

SYLVIA PALETSCHKEK
SYLVIA SCHRAUT

Introduction: Gender and memory culture in Europe

Female representations in historical perspective

Introduction: Gender and Memory Culture in Europe – female representations in historical perspective*

Sylvia Paletschek and Sylvia Schraut

At present, memory culture is booming and receives extensive attention both in the circle of professional historians and in the public sphere. Two characteristics are however conspicuous: most debates on public commemoration focus on the political space of the nation and, as a general rule, they neglect the gender of the actors. These observations led the editors to organize a conference financed by the Fritz-Thyssen-Stiftung on »Gendering Memory« at the University of Mannheim in the beginning of 2005. Case studies from European countries (Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, the Netherlands, Norway and Turkey) examined the role of gender in memory culture in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and the way in which they represented women.

We started from the following questions: How can the category of gender be integrated into debates on memory culture? What function does the remembrance of historical events play in the political participation of women? How can we shape a culture of memory that also incorporates women's experiences?

* The contributions in this collection were originally written for a conference at Mannheim University, Germany in 2005. Neither the conference nor the collection would have been possible without the support of several institutions and people. For financial support we thank the Fritz-Thyssen Stiftung, which mainly sponsored the conference and the publication, also the Universities of Mannheim and Freiburg. We also want to thank Gaby Pieri (Mannheim) and Thomas Williams (St. Antony's College, Oxford) who offered reliable and competent help with translating and editing which was essential to finishing the project successfully..

Collective Memory and Memory Culture

The terms *memory* and *remembrance* encompass a wide range of definitions and concepts.¹ Remembering is defined as the process of »bringing to the surface« and constructing the past. Remembrance is the result of this process. Memory is described as the structure of storage or the ability to store these remembrances (Erlil 2005: 7). The term memory culture is complex. It refers to the contents and the forms of representation of memory as well as to the social functions of memory.

Research on memory culture started in the 1920s. Above all, the works of Maurice Halbwachs (Halbwachs 1985) have been influential until today. Halbwachs coined the term »collective memory« and emphasized the constructed and socially determined character of individual memories. According to Halbwachs an individual is always a member of several social groups, e.g. a family, a party, or a nation. It is the combination of the memories of these different collectives that constitutes the differences in the memories of the individuals. This group-specific relation to the past is central to the shaping of the identity of the individual.

Maurice Halbwachs' theory was further developed by Jan Assmann who introduced the concept of cultural memory. Assmann puts more emphasis on the relation between culture and memory and focuses on the interrelation of public memory, collective identity and political legitimization. Assmann suggests that there are two forms of memory: communicative and cultural memory. He takes up the notion developed by Halbwachs and Nora that generational memory is limited to 80–100 years and draws a distinction between what he describes as communicative memory and cultural memory. Communicative memory is described as immediate remembrance passed on in an informal way by communication. Cultural memory, in contrast, is organized and institutionalized, bound to objects and rituals.

1 We cannot give an exhaustive overview of the manifold current debates on remembrance, memory culture and the politics of memory. In the following pages, only a short introduction to the approaches of Maurice Halbwachs and Jan and Aleida Assmann will be given. We would like to refer further to Eric Hobsbawm, according to whom the invention of traditions for the creation of identity and the legitimisation of political movements and institutions is a sign of modernity (Hobsbawm/Ranger 1984). Pierre Nora developed the influential and creative concept of »lieu de mémoire« which deals with the transformation and condensation of historical events during the transition into national memory (Nora 1989; Nora 1984–1993). See Erlil (2005: 13–39) for an overview of these as well as other approaches to memory research.

It includes any given society's and any given era's specific stock of »reusable texts, images and rites (...) whose »cultivation« serves to stabilize and convey that society's self-image Upon such collective knowledge, for the most part (but not exclusively) of the past, each group bases its awareness of unity and particularity« (Assmann, Jan 1995: 132).

As Aleida Assmann suggests, cultural memory can be further divided into »functional« and »storage« memory (Assmann, Aleida, 2006). Functional memory denotes the segments of the past that are regarded as functional and meaningful in a society at a given point in time and that serve, for example, the creation of national identity or political legitimization. Functional memory can be understood as acquired memory that constructs meaning. Storage memory, in contrast, also includes currently *useless* knowledge about the past, which was once meaningful for a society or a group and which can be re-introduced into functional memory when necessary.

Recent works on memory culture point to the fact that memory is politically contested. Jay Winter (2006: 1–13) emphasizes the constant re-interpretation of remembrance in the context of social debates as well as the fact that remembering is a process. This leads to the co-existence of many, hegemonic and marginal, cultures of memory.

All in all, the theories on remembrance and memory are complex and point to the social embeddedness of individual remembrance as well as to the importance of the politics of memory for the historically rooted identity of a nation. They address the split between public memory culture and private memories and stress the important function of communication in processes of remembering. The process of producing common remembrance that creates meaning mirrors social debates about the interpretation of the past. In general, and this applies especially to the process of condensation of memory on the level of nations, mainstream interpretations neglect the positions of social minorities as well as transnational aspects. The (national) cultures of memory shaped this way, especially since the nineteenth century, are still in effect today and exclude women.

Cultures of memory are historically closely linked with the development of nation-states and the shaping of national identities during the nineteenth century. The elements of a national culture of memory (monuments, remembrance days, festivities, etc.) orientated at these processes served the formation of a national consciousness, and furthered the development of such an identity, very often in delimitation to, competition with and hostil-

ity towards other states.² Cultural memory mirrors the bourgeois gender model and has a male orientation despite the claim that it is universal and inclusive. Women as actors, their agency and their self-perceptions and aims are often marginalized and forgotten.

So far, scarcely any research has explored the representation of women in national memory and the role of gender in cultures of memory. Memory and gender are, however, multiply intertwined: gender is a product of cultural remembrance, is called up by memory and social practices and is constantly re-inscribed into the collective memory. Memories are, moreover, gendered. We have to ask who remembers what, how, why and for whom (Penkwitt 2006: 1). Heretofore in theoretical works on memory culture gender is occasionally mentioned as a pivotal category of collective remembrance, but, in general, this is not systematically elaborated.³ The existing studies on the relation between memory and gender are mostly by literary or social scientists. There are only a rather limited number of historical studies on the subject: short essays or studies written in the framework of the feminist movement, studies on the relation of historiography and gender and on the gender-specific remembrance of the Holocaust and of war. The latter subject has been covered most comprehensively. There is, therefore, still much work to be done in the research field memory and gender.⁴

This conference volume deals with some aspects of the complex relation between memory culture and gender. The contributions are centered around three topics. The studies in the first section deal with the representation of women and national allegories in the national cultures of memory of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The contributions in the second section focus on the relation between violence and war in the memory cultures of families and the state. The last section deals with both the creation of and various methodological approaches to a gendered memory culture. The case studies in this volume cover a broad range of countries in Western, Northern, Southeastern and Eastern Europe, but certainly do not include all areas. The analysis of national cultures of mem-

2 See our more detailed contribution in this volume.

3 See, among others, Erll (2005: 2), who does not, however, make further reference to gender in the course of her overview on theories and her model for research into culture of memory.

4 For a more detailed overview of the state of research see the contribution from Schraut/Paletschek in this volume; see further: Leydesdorf et al. (1996); Grever (1997); Smith (1998), Paletschek (2007); Eschebach et al. (2002).

ory from the perspective of gender is focused on the representation of the female and of women. The impact of memory culture on the construction of masculinity is only briefly touched on and demands further attention elsewhere.

Women and female allegories in national and political cultures of memory

In her contribution, *Helke Rausch* examines female national monuments and female allegories in three European capitals – Berlin, London and Paris – in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Her analysis of national monument cultures »illustrates the highly significant and indeed biased role of gender in contemporary national memories«. There were only very few monuments in the three capitals in which women represented the nation, and women played a very marginal role in the inauguration ceremonies of national monuments. Only female rulers or female dynasty members could become symbols of the nation, while men did not need this superior status to be honored. The female national monuments in these capital cities mostly symbolized typical bourgeois values associated with femininity such as charity, willingness to make sacrifices and emotional and religious attachment to the nation. Only the monuments for Queen Victoria showed an explicit political symbolism due to her role as ruler. But these statues »did not promote a specifically female perspective on the nation, let alone advance emancipatory ideas«. An emancipatory interpretation – such as the Liberals' and Social Democrats' interpretation of the monument of Queen Luise of Prussia as a monument that called on women for political action – did not gain general acceptance and remained marginal.

From a transnational comparative perspective most national monuments with female figures could be found in France, especially in the form of the female allegory of the Republic, Marianne and the mythical figure of Joan of Arc. The French example shows what also applied to other female national icons: they could be claimed by various political groups and permitted contradictory political interpretations. The issues of women's participation in and contributions to the nation were not, however, broached in these debates.

It was not until the First World War that national monuments for middle-class women were erected in West European capitals. They had the function to promote women's national commitment in the society at war: »Only in retrospect does it become clear that these first tentative steps at female commemoration paved the way for a more emancipatory drive after the Great War«. It turns out that »national memories embodied in late nineteenth-century public monuments cemented the idea of a feminine confinement to the private and male responsibility for politics in the public (...) National monuments certainly provided no revolutionary vote in favor of equal participatory rights for women«.

Rebecca Bennette's contribution analyses »Feminine Imagery in Catholic National Memory during the *Kulturkampf*«. ⁵ She deals with a minority discourse, a version of national memory that was not inscribed into mainstream memory and thereby shows how dynamic and contested this memory could be. The discourse of the national mainstream was determined by the image of the Protestant nation created by male achievements in war and obliged to Protestant-Prussian values. German Catholics as well as Jews, Alsatians and women were excluded from this image of history and this definition of the nation. Characteristics such as irrationality or emotionality which the bourgeois gender model defined as feminine were used to label and to debase political Catholicism. Catholic men, however, turned this stigmatization into a positive characteristic. They answered with the construction of a counter-narrative in which Germany was presented as feminine, Catholic and moral.

Catholicism chose peaceful Germania with the sword turned downwards as a national icon in response to Protestant Prussia which favored the valorous Arminius/Hermann as a national symbol. Church, religion and morality, which had a feminine connotation in the nineteenth century, stood at the centre of the national memory of the Catholics.

Rebecca Bennette concludes: »Considering the labeling of Catholics as feminine that was used to exclude them from the nation and the general acceptance of the larger context of the division of society into separate spheres (undoubtedly by Catholics too), this assumption of the feminine gender was a rather radical endeavor. (...) It was not in spite of this femi-

5 The *Kulturkampf* was a fierce political conflict between the state and the Catholic church that dominated German politics in the 1870s. It started from many repressive measures by the state against Catholics and served in the end as a means of inner national unification by exclusion.

nity that Catholics deserved inclusion in Germany, but because of it. It was this construction of national memory that allowed Catholics, gendered feminine, to represent what the nation should be, to represent Germany as subject«. When the *Kulturkampf* ended, the national memory that was built around a feminine Germany sank into oblivion. This example shows that gender-specific symbolic representations can be partly broken up and inverted in times of crisis though without long-lasting effects.

Stefan Rohdewald examines the female allegory Mother Bulgaria in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in comparison with the *mothers* of other European nations, especially those of Southeast Europe and Russia. He shows the transnational character of female national allegories in nineteenth century Europe. In the 1840s Bulgarian literature created the figure of Mother Bulgaria who bewailed the bondage of the country under Ottoman domination. Like Marianne or Germania she stood for revolutionary awakening and appeared as the caring, educating and enlightening mother at about the same time the allegory of Mother Serbia or the allegory of the Greek Rumelia emerged. Mother Bulgaria is often mentioned in connection with these other national mothers and is thus placed in a European, especially Southeastern European context. Mother Russia also became a national allegory in the nineteenth century. But, in contrast to West or Southeast European female allegories, the figure of Mother Russia contains more religious-mythical ideas. Rohdewald traces the changes in the political and religious meaning of these allegories which were claimed by both traditionalists and socialists throughout the different political systems in the twentieth century. In times of crisis, for example during fascism and the Second World War, female allegories could be ascribed a more active role as can be shown with the example of Mother Bulgaria. »As an heroic warrior the mother turned out even to be ›the motor of our historic path« – the originally universal Christian narrative was confined to the life of the hard-working Bulgarian nation, to national progress, imagined with industrial metaphors«.

In 1940s Bulgaria, when the national movement gained new strength as German troops extended Bulgarian territory the hybrid gender of the allegory Mother Bulgaria served as a new role model in which female and male roles overlapped. After 1945, with the incorporation of Bulgaria into the Soviet system, Mother Bulgaria quickly lost importance. In post-1989 Russia by contrast, the national allegory of Mother Russia, once again charged

with religious features, experienced a revival as part of the renaissance of nationalist thinking.

The contribution of Stefan Rohdewald shows that female national allegories developed from the nineteenth century onwards in a European and transnational context. He points to the fact that the southeastern European allegories were more heavily imbued with religious features than those of western Europe. They were, like the latter, nevertheless open for interpretation and change such that traditionalists, socialists and fascists could refer to them. It was only for a short time and only in minority groups that an interpretation of female national symbols emerged, which suggested an increased political scope of action for women and an erosion of traditional gender roles, as is shown in the studies on female national monuments and the feminine-connoted national memory of German Catholics during a limited time of crisis.

Research has shown that a common collective remembrance is pivotal for the coherence of nations and political movements. This is the starting point of *Astrid Swenson's* contribution »Memory, Gender and Anti-fascism in France and Britain in the 1930s«. She asks whether there was a common basis to which women in the anti-fascist movement referred and what role collective remembrance played for them. Women and feminist organizations formed a substantial part of the anti-fascist movements. For male anti-fascists in Great Britain and France, who came from various political camps, the reference to a common historical heritage was a central concern. In France, male socialist and conservative anti-fascists agreed on the storming of the Bastille on 14 July 1789 as their common heritage. In Great Britain it was traditional English liberties that formed the common ground of conservative and radical anti-fascists.

Female members of the anti-fascist movement however did not refer to a common historical heritage that had to be defended. Astrid Swenson's research shows that women across the different political and feminist camps referred to a maternalist and essentialist discourse that suggested that women were peaceable by nature and thus natural adversaries of undemocratic and belligerent fascism. This proved to be very favorable for overcoming national, social and political boundaries and for creating a common understanding. The collective remembrance evoked by men was, by contrast, nationally encoded and thus less suitable for international understanding.

Historical events that were taken up by female anti-fascist activists included the experience of the First World War and the grief suffered because of it. These remembrances of war mostly served to underscore the importance of women's essentialist peacefulness, while the fact that the warring nations had also been supported by women was neglected. Female anti-fascists used the potentially open maternalist discourse by deriving a natural closeness of women and pacifism, humanism and democracy in contrast to fascists who used the same discourse as a rationale for misogynistic, pro-natalist policies and for the ousting of women from employment and public life. This example shows not only how contradictory political forces claimed the maternalist paradigm for their cause; it shows both the dangers and the opportunities this paradigm held for women.

Astrid Swenson makes it clear that a political identity based on collective remembrance was less important for women in the 1930s than for men. Therefore the importance of collective remembrance for the creation of national and political identities of women has to be qualified. She asks »how alternative memories and discourses are linked to women's involvement in official memory production, for example through their involvement in political and commemorative ceremonies and associations fostering the notions of memory and heritage«.

Guido Vitiello focuses on German movies produced in the post-war period and in the period from the end of the 1970s to the mid 1980s that deal with the national-socialist past. In all these movies the heroine appears as an allegory of Germany. The pattern is set in Wolfgang Staudte's 1948 film »Die Mörder sind unter uns« (»The Murderers are among us«), an early attempt to have a critical look at the Nazi past in which the female protagonist is depicted as innocent and as guarantor of a better future.

In the films examined by Vitiello women symbolize cyclical time, the circle of life and the perpetual, whereas men are symbols of linear time, of history and of change. Regardless of the ideological and political stance of the film-makers, their sex and the time in which the films were produced, they all show similarities in the way they construct gender relations and the image of women. In all films we can identify a female character in line with the traditional allegory of Germania. Blond and blue-eyed she represents motherliness and waiting in loneliness for the return of the (war) hero. For the guilty, broken or disabled male characters the heroines represent an innocent Germany. The victims of Nazism are not mentioned in the films. The female characters not only embody male longing for *Heimat* and for

healing: As women seem to be less burdened with guilt, be it with regard to Nazi crimes or crimes in history in general, they are better suited to serve as symbols of a new beginning and of a critical look at the past than the guilty male perpetrators. In this way, Germania and women in history in general are released from guilt and become symbols of the future. At the same time however, they are relegated from history.

Pinar M. Yelsali Parmaksız deals with the wives of Turkish political leaders who, since the Kemalist era, have served as female symbols or allegories for modern Turkey. In the reform era of Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk) in the 1920s, when Turkey became a republic, the questions of independence, modernization and of women were closely linked. Women and their emancipation were of central importance in the national modernization process as the subordinate position of women was considered to be the cause for Turkey's backwardness. During the reform era women received civil and political rights (1926/1934) as well as new job and educational opportunities. The reforms propagated a modern, middle-class family model.

The *modern* scope of action for women was, however, clearly limited. Despite increasing opportunities for education and employment for women, aspects of traditional patriarchy were preserved. Motherliness and household duties were integrated into the national canon of female tasks; women were attributed a decisive role in the reproduction of the modern nation and the modern republic. Women should be *modern yet modest*.

The wives and daughters of the Turkish political leaders were regarded as role models and as indicators of the degree of modernization. Their public appearance served to stage the roles women were expected to fulfill. Mevhibe İnönü, who was First Lady in Turkey from the mid 1920s to 1950 accompanied her husband during all important voyages abroad where she appeared in western clothing and without veil. She organized public events and was devoted to charity, but always remained modest, dressed elegantly but conservatively. Atatürk's adopted daughters also served as role models for the new ideal of the working and educated woman and as a symbol for modern Turkey. One was the first female combat pilot in Turkey, the other was a historian; both presented themselves modestly in public and always according to their father's ideals.

The contradictions in the Turkish modernization process with regard to the role of women mentioned above are also reflected in the way these role models are remembered. Despite the publication of their memoirs and the

fact that museums remember their activities these women remain in the background, strangely silent and modest. And only that which is regarded as desirable and as appropriate to their status as role models is made accessible to remembrance. While the memoirs of Atatürk's adopted daughters could be published, public debates delayed and finally prevented the publication of the writings of Latife Hanım, divorced wife of Atatürk, who was educated abroad, emancipated and whose high ambitions and self-confidence were said to have caused the failure of the marriage. It becomes obvious that »there is a strong link between the place and value of memory and a prevailing gender regime«. Yelsali's contribution shows that the contradictory Turkish modernization process with regard to gender relations also has an impact on memory politics, an observation that applies to other European countries as well.

Violence, War and Gender – memory and remembrance in family and state

The contributions of the second section of this volume highlight the remembrance of war and persecution during and after the Second World War in Finland, Norway, Denmark, Greece and Hungary from the perspective of gender. Special attention is given to the interaction of family memory and cultural memory. All studies point to the relevance of families as keepers of the memory of the achievements and living conditions of women in the past. The memory discourse of families is however tied to official history politics and to collective memory and the values set by the latter leave their traces in the communicative memory of families.

Tina Kinnunen analyses the changes in the depiction of a large patriotic women's organization active during the Second World War in Finland's public memory between 1945 and 2000. The Finnish mass organization for women, Lotta Svärd, was founded in 1921 shortly after Finland became independent. It represented the »white« middle-class, anti-communist and religious Finland. Taking up traditional gender roles and the concept of social motherliness the Lotta women served the Finnish nation especially by voluntary social work. Moreover, they also aimed at perfecting the nation's morality. In the wars against the Soviet Union between 1939 and

1944 they were of utmost importance during military actions as well as on the home front. The Lotta Svärd was banned in 1944.

The Second World War is pivotal for Finnish national identity but the women's organization Lotta was stigmatized and excluded from public memory until the end of the 1980s. The organization's character and activities were re-evaluated several times. At first marginalized, then stigmatized as fascist and promiscuous, the Lotta women gained a positive image after 1989. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the strength of the Finnish women's movement were decisive for the fact that the Lotta could be remembered again.

In a changed social and political context the memory of the Lotta which was previously handed down as counter-narrative in private circles and families could now pass over into official collective memory. Now many Lotta women published memoirs, in which they depicted themselves as hard working, patriotic, unpolitical and sexually pure women. This was a response to the post-1944 picture of Lotta women as fascist and sexually promiscuous. Therefore the image of Lotta women in memoirs can be described as »distorted memory«. It shows that »today's representations not only reflect the past – the years of the war – but also negotiate with earlier interpretations that were created in the decades following the war«.

The image of the pure Lotta stands for an immaculate, blameless Finland during the Second World War in which the Holocaust, expansionist endeavors and collaboration are cut out. Now it is necessary to deconstruct this new and idealized image of patriotic, moral Lotta as it conveys a traditional image of women that is closely linked with a new national discourse and that excludes the war experiences of women who were not members of the organization. Kinnunen's contribution shows that the marginalization, stigmatization and re-remembering of women's actions are closely connected with the respective prevailing memory discourse. All three forms of dealing with the memory of women can be interpreted against the background of the dominant national memory culture.

The centrality of the Second World War in »the grand national narrative« of post-war Finland is also the starting point for *Ann Heiskanen's* contribution. She examines how Finnish women who had sexual relationships with German soldiers between 1939 and 1944 – the period when Finland and Germany were brothers in arms – are remembered. By comparing Finland, France, Germany and Austria she shows that there are parallels in the way these countries dealt with women accused of sexual fratern-

nization in the post-war period. Whether intimate relations between women and foreign soldiers existed was a matter of national and especially male concern. The pictures of female Nazi-collaborators with cropped hair belong to the most widely spread stereotypes of a gendered representation of the Second World War in post-war Europe. In Finland, the era of the Finnish-German collaboration sank into oblivion after 1945. Even when a change of the socio-political framework from the mid-1980s onwards allowed the remembrance of the historical achievements of Finnish women during the Second World War, the remembrance of women who had relations with German soldiers was repressed. From as early as 1944 these women were excluded by the Finnish state and also by their families. Their experience and their memories could not and can not be used for the national discourse. They are counter-productive for the construction of national identity as they threaten the notions of integrity of the nation and of male heroism. The legend of the drowned girls, Finnish women who left the country in 1944 with German soldiers and who were allegedly drowned in the sea by the latter, was kept in memory as a warning example. These fraternizing Finnish women served as scapegoats and, after 1944, they symbolized betrayal »although the whole nation could be considered as a collaborator«. The image of the German's whore »provided a »usable« and efficient counter-image to affirm the central themes of the grand narrative: national unity, heroic masculinity and self-sacrifice that provided a »defensive victory«.

Heiskanen's as well as Kinnunen's contributions show that female memories can only be inscribed into collective memory when times permit it, namely when they are regarded as politically correct and when they are usable for the construction of national identity.⁶ This way of dealing with remembrances applies at least for periods of national greatness or periods in which the endangered nation demanded heroism and absolute loyalty from her citizens.

Helle Bjerg and Claudia Lenz deal with the role of gender in the construction of families' memory culture with regard to the Second World War in Norway and Denmark by comparing three generations. As is the case in Germany, the generation of the grandchildren in Norway and Denmark tends to portray their grand-parents as blameless resisters who acted

6 As research on Denmark and Norway shows (Lenz/Mattauschek 2004; Lenz 2006), this is the case not only in Finland but also in other European countries which excluded the *German girls* in fact and in memory.

according to today's values. Bjerg and Lenz show that female culture of memory in the family is defined by the power relations between the genders and by the authority to speak. The authors ask whether men and women have the same authority to speak and to present themselves as historical actors in family memories. They propose that »gender is one central category in this process in which authority is generated and regulated. Men and women relate themselves and are related to different historical themes and topics, which are regarded as more (male) or less (female) relevant«. More often than men, female eyewitnesses assume that they do not have anything relevant to recount; they regard their lives as meaningless with regard to *big* history. Male eyewitnesses, however, assume for themselves both authority and relevant factual knowledge. Their statements about the past are assigned greater significance in the family and especially by women. »The consequence of this is that even the women who did participate in the resistance and as such do have stories to tell about dramatic encounters with the occupying power seldom acknowledge these stories as political belonging to »big history« (...). Women then have the tendency of not viewing themselves as actors of history, even when the archive of national memory opens up that possibility. Thereby they not only rob themselves of the status of being active subjects of past history, but also of the authority of being worthy narrators and interpreters of the past in the present«.

For the analysis of the connection of gender and memory it is especially important that we find the gender-specific assignment of authority in younger generations too. Men belonging to the generation of the grandchildren place themselves »in an authorized position based on the division between male connoted factual knowledge as the most valuable and female connoted personal knowledge as less valued in the transition of memory in the family as well as in the public culture of memory«.

With two case studies – one about a female activist of the Hungarian extreme-right and a former female Greek partisan who lives in exile in Hungary – *Andrea Pető* examines the role of historical memory for the construction of female subjectivity and agency and the influence of political transition processes on the construction of memory. In times of political transition the political framework changes and the system of reference which existed by then and which was constitutive for the collective memory becomes insignificant. Personal memories, or memories which did not

fit into mainstream memory and were handed down only in families, now come to the foreground and gain effectiveness.

It was characteristic of the Hungarian mainstream interpretation of history that the responsibility of Hungarian political parties for the alliance with Germany, along with the connection of the Arrow Cross Party – the Hungarian national socialists – with the German Nazis, were played down or forgotten. Communist crimes and acts of violence were erased from official memory as well. As a reaction to the state's history policy, Hungarian families of the national right developed a minority discourse which remembered the communist war crimes. After the collapse of the Eastern Bloc, today's women of the national right took up parts of the national-socialist ideology as well as the view about this period of the past handed down by their families, above all by their grandparents, for the construction of a resistant female identity which triggered their politicization and made them right-wing supporters. Although the new fascist movements keep to the tradition of claiming male supremacy, this example shows how women of the political right can subjectively draw power from their powerlessness. By identifying with the power of the political group they are affiliated with they succeed in feeling less weak.

We can find similar phenomena in the second case study. The communist Greek exiles who came to Hungary after 1948 cultivated a memory culture in public which celebrated the anti-fascist masculine-connoted guerilla warfare as constitutive for their identity. Although their achievements were mostly left out of the narrative, the female partisans identified with this memory of a male heroic fight, of weapons and violence. Therefore they objected the deconstruction of this myth after 1989, which in fact could have provided space for the consideration of female achievements. »Therefore even if the political discourse constructs a dichotomy about »strong men« and »weak women«, women could benefit from this political discourse by using their subordinate position to become political agents. So questioning the myth of the strong, male Greek partisan questioned not only the public space offered to women in the Greek resistance movement but also decreased the power she imagined she had«. Pető shows the important role of the family as a place of counter-tradition, especially with regard to the politicization of women. Women use parts of this tradition and these memories to construct an identity which is in opposition to the dominant political discourse, no matter which real chances for emancipation the minority discourse's patterns of identification offer.

The last two contributions of this volume are conceptual reflections. *Maria Grever* and *Kees Ribbens* analyze the relation of memory and canonization. They ask how the whiggish plot of historiography centered on the nation state with male, white and bourgeois agents, which was established in the nineteenth century, can be broken up and how perspectives such as gender and ethnicity can be integrated. They also pose the question of whether the present memory boom has led to a broader perspective. They come to the conclusion that discussions about the culture of history have resulted in the inclusion of new, alternative as well as popular representations of history. The national framework, however, has not yet been overcome despite the inclusion of multiple perspectives, and ultimately even memory studies have perpetuated a national, male and white history discourse. To break up this hegemonial discourse they plead for a more dynamic approach to collective memory. The interaction of producers and the public, of theme and space, as well as the different possible interpretations of historical representations should be given more attention. Grever and Ribbens propose that an analysis of producers and consumers from the perspective of gender, of gender-specific practices of memory and subversive appropriation of hegemonic memory allow the male- and nation-centered history discourse to be broken up.

In addition, the essay critically discusses two projects which intend to inscribe women into history. In this discussion too they stress that it is important to ask whose history is presented by whom for whom. Furthermore, they question whether alternative forms of representation are taken seriously by the consumers, whether it is possible to improve the national canon, or to establish a counter-canon and whether a national culture of memory without a canon is possible at all. Undoubtedly, despite all restrictions a canon brings about, it also offers advantages: it makes orientation easier, reduces the abundance of information and gives security (Grever 2007). According to the authors, however, the dynamic of historical cultures and the possibilities of identification connected with the various perspectives beyond the national paradigm – gender, ethnicity, social position – should be taken into account and local, regional, national, as well as international perspectives should be made possible.

The concluding contribution by *Sylvia Schraut* and *Sylvia Paletschek* discusses the state of the art of research on gender and memory. The main characteristics of a culture of memory which excludes female scopes of action, experiences and counter-memories are, according to the authors,

the national orientation of public memory in connection with the norms of the bourgeois gender-model inherent in it. The authors discuss how the category of gender could be integrated into memory studies and how women could be inscribed into culture(s) of memory. As an example, they present a web-page on the revolution of 1848/49, which served as a pilot project for a gender-sensitive contribution to memory culture.

In order to give women a stronger presence in culture(s) of memory it is at first necessary to analyze the seemingly gender-neutral space of national memory with regard to its gender-historical implications and to contextualize historical gender stereotypes which claim universal validity. Here, a two-fold historicization of allegories used for memory policies is necessary: on the one hand we must analyze in which historical context they emerged and on the other hand we have to examine their lines of tradition. Moreover, inscribing women into memory culture requires breaking the dominance of politics and the nation in cultural memory and integrating themes which tend to be associated with the feminine (e.g. daily and social history, historical anthropology). Communicative memory should also be given greater attention as it allows more space for the representation of women than cultural memory. At last, we need a spatial system of reference and a form of media presentation which allow the boundaries of the nation state to be overcome. Playing with diverse spatial scales, linking local, regional, national and trans-national perspectives, allows multi-perspectivity and makes it easier to integrate the category of gender.

Conclusion

The contributions in this volume show that women and their scopes of action were decisively under-represented in the memory culture of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, despite this marginalization, gender is of integral importance in cultural memory. It is a desideratum for research to analyze the male imbuedness of memory culture.

The following aspects can be summarized:

1. How women are remembered is closely linked with the social developments of the nineteenth century, with the building of nations, with nineteenth-century gender roles and female scopes of action in this century. Pre-modern Christian and dynastic memory traditions had a

much longer impact for the representation of women in cultural memory than for the representation of men. Until the beginning of the twentieth century women were only remembered when they were members of a dynasty or rulers, because of their charitable or religious activities or because of their emotional bonds with the nation. The representation of women in the national culture of memory cemented the status quo of the prevailing gender order. Alternative, emancipatory interpretations of female national monuments were only part of minority discourses or were only valid in times of crisis.

2. The national public remembrance of women began relatively late. Monuments for bourgeois men were already being erected in the nineteenth century. The first national monuments for bourgeois women, however, were not built before the beginning of the twentieth century. Here, the First World War was important, because the monuments were part of nation states' intentions to mobilize women for war. At the same time the European feminist movements endeavored to establish feminist memory cultures.⁷ This may be due to the pressure for modernization which became visible at the end of the nineteenth century and which resulted in women's conquering of the public space. Systematic research is needed into the memory culture of nineteenth-century women's movements.
3. It is conspicuous that motherly achievements dominate the remembrance of women in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This system of reference of memory politics was based on pre-modern and middle class gender concepts and resulted in paradoxes. Referring to the motherly merits of women for the nation and the community limited women's scope of action and women's options. Simultaneously motherliness was a successful tool to implant women into memory culture and to assign them national and social importance.

This memory could motivate women to act and, partially, to overcome gender roles. In twentieth-century memory culture, *motherliness* was taken up by national as well as international, fascist as well as anti-fascist movements. Social motherliness could be linked with pacifism, internationalism, democracy but also with nationalism and fascism. The concept allowed *all* women regardless of class, ethnicity, denomination,

7 See Grever (1997) For the importance of historical remembrance and for the endeavours of the European feminist movements to create female traditions see Paletschek/Pietrow-Ennker (2004).

citizenship, age and marital status to be referred to. This is the strength of motherliness as a figure of memory; however, it relegates women from history and places them into the realm of anthropological constants. The real limits set by this symbolic organization of the remembrance of women ought to be more closely examined through the example of conflicts about memory politics.

4. Not only the memory figure of the mother, but also female allegories and female figures remembered in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century very often embody timeless values and thus represent *non*-history rather than concrete historical actions. We assume that this unhistorical component of the concept of femininity in various societies and in memory culture is an additional reason for the fact that women are marginalized in cultural memory. Female allegories symbolize cyclical time, the recurring circle of life and the future as well as emotional values such as caring, understanding, comfort, relief and sorrow. Men stood for history, change and linear time, for achievements, but also for guilt and responsibility. Especially female allegories such as *La République* or *Germania* which stand for the nation refer to timeless values. They were to a high degree open for the most varied political interpretations and thus enabled a broad consent across the various segments of society. However, they did not necessarily further the conclusion that women should not be excluded from higher education and from political participation in the nation.

It remains to be examined if historical role models, references to historical events and a common history had the same importance for women as for men. Did this reference to social motherliness, which was attributed to all women and which, in addition, was rooted in religion and Christianity, not offer a point of identification and bonding which made a common political-historical remembrance unnecessary? We also have to ask whether taking up unhistorical female figures must be seen as indicator for the lack of female role models in history. From this point of view the process of transition to historical female figures of memory could be interpreted as indicator for the inclusion of women into the body politic of the nation.

5. It is conspicuous, furthermore, that female remembrance comes into view primarily in situations of radical historical or political change. These are periods in which power is challenged and the sovereignty over interpretation is questioned not only in politics but also in mem-

ory culture. Memories of the historical achievements of women can only be brought to light – as is shown very clearly in the contributions which deal with the remembrance of war – when political and social changes bring about favorable conditions. Only politically correct remembrances of women which can be used for the national interest (the same applies of course to remembrances of men) find their way into the respective desired cultural memory shaped by the custodians of memory. It is obvious that families, keepers of memories that are suppressed in cultural memory, play an important role as space of female counter-tradition, despite the fact that family memory is dependent on the dominant memory discourse and is marked by the prevailing gender relations. As an oral tradition, this female counter-tradition is subject to the time limits of communicative memory which rarely keeps alive remembrances that date back more than about 80–100 years before they become rudimentary remnants of memory. Nevertheless, the importance of families as repository of remembrances over three generations should not be underestimated.

6. It has to be stressed that the opportunity to inscribe female experience into memory culture is closely linked with the status of women in politics and academia. Inscribing women into cultural memory is still that difficult in today's Europe because both the family and society do not acknowledge women as authorities in interpreting history. Many women do not claim this right or they think that they do not have anything to tell which is worth remembering with regard to history. Women however have the chance to re-interpret the male-dominated historical discourse subversively. By identifying with the power of a group or the power of its representatives it is possible, within limits, to take up fragments of mainstream memory to construct a resistant female subjectivity. Such strategies might, in some instances, open feminine-connoted spaces of remembrance. Women are however inextricably linked to the male dominated historical discourse and they are (self-)excluded from historical interpretation; this renders it difficult to implement a culture of memory which appropriately represents gender. Therefore a culture of memory which not only takes into account gender, but also social, cultural and ethnic difference is still a desideratum.

Works Cited

- Assmann, Aleida (1993), *Arbeit am nationalen Gedächtnis. Eine kurze Geschichte der deutschen Bildungsidee*, Frankfurt a. M.
- Assmann, Aleida (1999), *Erinnerungsräume. Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*, München.
- Assmann, Aleida (2006), *Erinnerungsräume. Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*, München.
- Assmann, Jan (1988), »Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität«, in: Idem/Hölscher, Tonio (eds.), *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, Frankfurt a. M., pp. 9–19.
- Assmann, Jan (1992), *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis, Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, München.
- Assmann, Jan, »Collective Memory and Cultural Identity«, *New German Critique* vol. 65/1995, pp. 125–133.
- Erl, Astrid (2005), *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskultur*, Stuttgart.
- Eschebach, Insa/Jacobeit, Sigrid/Wenk, Silke (eds.) (2002), *Gedächtnis und Geschlecht – Deutungsmuster in Darstellungen des nationalsozialistischen Genozid*, Frankfurt a. M., New York.
- Grever, Maria, »The Pantheon of Feminist Culture. Women's Movement and the Organisation of Memory«, *Gender & History*, vol. 9, no. 2/1997, pp. 364–374.
- Grever, Maria, »Die Neue Geschichtskultur und die Rückkehr des nationalen Kanons«, in: Regnath, Johanna R./Riepl-Schmidt, Mascha/Scherb, Ute (eds.) (2007), *Eroberung der Geschichte. Frauen und Tradition*, Münster, pp. 31–44.
- Halbwachs, Maurice (1985), *Das Gedächtnis und seine sozialen Bedingungen*, Frankfurt a. M. (original: *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, Paris 1925).
- Hobsbawm, Eric/Ranger, Terence (eds.) (1984), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge.
- Lenz, Claudia, »Zwischen nationalem Verrat und romantischer Liebe. Zur diskursiven (Ent)Politisierung sexueller Verhältnisse zwischen norwegischen Frauen und deutschen Soldaten«, in: Albrecht, Henning/Boukrif, Gabriele/Bruns, Claudia/Heinsohn, Kirsten (eds.) (2006), *Politische Gesellschaftsgeschichte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Hamburg, pp. 133–147.
- Lenz, Claudia/Mattauschek, Isabelle, »Geschichtspolitik und Erinnerungskultur in Dänemark und Norwegen aus der Perspektive intergenerationeller Tradierung«, in: *Wissenschaftszentrum Nordrhein-Westfalen / Kulturwissenschaftliches Institut Essen (KWI). Jahrbuch* (2004), Essen, pp. 65–78.
- Leydesdorff, Selma/Passerini, Luisa/Thompson, Paul Richard (eds.) (1996), *Gender and Memory (International Yearbook of Oral History & Life Stories vol. 4)*, Oxford.
- Nora, Pierre (1984–93), *Les lieux de mémoire*, 7 vols., Paris.
- Nora, Pierre, »Between memory and history. Les Lieux de mémoire«, *Representations*, no. 26/1989, pp. 7–24.

- Paletschek, Sylvia, »Historigraphie und Geschlecht«, in: Regnath, Johanna R./ Riepl-Schmidt, Mascha/Scherb, Ute (eds.) (2007), *Eroberung der Geschichte. Frauen und Tradition*, Münster, pp.105–142.
- Paletschek, Sylvia/Pietrow-Ennker, Bianka (eds.) (2004), *Women's Emancipation Movements in the nineteenth Century. A European Perspective*, Stanford.
- Penkwitt, Meike (2006), »Einleitung«, in: *Erinnern und Geschlecht. Bd. I*, Freiburger FrauenStudien 19, Freiburg, pp. 1–26.
- Smith, Bonnie (1998), *The Gender of History. Men, Women and Historical Practice*, Cambridge.
- Winter, Jay (2006), *Remembering War. The Great War between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century*, New Haven.