

Introduction

Public memorials and museums are not just places that store artifacts or historical legacies, but rather active agents in shaping collective memory and national identity. These institutions affect how history is remembered, especially as various cultural values and political situations change. Memorials should do more than just honor the past. They should: reinterpret history in new ways to align with modern beliefs, highlight both the accomplishments and the controversies of historical figures, and create safe spaces for public discussion and reflection. As alluded to prior, when new information or viewpoints emerge, museums and memorials have to adapt to this and should: include multiple perspectives for maximum accuracy, update how these figures are portrayed to align with modern viewpoints, and use community-driven and interactive displays. This, in return, addresses the question: How do public memorials and museums shape collective memory and national identity by presenting conflicting narratives of political leaders with complex legacies, and how do these representations evolve in response to contemporary political and cultural values? In response to this question, memory institutions should implement digital tools, inclusive curation methods, and ethical ways to rethink historical events and figures. By doing this, history is kept relevant, democracy is strengthened, and social unity is promoted.

Public Memorials and the Construction of Collective Memory

Public memorials are not just for remembering history, but also for actively shaping what one thinks about history. Traditionally, memory institutions hold a single story. For example, honoring a military victory or a national hero. This approach, however, can hide uncomfortable truths and silence opposing views. Scholar Daniel Little states that monuments hide just as much

as they reveal, because of their innate property of reflecting political and cultural goals (Little). New research suggests a shift in memorials' goals. Memorials now increasingly integrate public affect with modern media and performative acts, and as a result, inspire "responsible democratic citizenship" (Bak, Mehring, and Roza 3). In other words, this approach is not just about glory, but also presents themes of trauma, resistance, and loss. This provides openness for reinterpretation of historical events and figures, allowing for monuments to become interactive experiences for discussion, not just silent displays. National identity is shaped by global influence. Bak et al. corroborate this when describing memory as "framed within a dynamic system of intercultural contact zones" (Bak, Mehring, and Roza 2). This challenges narrow national views as well as encourages broader ethical thinking. For example, the global revaluation of various colonial monuments shows how public memory evolves with current values. In other words, material culture affects memory. A key example of this was when, after WWII, the U.S. sent magazines and books to Europe, influenced how those people remembered the war (Roholl 18). Similarly, cultural heritage is not fixed but is shaped by local communities and how people interact with it (Apaydin 16, 23). Modern memorials now often include voices and perspectives that were once ignored. Many statues around the U.S. are being reinterpreted to reflect the stories of oppressed groups, making public memory more inclusive and morally reflective (Hochbruck 96). Overall, by including multiple viewpoints, memorials can become more honest and meaningful, and show history's true nature and its complexity, rather than the current one sided stories seen today.

Museums as Dynamic Areas for Reinterpreting Political Legacies

Unlike memorials, museums are far more flexible as they can regularly update exhibits, rotate displays, and use interactive technology. This makes them far better suited for showing the different sides of complex histories. Bak et al. explain that direct argument can backfire, suggesting that museums should utilize subtle presentations instead (Bak, Mehring, and Roza 21). Interactive exhibits allow visitors to explore and form their own understanding, rather than just simply being told what to think. Zlotnik and Vansintjan corroborate this by stating that digital tools, such as augmented reality, can help people remember and connect with content better (PMC). What is important to be noted, however, is that museums are not the sole influence on one's memory and perception of history. Photos, personal stories, documents, and many other ways of preserving history all contribute to build a fuller narrative. In addition to this, museums have found that community involvement is crucial. On the extreme, some museums even let visitors co-curate exhibits and give feedback (Woods 1112). Nina Simon's work on participatory museums argues that this involvement turns museums into shared spaces where memory is built together, not just from experts. Another issue for museums is their bland and unappealing nature. Tools like virtual reality, interactive kiosks, and mobile exhibits all help visitors that would originally be uninterested in attending, visit these museums and connect with the past in engaging ways. These tools are not just for incentivizing visitors, they have also been proven to improve how people understand and remember complex history (Memory and Cognition, Harvard Health).

Integrating Multiple Perspectives: Broadening Public Memory

As the name suggests, collective memory is shaped by historians, politicians, communities, and everyday people, not just a singular source of information. Johan Norberg

warns that “false nostalgia” can distort memory and push political agendas (Norberg 11). False nostalgia refers to the tendency to idealize the past, not remembering how it really was, but what one wanted it to be. Although forgetting the hardships of the past is preferred by many, Assmann argues that museums and other institutions that display national memory must reflect trauma, shame, and conflict, not just the celebrations. This kind of balanced memory helps build democratic responsibility (Assmann 56). Memory is a social process, not a fixed record. Memory changes with culture, media, and how stories get passed down (“Memory as a Social Construct” 17). This supports a previous idea that museums and memorials must adapt to current values and technologies. One important form of memory influence is popular culture. Popular culture is especially important because it is frequently controversial and offers multiple viewpoints. For example, Deborah Paredez shows that icons like Selena can become vessels of grief and hope (Paredez 6). Colin Powell further states that memory should be critical and inclusive, not just proud or patriotic (Powell 49-51). Studies by Harvard and Yale Health have shown that memory is both biological and social, meaning that memory can be influenced by the brain, body, and society (Harvard Health; Yale). This knowledge supports the idea of using technology and public participation to keep memory alive and accessible. More importantly, history must be continually questioned and reinterpreted, not just preserved (Historical Thinking, Historical Consciousness 1-4). Museums and memorials should not just be static places of memory preservation, but active areas that spark discussion and new insights. Memory of history is very controversial and subjective, and that is okay. When done ethically, the political quality of memory allows people to negotiate facts and beliefs, creating a deeper and more inclusive nation identity and allowing individuals to choose and change their beliefs (Public History and Public Memory 37).

Counter Arguments and Objections

Some historians argue that changing or reinterpreting historical events or figures could alter the truth or distort history. They believe that the correct way for museums and memorials to present information is to continue their "objective" version of the past. On the contrary, David Lowenthal argues that memory has been, is, and will always be selective and evolving. Even though history refers to the past, it is never a finished product and is constantly changing from factors such as new evidence and shifting societal values (Lowenthal 14). Another argument made is that introducing interactive displays and more openness to subjective thought will lead to division or political quarrels. But research in public history, such as Nina Simon's work, shows that participatory models actually boost understanding and engagement, not division (Simon 6; Public History and the Study of Memory 42). Traditionalists, people who advocate for maintaining traditional cultures and values, argue that conflicting stories weaken national unity and that one clear society will keep the people united. On the other hand, studies show that being honest about a country's flaws and mistakes builds far stronger democracies and more inclusive identities (Assmann 57; Berger and Kansteiner 39). The final main point that is discussed is the expensive nature of change. Many argue that museums would not be able to financially afford to be adaptive or incorporate the use of digital technologies. Nevertheless, numerous successful museums worldwide prove that this investment in technology and collaboration pays off with better education and long-term public benefit (Erll 10; Simon 2).

Toward Adaptive and Inclusive Memorials and Museums: A Proposed Solution

A successful area to store public memory requires three main principles: Ethical reinterpretation, digital innovation, and participation. Ethical reinterpretation at its core is

reexamining history with honesty, transparency, and inclusion. In this way, both achievements and injustices are shown. It challenges old assumptions to present a more honest narrative which in turn allows individuals to create their own perspectives and opinions. In addition to this, digital innovation can further progress memorials and museums towards becoming more inclusive and adaptive to societal change. Technology such as augmented reality, virtual archives, and interactive displays can make history both far more accessible and engaging for the population. Erll explains how media reshapes how we experience memory, defending the argument of incorporating digital tools in memory institutions (Erll 4). Finally, participatory curation, which involves communities in creating and interpreting exhibits, can increase public trust and engagement (Macdonald 203). Methods that would be used include oral histories, local community-driven workshops, and co-created displays for multiple perspectives. Nina Simon corroborates Macdonalds argument by stating that sharing authority in the museum builds civic responsibility (Simon 5). In practice, a museum could build an interactive exhibit on a controversial event using digital tools. They could include maps, archival videos, survivor stories, and let visitors choose their own perspective. In addition to this, the museum could allow visitors to leave reviews, allowing for societal values and the people's opinion to be better reflected in these places of history. Memorials or museums could also host local residents to share personal stories and insights that may be beneficial to the history held in the museum. By combining these three core strategies, memory institutions can become far more inclusive, responsive, and democratic. This shift turns public memory from a fixed story into a shared, always evolving process, strengthening national identity and civic unity.

Conclusion

Memorials and museums shape how one remembers, and how people see themselves as a nation. They influence national identity by guiding collective memory. As society changes, these institutions must also evolve. The three strategies that museums and memorials can use to act as the strongest memory institutions are ethical reinterpretation, digital innovation, and participatory curation. Memory should be negotiated, not just preserved. The reexamining of history encourages informed civic engagement and leads to stronger democratic conversation and understanding. In today's rapidly changing world, a dynamic memory approach is crucial. It helps people honor the complexity of history and empowers them to create a more inclusive and aware society. As supported by various studies, transparency and inclusive memory create a far more resilient national identity than the current static memory institutions. Breathing life and change into these memory institutions allows them to become spaces for dialogue and shared growth. Although the past itself has already occurred, it is not static but rather lives on through how people remember and reinterpret it today.

Works Cited

Aarons, Victoria, and Alan L. Berger. "The Intergenerational Transmission of Memory and Trauma: From Survivor Writing to Post-Holocaust Representation." *Third-Generation Holocaust Representation: Trauma, History, and Memory*, Northwestern UP, 2017, pp. 41-66. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt22727kb.5. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Altanian, Melanie. "Memory as Social Construct." *Archives against Genocide Denialism?*, Swisspeace, 2017, pp. 13-17. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/resrep11066.6. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Apaydin, Veysel. "The Interlinkage of Cultural Memory, Heritage and Discourses of Construction, Transformation and Destruction." *Critical Perspectives on Cultural Memory and Heritage: Construction, Transformation and Destruction*, UCL Press, 2020, pp. 13-30. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv13xpsfp.7. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Assmann, Aleida. "Transformations between History and Memory." *Social Research*, vol. 75, no. 1, 2008, pp. 49-72. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40972052. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Bak, Hans, et al. *Politics and Cultures of Liberation: Media, Memory, and Projections of Democracy*. Edited by Sophie Levie, vol. 7, Brill, 2018. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctvbqs8h0. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Blutinger, Jeffrey. "An Inconvenient Past: Post-Communist Holocaust Memorialization." *Shofar*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2010, pp. 73-94. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.5703/shofar.29.1.73. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Britton, Diane F. "Public History and Public Memory." *The Public Historian*, vol. 19, no. 3, 1997, pp. 11-23. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/3379553. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Caygill, Howard. "Physiological Memory Systems." *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates*, by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, Fordham UP, 2010, pp. 227-32. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1c999bq.19. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Franco, Barbara. "Public History and Memory: A Museum Perspective." *The Public Historian*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1997, pp. 65-67. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/3379145. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Funkenstein, Amos. "Collective Memory and Historical Consciousness." *History and Memory*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1989, pp. 5-26. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/25618571. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Gardner, James B. "Contested Terrain: History, Museums, and the Public." *The Public Historian*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2004, pp. 11-21. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.1525/tph.2004.26.4.11. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Glassberg, David. "Public History and the Study of Memory." *The Public Historian*, vol. 18, no. 2, 1996, pp. 7-23. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/3377910. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

History, Memory, and Monuments: An Overview of the Scholarly Literature on Commemoration. (n.d.-b). https://www.nps.gov/parkhistory/resedu/savage.htm

Kansteiner, Wulf. "Transnational Holocaust Memory, Digital Culture and the End of Reception Studies." *The Twentieth Century in European Memory: Transcultural Mediation and Reception*, by Tea Sindbæk Andersen and Barbara Törnquist-Plewa, Brill, 2017, pp. 305-44. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctt1w8h377.18. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Karp, Ivan. *Museum Frictions : Public Cultures/global Transformations*. Duke UP, 2006.

Little, D. (2018, February 23). Monuments and collective memory - Philosophy and society - Medium. *Medium*.

https://medium.com/philosophy-and-society/monuments-and-collective-memory-749dea913238

McLean, Lorna R., et al. "Introduction." *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue Canadienne De L'éducation*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2017, pp. 1-5. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/90002341. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Memory - Harvard Health. (2022b, March 21). Harvard Health. https://www.health.harvard.edu/topics/memory

Milani, T. M., & Richardson, J. E. (2022b). Discourses of collective remembering: contestation, politics, affect. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *20*(5), 459–476. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2022.2090979

Olick, Jeffrey K. "Collective Memory: The Two Cultures." *Sociological Theory*, vol. 17, no. 3, Nov. 1999, pp. 333-48, https://doi.org/10.1111/0735-2751.00083.

Ross, M. H. & Bryn Mawr College. (2010b). *COLLECTIVE MEMORY AND HOW THE PRESENT SHAPES THE PAST: A PHILADELPHIA STORY ABOUT GEORGE WASHINGTON AND SLAVERY* [Conference-proceeding]. https://historiclandlosscoi.bm/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/AL32-Ross-and-Kenan-2010.pdf

Schechtman, Marya. "Memory and Identity." *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition*, vol. 153, no. 1, 2011, pp. 65-79. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/41487616. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Schmidtke, O. (2023b). Competing historical narratives: memory politics, identity, and democracy in Germany and Poland. *Social Sciences*, *12*(7), 391. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12070391

Sutton, John, et al. "Memory and Cognition." *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates*, by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, Fordham UP, 2010, pp. 209-26. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1c999bq.18. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Tann, Boravin, and Khuochsopheaktra Tim. "Perceptions of Memorialization." *'Duty Not to Forget' the Past?: Perceptions of Young Cambodians on the Memorialization of the Khmer Rouge Regime*, Swisspeace, 2019, pp. 24-27. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/resrep20127.9. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Terdiman, Richard. "Memory in Freud." *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates*, by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, Fordham UP, 2010, pp. 93-108. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1c999bq.10. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

The Texture of Memory : Holocaust Memorials and Meaning. E-book ed., Yale UP, 1993.

What is memory? (2015). *Yale School of Medicine*. https://medicine.yale.edu/news/yale-medicine-magazine/article/what-is-memory/

Winter, J. M. *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning : the Great War in European Cultural History*. Canto Classics edition ed., Cambridge UP, 2014.

Woods, Thomas A. "Museums and the Public: Doing History Together." *The Journal of American History*, vol. 82, no. 3, 1995, pp. 1111-15. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/2945116. Accessed 14 Apr. 2025.

Zlotnik, Gregorio, and Aaron Vansintjan. "Memory: An Extended Definition." *Frontiers in psychology* vol. 10 2523. 7 Nov. 2019, doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02523