CHAPTER SEVEN

Lieux de mémoire – A European transfer story

Benoît Majerus

Introduction

If an imaginary European History Academy had to choose the word of the last 20 years in historiography, then undoubtedly lieux de mémoire – realms of memory, or Erinnerungsorte in German – would be on the short list. The writings of Pierre Nora on lieux de mémoire have successfully created a meta-concept able to unite the growing studies on memory. Rarely has a notion coined by one person spread so rapidly through the Western academic world. But the homonym of the translations can be treacherous, hiding a heterogeneity of meanings. The following chapter tries to answer three questions. In which intellectual context did the original lieux de mémoire emerge? What was the discursive subtext of the whole enterprise? And how was the theoretical frame translated into practice? In a second step, I will try to trace the European success of the concept by analysing how the French paradigm of lieux de mémoire was introduced into other national historiographic traditions.

French spaces

The lieux de mémoire project developed during an academic course organized by Pierre Nora in the late 1970s at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris. Nora, the initiator, was at that moment already a
well-established historian and publicist. His starting point was a pessimistic one: "the rapid disappearance of our national memory seemed to call for a list of these places". Collective memory seemed to have ceased to exist at the beginning of the 1980s. Nora's initial purpose was thus to establish an inventory of a fading memory. Ten years later, after the bicentennial of the French revolution and the debates about the Vichy regime, Nora complained that French society was saturated by too much memory. The wish to chart national history/national memory was accompanied by a desire for a history of the 'second degree'. Such a history was not so much interested in examining reality itself as in how this reality was remembered. The project should however not be qualified as postmodernist, since Pierre Nora maintained a strict distinction between (subjective) memory and (objective) history.

The original lieux de mémoire project emerged from within the framework of French national historiography. In his introduction of 1984, Pierre Nora spoke of 'our national memory' ('notre mémoire nationale'), not of the 'French national memory', illustrating the historian's proximity to the subject of his analysis. The subdivision of the books - La République, La Nation, Les France - further 'nationalised' the whole undertaking. This configuration, which structured the whole project, seemed rather difficult to export to other historiographies. It is interesting to note that in no other country has tried to bind its narrative to a similarly rigid structure. Moreover, the vast majority of the participating historians in the writing of the Lieux de mémoire were of French nationality. The whole undertaking was evidently written for a French readership (and) in a French context.

The constructivist approach towards the nation which shaped the project was at that time a common paradigm within French historiography (Le Goff, Furet, Joutard). What is astonishing is the almost complete absence of any theoretical background besides the work of Maurice Halbwachs. Maurice Halbwachs had published in the interwar period on the social construction of memory, taking issue with Sigmund Freud and Henri Bergson, who explained memory on an individual level. The French sociologist stressed the importance of the collective frames in which memory is organized and is expressed.

The seven-volume Les lieux de mémoire constitutes a heterogeneous collection of articles on different material places of memory. Indeed, and this a probably one of the most attractive aspects of the project, Pierre Nora defined the lieux de mémoire as identity projection screens that could be a place like the Eiffel Tower, a book like Le tour de France par deux enfants or a more abstract concept such as Le génie français or Le local. All three elements, at different levels, played an important role in the definition of French identity. Nora defines lieux de mémoire on three levels: a material one, a functional one and a symbolic one. But despite this rather loose and open definition, the more than 130 articles more often provide a specialist's view on a given subject rather than inscribing it into this broader theoretical framework.

The influence of international historiography on the French project was rather limited. Classics on nationalism such as Anthony Smith's...
European spaces

In addition to the impact of these translations, Nora's topography of French collective memory inspired numerous similar undertakings in several European countries. In Italy and Germany, two large projects were launched that deserve a closer look.  

Even if the Italian undertaking is on a somewhat smaller scale than the lieux de mémoire—'only' three volumes and 60 authors—it follows the French example very closely. At the end of the first volume, the editor, Mario Isnenghi, clearly refers to the influence of Pierre Nora, writing that 'la prima... dalle stimolazioni venute dal grande progetto portato a termine da Pierre Nora a dai suoi collaboratori inventando e divulgando anche il concetto dei "lieux de mémoire"' ('the first inspiration... came from the great project realized by Pierre Nora and his colleagues who invented and disseminated the concept of the lieux de mémoire'). Two key sources of methodological inspiration can be traced back to Pierre Nora's introduction: Maurice Halbwachs and the duo Hobbsbawn/Ranger. Neither the editor nor the authors—with the exception of Marco Fincardi, who had studied at Pierre Nora's home institution, l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales—had any direct link with France or French historiography. But the Italian historical sciences are generally very French-oriented. Moreover, several authors, in contrast to their German colleagues, referred directly to the Lieux de mémoire in their articles, illustrating the widespread diffusion of the book in Italy. The Luoghi della memoria were relatively well reviewed by the academics, but were not a great success for the publisher: there was no second edition, and no paperback version. The publication of the Luoghi della memoria was however overshadowed by a conflict between Isnenghi and Nora. Pierre Nora himself had plans to launch a collection of Italian lieux de mémoire, which he had to abandon once the Isnenghi project was published. This clash revealed two things. On the one hand, the term lieux de mémoire quickly developed a market value for publishers. On the other hand, this raised the issue of who actually holds the 'copyright' for the concept. Pierre Nora did not just want others to acknowledge their indebtedness to his work: he wanted to enforce a certain right of supervision over any similar project. This seems a rather unusual wish, but surprisingly, several of the other project coordinators involved Pierre Nora directly in their work as it was progressing.

Apart from the French lieux de mémoire, the German edition was without any doubt the biggest and commercially most successful undertaking. As was the case with the French project, the project was launched through an academic course. This was co-organized by Hagen Schulze, former director of the German Historical Institute in London and a specialist on the German nation-building process, and Erinnene Francois. Francois, professor at the University of Paris I, had been director of a French-German research centre in Berlin, the Centre Marc Bloch, and was the director of the Frankreichzentrum at the Technical University in Berlin at the time when the Erinnerungsorte were published. His personal contacts with the French and Parisian academic field as well as his access to institutional resources proved to be an ideal background for the transfer of the French concept to a German context. Several preliminary conferences were thus organized at the Centre Marc Bloch, confronting German social scientists with the concept of the lieux de mémoire.
The German *Erinnerungsorte* placed themselves in a rather a-critical genealogical relation to the initial French project, as is illustrated by Pierre Nora writing the afterword. Whereas Nora is acknowledged as one of their major inspirations from page one already, François and Schulze do not openly refer in their methodological introduction to any of the critical reviews the *Lièques de mémoire* had triggered. On the other hand, and contrary to the French model, the editors try to elaborate a broader theoretical background. They discuss quite extensively the work of the French sociologist, Maurice Halbwachs, stressing the importance of collective frames in organizing memory. The French historian Henry Rousso and the German cultural scientist Alida Assmann constitute the two other major reference points. Rousso pointed out the important tension between memory and oblivion, an oblivion that allows for the existence of memory. Assmann provided the tools to deal with the opposition between history and memory. For Assmann, history leads a double life: as science and as memory. Both do not necessarily compete, nor are they contradictory: rather they are two different ways by which to link the past to the present. In trying to open up the concept, *Erinnerungsorte* offered a far more eclectic approach, including articles, for instance, on the Bundesliga (the German Premier League), the Schrebergarten (allotment garden), but also on Goethe and the Berlin Wall.

The reception of the *Erinnerungsorte* was however quite critical; the result was seen as too essayistic, too "museal" (antiquated), as too arbitrary in terms of the selection made – and as not popular enough. Even if the German contributions attempt to underline the discontinuity of national history, some observers still condemn what they see as a too homogeneous presentation of German history in the *Erinnerungsorte* volumes.

A comparative analysis of the French and the German undertakings reveals much that is significant. Both projects are more or less of the same scale. Both projects clearly had national ambitions, and this is certainly how they were understood in academic circles. Both projects tried to address the scientific community and the larger educated public (Bildungsbürger). But contrary to the French project, which was clearly part of a larger project of nation building, the German *Erinnerungsorte* was not so much defined by a sense of the continuity of history. A comparison of the authors, even if the samples are rather small, produces some interesting hypotheses concerning the historiographical fields in both countries. For some aspects, figures relating to the somewhat smaller Italian project are included in the comparison.

The first difference is gender-related. While female authors made up 12 per cent of those involved in the *Lièques de mémoire* project, every fifth author of the *Erinnerungsorte* contributions was a woman. More important is the dissimilarity concerning the citizenship of the authors. In the French undertaking, the participation of foreign historians was limited: the non-French authors came from five countries (United States, Israel, Italy, Poland, Switzerland, Germany) and represented 8 per cent of all authors. François and Schulze asked twice as many foreigners, hailing from four countries (France, Great Britain, Israel and Poland). Four-fifths of the foreign historians in the *Erinnerungsorte* project originate from France, which shows the importance of the personal links – Étienne François – and institutional networks – Centre Marc Bloch and Frankreichzentrum/TU Berlin – within the context of which the German project was conceived. The German undertaking was also clearly placed within a broader European framework, not only due to the international composition of the authors, but also because the scope of the articles often stretched beyond the German borders. But this framework is nonetheless characterized by the old French-German axis which defined (Western) Europe in the 1950s and the 1960s, but which no longer defines Europe at the beginning of the twenty-first century. The complete absence of any foreign involvement in the *Lièques de mémoire* project seems to indicate a certain sealing off of national Italian historiography from foreign participation – despite the numerous foreign historical institutes in Rome.

The German *Erinnerungsorte* project was not only more open to foreign authors, but it was also informed by a greater methodological openness. One third of the authors were non-historians; in the French case, this percentage was lower at 25 per cent, and in the Italian case, it was under 20 per cent. In Germany, most of the non-historians came from literary studies, in France they were mostly philosophers and art historians. François Audigier, the only historian who has hitherto tried to write the history of the *lieux de mémoire*, was therefore perhaps a little bit hasty when declaring that the French project was characterized by its multidisciplinarity and openness to foreign historians.

The biggest difference between the French and German enterprises evidently relates to the importance of the political capital of the country. The *Lièques de mémoire* were not only a predominantly male undertaking, but also a Parisian one. Two thirds of the authors were working in Paris, 20 per cent of them based at the *Ecole des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales*. In Germany and Italy, the reverse is the case. The *Lièques de mémoire* seemed to be a project of the universities of Northern Italy and unified many historians specializing in Italian fascism. In Germany, even if both editors came from Berlin, most of the authors did not. Finally, the German project was realized by a younger group of historians than the French one.

The dissimilar nature of these editorial projects reveals much about the historiographical fields in both countries and about the place of the project in the context of both national historiographies. As the above analysis shows, the French project was more of a national undertaking, written by male, well-established historians, whereas the *Erinnerungsorte* project, while not existing at the margins of the guild, clearly could not (pretend to) speak for the majority of German historians. It seems as if the confrontation between the *Lièques de mémoire* and the *Erinnerungsorte* projects provides further proof of Pierre Nora's assertion that in France, historians have played a
more fundamental role in the construction of the nation's master narrative than in other countries.

In addition to these two larger projects, numerous smaller ventures dealing with the construction of national identities referred to Pierre Nora. The only exception to this is the Dansk Identitetshistorie, published between 1991 and 1992 in Denmark. It is not the intention of this chapter to present a complete overview of these smaller projects, but consideration of some of them will reveal how the lieux de mémoire circulated in the European world of ideas.

The first country in which the lieux de mémoire were adapted, were the Netherlands. One of the Dutch editors of the Lieux de mémoire et identités nationales, Pim den Boer, wrote his thesis on nineteenth-century French historians: this methodological and geographic proximity on the part of one of the initiators explains the rapid transfer. In the end, however, the book had little in common with the French Lieux de mémoire besides the title. It is an edition of papers presented at the Institut Néerlandais in Paris in 1991 on the construction and invention of the French and Dutch nations. Half of the participants were French historians who had participated in the Lieux de mémoire project, including Pierre Nora himself, while the other half were Dutch historians. Their articles provide not so much an analysis of one specific lieu de mémoire as a general overview, as is demonstrated by Nicolas van Sas' article on 'La nation néerlandaise au dix-neuvième siècle: mythes et représentations'. Nevertheless, the book testifies to the attractive character of the spatial metaphor at a very early stage.

If the Dutch, the Italian and the German projects remained confined to a national framework similar to the one developed by Pierre Nora, there have recently been several undertakings that tried to 'downgrade' the Lieux de mémoire to subnational levels or 'upgrade' them to a supranational one.

In several French regions, there have been attempts to write regional Lieux de mémoire. A search of Opale, the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale, shows that the concept seems to have been particularly 'successful' in the Lorraine, where four books have been published in the last 20 years with Lieux de mémoire in their title. The same publications also illustrate the speed with which the word was transferred from an academic to a wider, more popular context. Indeed, only one of the four books has a clear academic ambition, the three other are popular or touristic in character. In the last volume of the Lieux de mémoire, Pierre Nora shows himself overwhelmed by this 'success' and seems distressed by the popularization of the concept, which, however, had been facilitated by the nostalgic character with which Nora himself had invested the project. The academic Mémoire et lieux de mémoire en Lorraine, edited by two professors of the University of Nancy, is interesting in several regards. First, it demonstrates that smaller social groups can have their own lieux de mémoire and that they can construct their identity in similar ways. Secondly, one of the editors, Philippe Martin, made two important contributions that are too rarely taken into account: on the one hand, he introduced a kind of scale (according to the number of people who can relate to a lieu) by distinguishing between 'le lieu de souvenir, le lieu d’identité et le lieu de mémoire' (realm of remembrance, realm of identity and realm of memory). On the other hand, he also made some pertinent remarks about those events, persons, places that had never become or no longer were lieux de mémoire. Both perspectives had been overlooked in Nora's Lieux de mémoire, whose vision was clouded by the national approach and who did not take enough account of the variations in scale.

At the same time, however, his project is clearly being utilized by the local political elite of the région. In France, these administrative units have gained a greater importance since decentralization started in the 1980s and conseillers régionaux (regional councillors) were elected directly by their constituencies. Numerous regions have been engaged in a process well known to the historians of nineteenth-century nation-building, namely desperately looking to history to legitimate their existence.

In Austria, a transnational approach was chosen, a transnationality resting on a common history, namely that of the Habsburg rule. The avowed aim was to take a first step towards a European history of national constructions. A project Pierre Nora had always regarded with great scepticism. One of the three editors of the Austrian project was Jacques Le Rider, a French specialist on the Habsburg monarchy. Similarly to the German Erinnerungsorte, the Austrian Orte des Gedächtnisses project refers to Pierre Nora etymologically, but on a methodological level, they rely more on German scholars such as Aleida and Jan Assmann. In the Austrian project, the contributions are not limited to one specific lieu de mémoire, but are focused on a long process of nation building. One of their core aims is to analyse how 'transnational' persons/elements were renationalized and instrumentalized to invent national identity. Austria and Vienna appear in this approach as a meeting point of different identities: this is a perspective that breaks with a national perspective, but that seems at the same time to participate in shaping a new metaphor for this region as the 'heart' of the new, enlarged Europe. In parallel to this transnational project, the University of Vienna has launched a specifically Austrian project on realms of memory that tries to integrate results from empirical evidence gathered by the social sciences, such as representational polls.

Other lieux de mémoire have been written for countries that no longer exist, such as the GDR, and countries that seem doomed to disappear, such as Belgium. Moreover, it is interesting that the Belgian project was the last one to be launched by the six EU founding members. In 2011, the European Institute in Mainz (Germany) launched a multi-volume work on European lieux de mémoire. Up to now, however, the British Isles and the Iberian Peninsula have proven quite resistant to the concept.
Hypothetical spaces

First coined in a quintessentially French context at the beginning of the 1980s, the lieux de mémoire have become within 25 years one of the most successful export concepts of French historiography. A first general analysis leads us to the following remarks and hypotheses:

(1) The success of the ‘image’ of lieu de mémoire.

While there are evidently problems translating the French term lieu de mémoire into other languages, one cannot deny that the metaphor ‘invented’ by Pierre Nora has functioned effectively in a wider European context. Even if the approach is not always comparable to the lieux de mémoire, as in the Dutch or Austrian case, the editors choose to maintain this term in their title. The apparent methodological openness of the concept explains the numerous national and local adaptations the idea was submitted to. Presenting national history as a labyrinth, as Aleida Assmann has called the French lieux de mémoire, rather than under the rubric of totality was in line with a larger European movement that was looking for new ways of writing national histories. The resurgence of nationalism after 1989 made a critical approach all the more necessary. Only recently has the concept begun to extend beyond issues of spatially defined national identities and been applied to language or to political parties.

(2) The limited expansion of the concept.66

Without any doubt, the lieux de mémoire concept swiftly crossed the borders of French historiography, but originally the scope of the transference remained relatively limited. Indeed, despite the fact that the Berlin Wall had fallen 3 years before the last volume of the Lieux de mémoire was published, the concept did not cross this old political frontier quickly. Most of the national libraries of the former Eastern bloc countries hold neither the French nor the English version. For 20 years, the concept was not implemented systematically in the former communist republics. An exception to this general thesis are countries which used to belong to the Habsburg monarchy. They did not develop their own realms of memory, but were ‘colonised’ by Austrian historians. It is thus revealing that there is only one Romanian historian involved in the transnational Central-Europe project. Only recently did a German-Polish project see the light of day, with German and Polish historians working together on German-Polish realms of memory. The history of the transfer of the concept demonstrates that the 50-year division of Europe into two parts still poses an obstacle to processes of globalization and cultural interpenetration. On the other hand, it is interesting that all six founding countries of the European Community have their realms of memory projects, perhaps an indication of the academic interdependence that has developed in the last decades.

(3) From passive reception to active appropriation.

The usage of the French concept varied greatly in Western Europe. The arguments in circulation and the interpretations within different national contexts were very heterogeneous in character. In Italy, one can speak of a one-to-one transference. There was no methodological transformation of the original Lieux de mémoire: Maurice Halbwachs and Eric Hobsbawn remained the only methodological reference points. In Germany, however, there was a partial transformation, reflecting a wider theoretical investment. The French concept was enriched by the scholarly discussions conducted at that time in Germany. Other countries just used the ‘magic words’ lieux de mémoire, following only very loosely the method proposed by Pierre Nora.

(4) The importance of personal vectors.

Without wanting to fall into the trap of writing a mechanistic history in which developments are attributed to individuals, it is interesting to observe that in almost every national publication, one finds among the editors a French historian or an academic with links to France. The spread of the lieux de mémoire was and still is facilitated by these people and institutions who act as mediators between the French culture and the rest of the world. The Lieux de mémoire benefited from a particular well-developed French cultural network. This is particularly obvious in the case of the English translation by Kritzman or of the role played by Étienne François and the Centre Marc Bloch in the German case. A final example is the recently published version of the Dutch Lieux de mémoire, edited by Henri Wesseling, a Dutch historian who has worked on France and whose books have been translated into French.77

(5) The importance of the national habitus of the respective historical guild.

As the comparison between the lieux de mémoire, the Erinnerungsorte and the Luoghi della memoria has demonstrated, national habits still played an important role. Even if these undertakings shared numerous similarities, there were quite significant differences in the composition of the participating authors. The geographic distribution shows the central role played by Paris in the field of French historiography, which is but one of the numerous elements that demonstrate the strong centralization of French intellectual life despite the decentralization introduced since the 1960s. The fact that the French team of authors was primarily composed of older men, was less interdisciplinary and included fewer foreigners is a factor that supports, in my view, the hypothesis that the lieux de mémoire, as a critical analytical tool, still operates within the long genealogy of French history writing, starting with Ernest Lavisse and ending with Marc Ferro’s Histoire de France.74 This difference is also visible in the way both works have been received by their peers: in France, the reception has been relatively positive across the board, while in Germany the reception has been more ambiguous and critical.
(6) A one-way transfer until recently. Only one of the other projects has been translated into French or English, while none received a larger coverage in academic journals in other countries. The German school of memory studies around Jan and Aleida Assmann, which played an important role in the German and Austrian undertaking, has had little impact in Italy or France. In his new introduction to the paperback edition of the Lieux de mémoire, Pierre Nora does not refer to the discussions that were already taking place at that moment in the Netherlands or in Germany. This is a final example of the lasting impermeability of intellectual frontiers, something I did not anticipate when I began analysing the apparent success story of the Europeanization of the French Lieux de mémoire.

(7) The difficulty in not acting as identity creator. Even if the lieux de mémoire projects inspired by Nora’s writings claim to adopt a critical approach towards the legitimating role of the historians of the nineteenth century, they all had to face the reproach that they were doing precisely what they were trying to deconstruct. Neither the more eclectic German method nor the regional approach adopted in Lorraine nor the transnational Austrian perspective can prevent the potential creation of new identities and profess merely to deconstruct older ones.
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