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A border can, simultaneously, have influence on landscapes of three different kinds. Rivers, mountains, and political borders split the physical landscape (or its representation on a map). A border can also have influence on what Jerome Bruner has called the landscape of action constituted by the arguments of action: agent, intention, situation, and instrument. And finally borders have influence on the landscape of consciousness: what those involved in action do or do not know, think, or feel.

These three different landscapes are intertwined in mutual dependence. Our image of the physical landscape shapes our consciousness, which in turn has influence on our actions. And our actions can change the borders of the physical landscape.

When historians deal with borders they most often concentrate on the relationship between the physical landscape and the landscape of actions. The borders that exist within an actor’s consciousness are accessible to the scholar only indirectly, fragmentised and difficult to ascertain. Herein lies a challenge: When it comes to images of people’s consciousness, the distinction between reconstruction and free-hand construction becomes blurred. The result can seldom be validated through traditional methods of source criticism.

The texts collected in this volume were, in earlier versions, presented during a session at the 4th Swedish History Conference, held at Lund University, April 24-26 in 2008 and organised around the main theme ‘Borders, Identities and Cultural Encounters’. Borders, boundaries, and culture constitute a common field of interest for lecturers and researchers at the School of Humanities at Halmstad University, where the research group Context and Cultural Boundaries was set up five years ago. A session proposal was therefore more or less a matter of course. The proposal was accepted and eventually the session was built around eight papers written by historians, dealing with different kinds of borders, their constitutive elements and their influence on the physical landscape as well as on the landscape of actions. During the session the papers were commented on by scholars from neighbouring academic disciplines and the concepts of
The concept of 'borders' is of course a common denominator in all of the texts, but not the only one. The texts can be grouped or linked together in many ways: chronologically, geographically, or thematically (class, gender, ethnicity, and migration are just a few possibilities). Suggesting a given path to follow might, however, obfuscate other equally important links between the texts. Instead the papers appear in alphabetical order by author, each paper followed by its comment. Thus the reader is free to choose to link the texts together according to his or her own preferences.

All academic disciplines, History studies among them, have their own borders, present in the landscapes of actions and of consciousness. The multi-disciplinary character of the session was therefore in itself a challenge of borders, the aim of which was to contribute to a further discussion on theoretical and methodological obstacles arising from studying the landscape of consciousness. Historians were thus given the opportunity to pick up new perspectives and new tools from neighbouring disciplines and, correspondingly, historians’ viewpoints were given to offer new thoughts and starting-points for scholarly work all through the field of Humanities.

Through publishing the papers and comments from the conference we hope to provide impulses and inspiration so that the discussion that started during the conference session can continue. Borders are ubiquitous – we may cross them or bang our heads against them, accept them or challenge them, but we can never get around their existence. We should therefore do our best to understand them.

---

**The Borders between the Historian and Those Whom She Studies**

**Johanna Bartholdsson**

The more we try to separate our sympathies and antipathies, the more we try to distance ourselves from our experience, the more this comes out from us in the writing of history.¹

In my late teens, I often visited my grandmother in her small one-room apartment. We sat at her kitchen table and she told me stories from her life, mostly from the time before she immigrated to Sweden. She was born in Budapest in 1912 in a Jewish middleclass family. She wanted to become a gym teacher, but as she was Jewish, she was not allowed to study according to the principle of *numerus clausus* that limited the number of Jewish students at Hungarian universities during the 1920s.² She managed to survive, with her six year old daughter (who later became my mother) through 1944 and the beginning of 1945 by hiding with false identification papers outside Budapest. Her husband was deported to Auschwitz where he perished. In 1957, when she was forty-five years old, she fled to Austria together with my mother, who was then 19 years old. Later they were allowed to settle in Sweden. She told me her reasons for fleeing were that she did not want to re-encounter the anti-Semitism which she had experienced during the period from the twenties to the forties. In the aftermath of the revolution, in 1956, she recognized the same anti-Semitic arguments that she had heard before.³ She chose to flee. It is my impression that, in many respects, her life effectively came to an end after that. She never really adjusted here in Sweden. Since she was almost deaf she never mastered the Swedish language. She had very few friends and lived mostly for her daughter and her granddaughters.

---

¹ Liakos 2008 p. 47.
² Lajos 2002 p.7.
³ About 10% of the Hungarians that fled in 1956 and 1957 were in fact Jewish and their reasons were often the same as those of my grandmother. Svensson 1992 p. 66.
Even though both her Swedish and her hearing were poor we found a way to communicate. I imagine it was then that I developed a skill at inferring what she meant which has been very useful later on while interviewing Serbian immigrants. I would often repeat what she told me in Swedish changing my interpretation until she confirmed that I had guessed correctly.

She sat there, at her kitchen table, with all her memories from the past. Most of her stories were about her youth in Budapest between the wars and about the hardships experienced during the war.

As I meet Serbian immigrant women who are the focus in my doctoral thesis, I am often reminded of my grandmother and of our talks at her kitchen table. I recognize the way we communicated since several of the interviewees speak broken Swedish and I find myself guessing, as I often did while talking to my grandmother. These women immigrated to Sweden and settled in the towns of Halmstad and Oskarström in the 1960s. They all originate from the small town Dubica in Bosnia. According to their own individual stories, and to the collective stories about them, they immigrated in order to find or build a better life and move away from the poverty and unemployment in Yugoslavia. Sweden, at the time, had a need for workers and consequently there were plenty of opportunities for them.\(^4\)

I recognize the stories of hardships in the homeland before they immigrated to Sweden. I recognize the hardness in their way of talking about their past and also the irony in their tone of voice. I recognize their worries for their children and grandchildren. I recognize their longing for their homeland.

With this recognition, the border between us seems to dissolve in some respects. The differences between one’s academic persona and the ‘informant’ lessen – or, more alarmingly put, the importance of a lack of relationship between us is reduced and there is less of a border to overcome. I, as a historian, feel more at ease in their kitchen, less a colonist and more of a guest, sometimes even with a feeling of being a granddaughter.

But still, there are differences between us since they do not tell the same story as my grandmother did. Unlike my grandmother most of them never intended to stay in Sweden. They developed a solid social net of friends and relatives in the towns of Halmstad and Oskarström. They return to Yugoslavia (now Republika Srpska) each summer where many of them built houses. The relationship between us is not in fact as familiar as the one between me and my grandmother. They didn’t invite me; it was I who asked them to tell me their story. And still, I am the one that will transform their life-stories to something of interest in the academic world and elsewhere. In a way, I have the feeling that they expect me to be their spokesperson to the outside world. This feeling reminds me of how the anthropologist Ruth Behar describes how Esperanza, a Mexican woman she has studied, sees the anthropologist as a redeemer passing her story on to the white, (and for Esperanza) unreachable world.\(^5\)

One might ask how this similarity between my talks with my grandmother and my talks with the people that are put into focus in my study affect my research. Is this similarity beneficial or is it a disadvantage for my results, or could it be both? Is it at all important to consider this personal recognition between the experiences of my own life and those of the subjects of my study?\(^6\) Is it really scholarly to consider my own personal thoughts and feelings? This is the position I want to adopt and furthermore I believe it could be of value for historians to consider the borders within consciousness that exist between themselves and the historical persons or phenomena they study. The physical borders between the historian and the sources studied in time or space, however, are of course often considered. Most historians find it crucial not to be anachronistic in their interpretations of the material. The borders that have to do with the person of the historian and the persons studied are less often discussed, impersonality often being too readily equated with impartiality. In the anthropological and ethnological disciplines there is a long tradition of discussing the relationship between the researcher and the subjects she studies. In this tradition, discussions about the benefits and/or the disadvantages of having an


\(^5\) Behar 1993 pp. 231-274.

\(^6\) I choose to call these women the *subjects of my study* instead of the objects of my study in order to emphasize that I consider them as such. I see them as subjects in the meaning that they are active actors that are participating in the research process of creating knowledge about them. Several oral historians have discussed this issue of seeing the persons they study as active subjects and often name this relationship between the researcher and the studied as a subject – subject relation, see Thor 2001 pp. 334-341.
insider’s or an outsider’s perspective are often encountered. I consider the anthropologist Ruth Behar an inspirational example of this way of working in the social sciences. In her book Translated Women. Crossing the Border with Esperanza’s Story she relates how problematic, and sometimes unproblematic, it was, as a white researcher from the west, meeting with Esperanza, the Mexican woman that is put into focus in the book. In one part of the book Behar describes the relationship between her and Esperanza and how they negotiated with regards to the final result of the book. She describes the borders between them and how these borders influence the outcome of Behar’s research. Still she does not lose the scholarly sharpness and insight as she in the last part interweaves these personal reflections with more traditional theoretical discussions around the life story of Esperanza. Behar finds a way in her study, to include her own person, the person of Esperanza and academic work as such, without any of them falling out of the picture.

Since Donna J. Haraway’s notion of situated knowledge social scientists often discuss knowledge as a construction. According to Haraway a scholarly objectivity can still be achieved as long as the scholar becomes aware of and makes visible the position from where she creates knowledge. The historian Joan W. Scott questions the historians’ way of considering experience as unquestionable evidence. She sees experience as constructed by historical processes and says that it is important to study how this construction is made possible and in addition not to reproduce essentializing categories. I do agree with Scott in that it is important to study how experience is constructed in order to understand power relations. I would like to go a step further and put the researcher’s own life-experience into focus and look into how this experience affects her work and more specifically her attitude towards the persons involved in the sources she is working with.

The historians that discuss the issue of the relationship between the researcher and her sources are typically the historians that work with oral sources. This is more natural for them since they have a direct communication with their sources and moreover these sources are real people who can object if the historian somehow mistreats her or his testimony in any way.

Alessandro Portelli means that oral history presents a new way of writing history where the historian becomes one of the partial protagonists of the story that she writes instead of being a third impartial person, as the historian until now has been considered to be. While being part of the creation of the oral sources the historian is pulled into the narrative and becomes a part of the story. In order to enhance the status of oral history Ronald Grele suggests that working with oral sources provides the historian with an excellent opportunity to find out how ideology and mythmaking form our conception of history. He suggests that oral historians should analyse their interviews or conversational narratives, as he chooses to call them, on the basis of three sets of relationships that he means exist in the interview. These sets are the relations between the linguistic, grammatical and literary structure of the interview, the social and psychological relations between the interviewer and the interviewee and finally the relations between the interviewee’s view of history and the historian’s view of these historical processes. According to Grele this kind of analysis makes it possible for the historian to capture the contradictions between ideology, myth making and reality.

I am of the opinion though that considering the relationship between the historian and those being studied is important, not only for the historian working with oral material, but also for the historian working with any kind of sources. I believe this is more common among German and French historians. Luisa Passerini and Alexander C.T. Geppert have collected a number of ego-histoires of contemporary historians which show how their personal lives are intertwined with their professional lives as historians. Passerini and Geppert claim that historians writing ego-histoires is not a postmodern phenomenon but have been produced by historians for example in book prefaces and in so called Festschriften for a long time.

---

8 Behar 1993.
10 Scott 1992 pp. 36-38.
12 Portelli 1998 pp. 72f.
14 Passerini & Geppert 2001 pp. 7-18.
The referential framework the historian has acquired from her own experience of life affects how she interprets the sources and I think that historical studies have a great deal to gain if this process is made more visible. In my own work in interviewing two generations of Serbian-Swedish women I have encountered several different kinds of borders between myself and the interviewees that could be described as borders within consciousness. I will here describe these borders and discuss how they affect my research.

While doing interviews, the borders between myself and the interviewees, some of which emanate from different kinds of social categorizations, become important for our interaction and later on affect how I interpret the material. This could be our sense of belonging to, for example, different generations, different social classes or different ethnicities.

Since I do interviews with two generations of Serbian-Swedish women, the generational borders have been an issue which I have subsequently reflected upon. One of the reasons why I am reminded of the similarity of my relationship with my grandmother while interviewing the elderly women is the nature of our talks. They seem to be characterized by the transmission of the story from the older generation to the next. I often find myself in the role of a granddaughter during these interviews. The women very easily find their role in telling me about their life. I believe they do so because there is a collective tradition of the older generation telling their life-story to the younger generation. Both the women and I are part of similar traditions so therefore we can easily find our roles as teller – listener.

The ethnologist Alf Arvidsson writes about phases in life-story interviews saying that the form of the conversation is established in the first phase. According to Arvidsson this first phase is characterized by a negotiation between both parties with regards to the form of the conversation. In this phase, the negotiating often goes smoothly between the researcher and the elderly women and the form of the conversation is easily established. On the other hand there is not such a tradition of natural story telling between myself and the younger generation. Therefore the younger interviewees do not as easily find their role as story-tellers. In the beginning of the interviews they often want me to ask them questions and they are more insecure while telling their life story often interrupting themselves and asking what else they should tell. The sociologist Anna Johansson has related a similar experience while interviewing two generations of Nicaraguan women within the framework of her thesis. With the elderly women Johansson felt comfortable in the role of a younger guest or as a 'daughter'. The elderly women found their role as tellers and Johansson easily found her role as a humble listener. While interviewing women of her own age the differences between them became more obvious and the interviews had more of the character of a fixed situation with a formal framework of question – answer where the researcher set the agenda and the interviewees simply answered. In my research I am interested in the relationship between individual stories and collective stories. I can probably more easily find the collective story in the stories of the older women since they tell their story in this traditional way. In the stories of the younger women I can perhaps more easily find the alternative stories since they are not as used to telling their life story.

Moreover the generational border between myself and the elderly women could raise problems when I interpret their stories with regards to phases in their lives which I cannot completely relate to since I have not yet experienced those phases in my own life.

On the other hand the fact that I and the younger women were born within the same decade and can be considered to be in the same generation does not automatically mean that there are no problems in our interaction and my interpretation of the interviews. The ethnologist Lena Gerholm discusses the concept of ‘generation’ saying that generation could be seen both as an experience and as a construction. Moreover, it is hard to look at generation exclusively since the experience and/or the construct of generation coincide with other categories, such as sex, ethnicity, class and religion for example. Therefore, in some ways, I can relate to the younger women since we have some mutual frames of reference emanating from our experience of being brought up during the 1970s and 1980s. However in other ways there are differences between us emanating from our sense of

---

15 I here choose to call my interviewees Serbian-Swedish to show that they are Swedish citizens with a Serbian origin. They themselves vary in naming themselves as Serbs and as Yugoslavs. I am not yet determined how I will name them eventually; the outcome of my analysis will help me decide this.


18 Gerholm 1993 pp. 110-112.
belonging to different social classes, different ethnicities, and the fact that I was brought up in Malmö, a larger town than Halmstad. I have to keep these borders in mind while interacting with the women and while analysing the interviews since they can hinder my understanding. There is a risk of understanding what I already know rather than what they actually tell me; the generational similarity obscuring, for instance, social or ethnic differences.

I have also had reason to reflect upon the borders, constructed from our sense of belonging to an ethnicity that exists between me and the women. Another similarity between my talks with my grandmother and the talks with my interviewees is their mutual experience of being persecuted by the Nazis during the Second World War. Several of the Serbian-Swedish women have told me about their experiences of persecution at the hands of the Nazis during the war. Their hometown, Dubica, is close to Jasenovac where a concentration camp was established by the Croatian Ustashas and where many Serbians were held imprisoned and were tortured and murdered. In their life stories they talk about fathers and brothers being held in Jasenovac and never coming back home. Somehow, these rather similar experiences of having family members persecuted by the Nazis and by the Croatian Ustashas, makes me feel close to them. Even though this happened a very long time ago, I can understand how the war-stories are still important today for both generations and for their identification as Yugoslavs and/or Serbs. Several of the interviewees relate the dissolution of Yugoslavia in the nineties as a consequence of conflicts between ethnic groups originating in the Second World War. The similarity of the experience of being persecuted or having relatives who have been persecuted for ethnic reasons perhaps enhances my understanding and helps the interviewees feel more free to talk about this experience. On the other hand their identification as Yugoslavs and/or Serbs could become problematic in our relationship with me also being Swedish (my father is Swedish). Both of the generations differ in terms of calling themselves Yugoslavs or Serbs. I believe that several of them are somewhat afraid of calling themselves Serbs since they, in the Swedish context, are very easily considered to be perpetrators. During the nineties, the media reports from the war in Yugoslavia often described the Serbs as the perpetrators and the Croats and Bosniaks as the victims. I intend to do several interviews with these women. As of today I have done one interview with each of them. This first interview concentrated on the women’s life-stories and I let them tell their story freely without interfering too much. Typically, none of the women talked much about the war that dissolved their home country. The second interview will focus on so called critical points in their lives. Here we will probably talk about their identification as Yugoslavs and/or Serbs and how the war affected them. I imagine that our ethnic differences will be of importance here. The psychiatrist Nicholas G. Procter noticed how the ethnic borders between him, as an Australian, even though he was married to a Serbian woman and spoke Serbian fluently, and Serbian Australians were fortified when he wanted to study how they reacted to the war in their home country during the 1990s.

How then, could considering the generation borders or any other border emanating from social categorization between the historical and written sources be of any importance?

The interaction between the historian and the written source is not as obvious as it is with the historian and the interviewee, but still, there is an interaction. The historian Malin Thor suggests a subject – subject relationship not only between the oral historian and the interviewees but also between the historian and the written sources. Thor gives the example of a historian analysing a diary and means that there exists a dialogue between the historian and the author of the diary when the historian actively tries to understand the author as a thinking subject. I suggest that this dialogue between the historian and the subject of the past affects the historical analysis in different ways. The dialogue is influenced by the historian’s categorization of both herself and of the subject under investigation as for example belonging to a certain social class, ethnicity, religion or sex. If the historian asks herself how this categorization is made she could avoid putting herself in a superior position towards the people involved in her sources. Considering the borders between the historian and the studied material, oral or written, in this way, has an ethical dimension. In order not to colonize the subjects of the study the historian has to ask herself why she

17 Judah 2000 p. 129.
20 Magnusson 2006.
21 Procter 2000.
understands the subjects as she does. She has to scrutinize the categorization she makes of herself and the persons studied. This ethical dimension is as important whether those she studies are alive or have been dead for decades or even hundreds of years.\(^{23}\)

I also believe that the fact that the historian sympathizes, or does not sympathize, with the research subject on a more personal level, influences the analysis. This issue has been discussed by historians who work with oral sources but it is of course also relevant in work with written sources.\(^{24}\) The outcome of the analysis would probably be richer if this aspect was made visible.

*How come historians so seldom write about their personal thoughts and feelings and its impact on their research? I believe it is a remnant from the positivist era where historians thought of their missions as historians to find the ‘true past’ and ‘what really happened’. Even though there are not many historians today that see the past as an objective reality, many historians have not yet entirely left the scientific attitude of the positivist tradition towards their sources. According to this view, the historian was supposed to be neutral, objective and emotionally detached and certainly not involved with anyone in her studies. With this view, the personal aspect had no place in the historical scientific research. It was considered outright unscientific.\(^{25}\)*

More and more historians are aware that their choice of theory and method are very influential on the results they achieve. I would, however, suggest that the historian’s work could be more trustworthy if they also became aware of, and showed how their own personal preferences actually influence the results of their research. The Greek historian Antonios Liakos means that if we try to avoid traumas of our lives they tend to return as history writing. Liakos spent four years in prison, between 1969 and 1973, in his early twenties as a member of a resistance group fighting against the Greek dictatorship. After he had been freed he went back to his university studies and began looking for a suitable subject for his doctoral thesis. He put a great deal of energy into choosing a subject that he considered to be as far away from his own experience as possible. He wrote about Greek and Italian national movements in the 19th century. Eventually, however when he read the book it struck him that in many respects he had written the story of himself and his resistance group. It was the story of failed endeavours, the attempts of small groups and the asymmetry between means and outcomes.\(^{26}\) I do not intend to write my own or and my grandmother’s story in the light of these Serbian-Swedish women. Therefore I find it crucial to scrutinize why I get reminded of her when I meet these women. But still I also believe that my experience of having known her and having listened to her stories as well helps my understanding of these women in some respects.

I do not mean to say that it is crucial to consider the historians more personal and intimate thoughts and feelings in all historical research. I just mean that historical research could sometimes become more honest and multifaceted by doing so.

*Bibliography:*


\(^{23}\) Eva Österberg cleverly discusses the ethical choices historians make in their practice. Österberg claims that these choices are made on several levels, theoretical as well as methodological and have to be discussed more, Österberg 1990 pp. 1-20.

\(^{24}\) Estvall 2006; Blee 1998 pp. 333-343.

\(^{25}\) Kim Salomon 1999 p. 61.

\(^{26}\) Liakos 2001 p. 51.


‘As a researcher it is important to actually deal with one’s own privileged situations and positions...’

A Comment on Johanna Bartholdsson

Kristina Gustafsson

The storyteller creates borders. His story divides the world in certain ways and states that this division is compatible with reality. The one who is listening or reading must, at least provisionally accept this language of truth.

In this comment on Johanna Bartholdsson’s contribution to this volume I will look at Bartholdsson as a storyteller. I will especially discuss three aspects connected to the act of ‘telling a story’ as well as the content of the story. These three aspects are not necessarily related to each other, but are a result of reading Bartholdsson’s chapter and thinking about its contents from the perspective of an ethnologist.

The first theme is the act of defining a group and even group identity and investigating differences and similarities and how they create borders in consciousness.

The second theme is about understanding national identity.

The third theme is the act of self-reflexion and understanding the role of the storyteller, in this case the historian, or even more specifically, Bartholdsson herself.

Defining a group

In focus within Bartholdsson’s study is a group of immigrated Serbian-Swedish women. In this short chapter we do not for obvious reasons get to know very much about them. We know that Bartholdsson is performing interviews among two generations, older and younger women. The older informants are first generation immigrants while the younger ones belong

to the second generation. We also learn that the women are not only from the same town and part of Bosnia, but also live in the same small towns in Sweden. They came as ‘labour’ immigrants during the sixties and are now watching the third generation grow up in Sweden.

In short, the group is constituted by some essential categories, based on gender; it is a story about women, about ethnicity, about Serbians and ‘Swedishness’, about labour immigration, class, and age; it is a study of generations. These categories are fundamental for the representation in the study as well as the delimitation of the subject matter.

**Borders and differences**

Bartholdsson poses the problem of having overlapping experiences with those who she is interviewing and how the feeling of being similar in some aspects might obscure differences. She writes:

> Therefore, in some ways, I can relate to the younger women since we have some mutual frames of reference emanating from our experience of being brought up during the seventies and eighties. But in other ways there are differences between us emanating from our sense of belonging to different social classes, different ethnicities, and the fact that I was brought up in Malmö, a larger town than Halmstad. I have to keep these borders in mind while interacting with the women and while analyzing the interviews since they can hinder my understanding.

Bartholdsson then presents an analysis full of insights into different aspects of overlapping and differing relations between herself and those whom she is studying.

There is one part where Bartholdsson says something about being in a position of domination and subordination and that is when she discusses the ‘subject of the study’. Here she problematizes her position as a researcher. She is the researcher eliciting the stories from the women and ultimately she is responsible for transforming their stories into the language of scholarship. That is in one sense a dominant position, but as she shows also a relation of dependence. Without the cooperation of the subjects of the study there will be no study.

In this discussion the concept of ‘subject of the study’ is important and includes the essential intention to look upon the Serbian-Swedish women as partners and co-producers rather than objects. To describe the later relation where the people studied are objects, Bartholdsson uses a term loaded with negative connotations. She writes about how researchers might colonize their research persons. I find the choice of word, colonize, interesting and something that could be further developed.

**Processes of power relations**

Obviously the researcher has a dominant position compared to those whom she studies and the word colonizer indicates that this relation could be more a form of exploitation than reciprocity. Intertwined in the discussion about difference and borders in consciousness between the historian and those whom she studies there are several other aspects of power present. I think it would be fruitful to make them more visible in this self-reflecting analysis.

To do that firstly we could go back to the question about borders in consciousness.

What creates borders in consciousness? There are many answers of course and we could talk about the impact of discourses, expectations, representations and self-images. Borders in consciousness are a result of imagined as well as real mental as well as physical differences and similarities. This idea of borders in consciousness follows basic cultural theory about how the notion of ‘us’ is created in contrast to ‘them’. In creating an ‘us’ the act of finding similarities are important as well as the act of finding differences in relation to ‘the Other’. This is the process that makes borders in consciousness appear. In this process of producing sameness or difference there is one more aspect involved, namely domination and subordination. In other words, the processes of establishing on the one hand sameness, inclusion and group identity and on the other hand differences, exclusion and ‘the Others’ is also a process of establishing relations of power. Maybe it is not always the case but creating an ‘us’ often involves creating a sense of superiority: ‘We are not just different from the Other, we are also better’. Within the field of Cultural analysis there are many examples of this kind of inclusion and exclusion described through history, the bourgeoisie vs. the working class, women vs. men, Europeans vs. non-Europeans etc.

---

Some traps in defining a group

Placing Bartholdsson’s study in the light of this kind of basic cultural theory leads to a complicated history of how research about other people can be performed without falling into the trap of creating an ‘Other’ which is different, exotic and subordinated. Obviously the path of self-reflexivity which Bartholdsson takes is a methodological starting point in the ambition to avoid these traps.

And maybe this ambition is most important when the Other, the subject of the study, is defined as an ethnic or national group. As soon as one starts to speak of group differences and relates to ethnicity and national identity the whole heritage of colonialism and white European men interpreting different people, religions and cultures in different countries and places around the world comes forward. 4

Within the field of international migration and ethnic relations, these processes of establishing an ‘us’ and a ‘them’ have been continuously investigated throughout the end of the 20th century. The main opposition is the risk of reproducing the colonial heritage. More radical researchers state that all kinds of studies of ‘other people and other cultures’ are a form of cultural imperialism and that researchers should leave aspects of ethnicity, religion and culture and focus upon structures of economic and social inequality instead. Their theory is based on the same basic cultural theory that interest in culture and ethnicity among for example minority groups emanates from social injustice.5 Drawing from this theory one could say that some borders in consciousness are supported or even only possible in unequal relations.

Leaving these aspects out Bartholdsson seems to desire the development of a more equal relation with those whom she studies except for the situation of interpreting and turning the stories of the Serbian-Swedish women into academic text. In doing this she creates a friendly, reflexive and very conscious analysis of the relationships. But maybe she will also have to look more closely at aspects of power and how differences might be linked to discourses of domination and subordination which means that being a woman, man, white, black, rich, poor does not just create borders in consciousness that might obscure understanding but also creates unequal positions. As a researcher it is important to actually deal with one’s own privileged situations and positions in relation to those whom one is studying or vice versa. Relations of domination and subordination are inevitable.

Risk calculation

As described above basic cultural theory is based on the knowledge of how people, individuals, as well as groups, tend to develop an ‘us’ in contrast to a ‘them’ and that this process is almost always an act of making positions of domination and subordination. Because of that it is obviously always a risk when a researcher like Bartholdsson picks out and defines a group, like Serbian-Swedish migrant women. As a historian or, as I have chosen to look upon her position, as a storyteller, she tells a story about the ‘Other’. She creates an expectation among her readers that there must be something special about this group of women; otherwise she would not be able to tell their story. Whether she wants to or not Bartholdsson has to relate to the long line of scientists who have studied different groups around the world and also relate to the discussion of the risk of becoming a ‘cultural imperialist’ interpreting and describing the ‘Other’. That leads to the other comments about how to understand Serbian-Swedish migrant women and national identity and how to create a story about them.

Understanding national identity

Bartholdsson describes the mixed and also ambivalent use of ethnic or national labels among the women interviewed. The older generation of Serbian-Swedish women witnessed experiences of war and persecution from the Nazis. Bartholdsson writes:

Their hometown, Dubica, is close to Jasenovac where a concentration camp was established by Croatian Ustashas and where many Serbians were held imprisoned and were tortured and murdered.

The interviewed women refer to these experiences from the Second World War and make it a starting point for the dissolution of Yugoslavia and all the conflicts between ethnic groups. The women call themselves Yugoslavs

---

4 This heritage is described by for example Edward Said in Said 1997; Eriksson, Eriksson Bazz & Thörn 1999.
5 For a basic philosophical discussion about the relation between the demand for recognition and redistribution, aspects of cultural recognition and social justice see Fraser 1997; Harvey 1996; Taylor 1994.
and/or Serbs and the history of persecution and conflicts seems to be important in this formation of identity. On the other hand the women do not talk very much about the conflicts and dissolution in the 1990s. Bartholdsson discusses that maybe this is one of the borders in consciousness that might be hard to bridge. In Sweden during the war in former Yugoslavia media reports represented Serbs as the persecutors and Bosnians and Croats as the victims. Still the name ‘Serb’ might awaken bad connotations among Swedes and this might be why the women prefer to call themselves Yugoslavs.

I am not sure whether questions about national and ethnic identity will be an important part of Bartholdsson’s study. As I have already stated, it seems so since she has picked out a well-defined group of women and labelled them as Serbian-Swedish.

Furthermore, despite the risk in picking out a group and forming expectations on the ‘Other’, obviously national and ethnic identity is important to these women. The next step is then to theoretically and methodologically approach this phenomenon of national or ethnic identity. There are two dominating theories that I will shortly recall and then I would like to highlight a study performed among Brazilian-Japanese migrants by a scholar within the field of psychological anthropology.

Different cultures and nations

The first theory goes back to the concept of culture and of differences between cultures. In short, it starts with an idea that all human beings are cultural beings and belong to a certain culture. Which culture a person belongs to depends on where, when, among whom a person grows up and lives. This notion of relativism, which means that culture differs depending on where, when and who we are studying, was strongly emphasized among anthropologists in the early 20th century. When it first appeared it introduced a more generous and open attitude towards how people in different parts of the world organize and live their lives in relation to diverse material and mental environments. The cultural relativism contained a severe critique of earlier 19th century anthropology which based their studies of cultures on theories of cultural evolution and therefore also theories of hierarchies between different cultures.

The cultural relativism introduced an idea that every culture bears a meaning of its own and to understand culture the researcher must get to know it from the inside. Finally this perspective on cultural meaning makes all tempt to compare cultures meaningless. This understanding of culture and belonging was nourished especially within national rhetoric and development during the late 19th century and early 20th century. The meaning of nation at the time was: one people sharing a history and one culture and one language; a Volksgeist.

Today, these theories are still strong, not among researchers but in other public spheres and when it comes to questions about identity. People with migrant background are often asked whether he/she is for example Swedish or Serbian. In several texts about identity, ambivalence and the feeling of having double identities are analyzed and discussed. And very often in this kind of material national identity equals cultural belonging in a quite unreflected and simplistic way where one nation is the same as one culture.

This leads to the second theory about nation and national identity that I want to recall. Even if this idea of the Volksgeist is still strong in society, researchers have for some time questioned it from a perspective of constructivism. Within ethnology as within other disciplines, Benedict Anderson’s work about ‘imagined communities’ has been influential and taken theories about nation in new directions. Instead of seeking knowledge about the content of nations and culture, the approach Anderson and others have developed asks questions about how certain content and meaning is established. How is a sense and understanding of a certain community possible and when and who is included, who is excluded etc?

The ‘we’, as I described above, is always a construction depending on a number of different phenomena; material environment, traditions, imaginations, discourses etc. This does not mean that the sense of community is not real but that it could have been different and maybe more important, it is not eternal; it is multifaceted and changeable.

From this perspective the question, as to whether a person is Serb or Swedish, is not so important, but why one identifies oneself like this and how a person integrates different understandings of belonging to a nation are of significance. One consequence of this constructivist approach is that research might distance itself very much from people’s notion of reality and life-worlds. How do we stay within these life-worlds, experience-based
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6 For a short and instructive introduction to this part of anthropological history, see Eriksen 1997.

7 One example from research that problematizes the aspect of a double identity is Månsson 1997; see also Månsson 2000.
spheres in our analyses? What kind of scholarly tools are there to understand national and ethnic identity from this perspective? The first mentioned theory about Volksgeist with the goal of describing the essence of a certain nationality is out of question. The second constructivist theory described above of imagined communities might violate people’s experiences of national identity. I will in the last part give one example that might be useful and inspiring.

This also leads into my last comment about understanding the role of the storyteller and what a researcher might be able to do when turning empirical experiences into text using theories and methodological considerations.

Producing a story

Dan Linger, a researcher in psychological anthropology, for a study in 2001, followed and interviewed nine people about their migration from Brazil to Japan in the 1990s. All of these people are children or grandchildren of Japanese migrants living in Brazil. Therefore they are in some aspects already Japanese when they enter their new country. They have a ‘blood’ connection to Japan and look Japanese.

Some of the interviewees refer to how they feel an ambivalence towards Brazilian ‘warmth’ and Japanese ‘respect’. These concepts can possibly be traced back to two very influential descriptions of Brazilian and Japanese culture: Gilberto Freyre’s *The masters and the slaves: A study in the Development of Brazilian Civilisation* (1933) and Ruth Benedict’s *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture* (1946). These two works are and have been very influential and are a part of constructing national identity and differences within the transnational scene. They do not explain anything about who the Brazil-Japanese migrants are, but why and from where they pick up definitions and self-identity and how they have to relate to fixed expectations and stories. Linger’s intention in contrast to his more senior colleagues within anthropology, for example Freyre and Benedict, is to describe, analyse and understand people’s experiences of differences and similarities. All of the nine people interviewed perceive and experience cultural differences in their everyday life and sometimes they refer the differences to nationality. How this works, what the effects are, and how it gives a foundation for national identity is interesting. This is the essence of his standpoint; Linger has no ambition to describe Brazilian culture or Japanese culture. He keeps the notion of culture as something living and evasive and very personal although it is collective.

In the book *No one home*, Linger creates a story about national identity, belonging, and deals with self-images and understandings and expectations from the surrounding people and environment. The book is very much based on the interviews and Linger discusses the problem of integrity and handling the stories of other people. To use theory is in a way also to violate people’s experiences.

*In short, too much theory tends to automate people and animate abstractions. It turns people into the fodder of History or specimens of Science. Here I seek to reanimate persons. I am trying to recover a sense of each person’s singularity and irreducibility, a corrective to our more usual categorizing frame of mind.*

Being a storyteller

To tell stories, according to folkloristic and ethnographic theory, is a cultural practice. In everyday life storytelling is a way of exchanging experiences, traditions, ideas, ethical evaluations and to be confirmed or to receive new impulses. In short telling a story is a way of establishing relationships and at the same time to say who does not belong. In her analysis of meeting and interviewing some Serbian-Swedish women in a small communities in Halland, Sweden, Bartholdsson makes her own position clear. She shows in what aspects she might understand and also how it is possible to understand those whom she is studying. Bartholdsson is very open and direct about her own experiences of talking and spending time with her grandmother and in what respects this might affect her relation to the Serbian women in the older generation. She describes a situation of ‘high context’ where the storyteller and the researcher share a number of common experiences of environments, people, happenings etc. There is a relationship and roles that she can easily fit into, being a ‘granddaughter’ listening to an older relative.

Bartholdsson also scrutinizes some possible borders in consciousness that might be difficult to bridge but which she has to be aware of. What I want
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8 Linger 2001 p. 300.
9 Linger 2001 p. 10.
to add or think would be fruitful would be to make the self-reflective approach reach further in terms of the three dimensions discussed above. Relations of power on the one hand, theories about national identity on the other, and, thirdly, the act of producing a story about ‘the Other’. In this act there are several dimensions which are complicated and maybe the production of the story is the most delicate. How do we avoid exploitation and violating people’s experiences in our use of theory and methodological considerations? And how do we avoid confirming fixed and stereotyped understandings of ‘the Other’? The last question I think is especially delicate every time the subject deals with ethnicity or nationality in one way or another.
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Emelie Rathou: A Movement Intellectual
Crossing Borders

Åsa Bengtsson

To come to consciousness is ever more to come to power.1

Borders and limits shape people’s experience, shape their behaviour and their actions, and more importantly, borders and limits affect people’s consciousness and their identity. A limit is set by someone, and crossed by another. Limits are set to preserve, and still it is when they are crossed, that transformation occurs. Borders and limits are about strength and weakness, about hierarchy and power. In this paper, I introduce a woman, Emilie Rathou, who was one of those who had the strength to cross borders. You can say that she exceeded the boundaries of what women were supposed to be like and how they were supposed to act at the turn of the last century. She fought hard to change society and to change the balance of power. She fought in an arena where her gender was not welcome, an arena where she had no chance of being in power or reaching high hierarchical positions due to her sex. In other words, Emelie Rathou crossed the border into a world of men where she fought for equality and for the rights of women.

The women’s movement – the entrance to a male arena

The struggle for women’s rights was a long process of fighting for the right to be active in the public sphere, a fight against patriarchy’s disequilibrium of power. For women the fight was not only about obtaining power in society per se, it was more a question of obtaining the power over one’s own life and body. Before the formation of the women’s movement, legislation and enactments at the end of the 19th century improved the situation for women. However, these regulations were not in answer to a women’s
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1 Slagell 2001 p. 18 (The quote is from Frances Willard’s writing ‘Great Thoughts’, 1893).

2 Paxton et al. 2006.
5 Bergman 2004 pp. 5-7.
of the 20th century had the ability to influence and to affect the progress of society and the process of democracy. In this paper, I will emphasize the founder of the organisation Vita Bandet and how she crossed the border into the male dominated arena of the public sphere, and thereby claimed and created positions for women in this arena.

Emelie Rathou started and formed the female temperance organisation Vita Bandet in Sweden in 1900. The Swedish organisation is a member of the international organisation the World’s Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, WWCTU. Since the English name is long and in order not to be confused with the international branch, I will use a translation of the Swedish name, The White Ribbon, to make the text more fluent. The organisation, which still exists, though it seems to lead a languishing life, is a devoted promoter of temperance. However, in the past the activity was much further extended. During the first half of the 20th century, the organisation’s activity focused on the question of women’s rights to be treated as equal citizens which meant that The White Ribbon took part in the women’s movement and worked for female suffrage, as well as for equal legal rights and rights on the labour market. Intemperance, social problems and inequity were elements that went hand in hand, and the organisation claimed that the problem of alcohol could only be solved if women had the same rights as men.

A theorised biography

Before I begin my presentation of Emelie Rathou, it is necessary to introduce the theoretical aspect that this study has proceeded from, in order to make this presentation more than just a narrative story of her life. The basis of my study has derived from the theoretical perspective of social movement analysis. In my dissertation I study the organisation and I treat it as a social movement, not only because it complies with the criteria for a social movement, but because this theoretical perspective works as an analytical instrument to reach the ideology of The White Ribbon and also to illuminate its development. However, in this study I will not emphasize the organisation but rather what is considered the foundation of a social movement.

A social movement arises from social injustice, but it is not the injustice itself that forms the movement. Contradictions in the structural circumstances and places where these experiences of injustice and contradictions can be articulated and moulded in a public sphere, are required and necessary. In order to form a social movement there has to be a spirit of community that creates an identity that the members can identify with. Moreover, there has to be a mutual utopian vision about a transformed society. Most importantly however, is the asset of resources and stimulating motivation, in order to recruit members, run the organisation and keep it alive for a long period of time. In other words: it takes activists; leaders that can network and mobilize groups. A social movement needs leaders that are able to get the attention of the public, and simultaneously usurp political power, for both themselves and for the movement.6

The leaders play an important part in the movement. Earlier researchers have called these leaders ‘the feminists’ or ‘the suffragists’, but without emphasising or illuminating the persons themselves. In my opinion, the role of these leaders is much too underestimated, and the importance of these women is much greater than has been realised in earlier studies of the organisation of women. These female leaders were themselves the foundation of the movement, and they were the basis of the development and the success of the movement. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to shed light on some of the qualifications that were not only the foundation for building an organisation and to hold leader positions, but also the condition to take part in the public political debate and discourse.

In my opinion, it is not enough to mention these female leaders, and also, it is not a question of who they were. Instead, we must ask why: why these individuals? What made these women able to participate and to carry the liberation of women into the public sphere during a time when they were not welcome or accepted in this male dominated sphere? What was special about these women; what did they possess that made them become leaders of the women’s movement to fight the male hegemony on a male arena? In order to answer these questions; we have to look at each leader as an individual.

When analysing a social movement, it is necessary to study the leaders, who in theoretical terms are called movement intellectuals. The ability to lead, such as the skills necessary to preside and run administrations, is perhaps a self-evident talent, but more important is the ability to be an agitator and an ideological leader. These ideological leaders are the voices of the movement, since they produce texts embodying the essence of the movement and propaganda material. By being the articulator of the

movement, the intellectual plays a specific role and has a specific function. Thus, the movement intellectuals represent the movement's outward image, while simultaneously they are internal symbols for the members. They are significant for the recruitment and for the mobilisation of activities, and they are furthermore intertwined with the norms, values, and symbols, as well as in maintaining and reinforcing the movement's culture. Therefore, the movement intellectuals articulate, maintain, and reinforce the movement's collective, or cognitive identity.\(^7\)

The movement intellectuals are to be seen as discursive subjects, that is to say, they are central actors in a discursive process. As discourse subjects they use strategic rhetoric in order to gain sympathies within as well as outside the movement. The Swedish sociologist Håkan Thörn argues in his dissertation about modern social movements, that the concept of a movement intellectual is closely connected to discourse, ideology, utopia, and hegemony.\(^8\) He means that the movement intellectual can be regarded as a modern producer of culture, whose intellectual activity is both to create a collective identity and at the same time to create new cultural forms. The intellectual is intertwined with the utopian vision of the future, and therefore, we must assume that the intellectual takes up an intellectual position. This position is socially and historically specific, and must for that reason be comprehended in cultural terms. The intellectual position is also related to a discourse, as in the modern production of symbols, and it is also connected to institutional power, a power to interpret and to define the world. The position is maintained and reinforced by the power of the intellectual activity, but it also demands recognition by the general public.\(^9\) Simultaneously, as the movement intellectual criticises or observes, interprets and defines the world, he or she is also acting on a discursive field, talking about the movement or for the movement, by which the power then is all about identifying, including and excluding the collective referred to.

Movement intellectuals create their own individual roles at the same time as they create the movement; this is an interactive process. They interpret modern political and cultural forms; they formulate the cognitive identity of the movement and the articulator of the cognitive identity, the intellectuals are in fact the condition required for the formation and existence of the movement and its collective identity. The intellectuals are, however, not only the ideologists; they are also strategic designers of the movement's activities. They have the ability, to not only mobilize the feeling of the collective's wishes and will; they also have the ability to formulate and to communicate the requirements of the referred to collective.\(^10\)

In order to break resistance and to modify settled conceptions, movement intellectuals convey knowledge and introduce new ideas to educate and influence, with the aim of changing society. The intellectual serves as an articulator, as a lecturer, as a writer and a disseminator of ideas. The intellectual is like a bank of knowledge and a teacher, who teaches the uneducated about society. The talent of articulating and speaking in order to influence people is, however, no more important than the ability to organize, to establish connections and to cooperate.\(^11\) In other words, the movement intellectuals are the foundation of the movement and without them; there would be no movement at all. They are the driving force of the movement.

With this theoretical perspective as the basis of my study, I will not study Emelie Rathou's personality but rather emphasize her as a movement intellectual and her intellectual activities and positions, which will also bring knowledge of her persona. Theorising an individual as an intellectual through the movement texts and movement journal also shed light on the historical context. However, there is a problem in only illuminating rhetoric and events, we must, as Thörn maintains, look at the power that the intellectual gained, and we must, consequently, relate this to the social background of the intellectual. Education and social belonging entail both symbolic and economic resources that the majority of the collective referred to did not have access to. Therefore, it is not a question of illuminating the personality, but rather the resources that constituted movement intellectual activity and position. These resources are connected to how power is obtained, and I claim that leaders of The White Ribbon, as well as other female leaders of the women's movement, had these resources and used them in order to cross the borderline to the male public arena, in order to improve the situation of women, and to change the system of power and the order of gender.

\(^8\) Thörn 1997 p. 153. (I use Thörn's theoretical point of view in my dissertation.)
The theoretical concept is not to be seen as a mirror of the empirical reality, but rather the representation and the apprehension of the lived reality, which attributes a specific significance to a special phenomenon. \(^{12}\) To be able to illustrate the intellectual position and the resources of Emelie Rathou, I will also use the theoretical terminology of capital from Pierre Bourdieu’s field theory, in order to highlight the resources as being particularly significant and not only mirror images of her life. The field theory is more of a methodological tool to describe a transforming society. \(^{13}\) A field is a room of social relations, where participants act from their resources, capitals, and from their individual habitus, which can be described as a system of disposition that makes the individual act, think and orientate themselves in a specific way. The system generates strategies for acting. \(^{14}\) The actors on a field act to reshape resources into other capitals, in order to gain higher status on the field. The structure of the field is a state of struggle between the participants who fight to preserve or to change the distribution of capital. \(^{15}\) In my study I proceed from a political discourse on a political field, since both the question of women’s rights and the question of temperance were political questions, and since social movements act on the political field given that they are linked to the establishment of ideology and a utopia. \(^{16}\) The field itself is in fact not interesting to study from a historical point of view, since we today know who the dominating actor of the field was in the past. Instead, it is interesting to study the capital used by the participants. In other words, we do not study the field, but its participants, and to do this we find out what capital they used in order to be competitive and recognised on the field.

When using Bourdieu’s field theory the emphasis is on the relationship between the individual and the collective, and on their relation to power, to the social order and to institutions. Thereby, the theory of capital becomes a tool to study the aspects that form people’s consciousness and that controls social actions. \(^{17}\) I find it constructive to use the terms of capital to call attention to the resources that the women actually had and used in order to be able to participate on an arena, on which they were not welcome due to their gender. Therefore, since I am only studying one actor, I will not do a deep field analysis of the participants, but rather a descriptive illustration of the capital that was fundamental and characteristic in order to be accepted on the public field that Emelie Rathou was acting on.

On the political field, the fight between the actors is about public opinion. The actor using the capital of forcible means, the symbolic capital, in the best possible way wins the fight on a field. The symbolic capital on the political field is therefore the formal and public language, thus, the language approved of and used by those involved in the public debate. Therefore, by best handling the symbolic capital, the actor can win the opinion of the people. To master the symbolic capital was, consequently, also the instrument to influence the power elite.

When studying intellectual activity, movement texts are the main source, and this means that, my focal point is symbolic capital, the language to convince and persuade public opinion. However, there are additionally some basic requirements for public participation that relates to the intellectual position. Not just any woman was accepted and recognised by the field actors, or by the men with power or by the public. A specific habitus and certain resources were demanded of women as well as of men. However, we must not forget that at the end of the 19th and in the beginning of the 20th centuries, women were excluded from politics and from political power, and they were not always welcome to participate in the public debate or in the public sphere. Therefore, by entering the political field and discourse women entered a male arena.

I will now present how Emelie Rathou, the pioneer of The White Ribbon movement in Sweden, created a position for herself in the political field and in political discourse. By shedding light on her background we can discern some of the basic requirements for women to make themselves heard on the public arena at the turn of the century. This study aims to answer what sort of capital did Emelie Rathou have, or rather use, in order to cross the border into the public arena of men? With this presentation, I will thus highlight some of the qualifications required in order to transgress certain limits and cross the borders necessary to obtain and to maintain a position in the public arena at the beginning of the 20th century.
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13 Carle 2003 p. 376. (The basis of the field theory has in my text been summarised from a read through of Bourdieu’s work and other authors familiar with Bourdieu’s theory.)
16 Thörn 1997 pp. 148-149.
From Who? to Why?

My study of Emelie Rathou arises from sources like biographical dictionaries and contemporary biographies in order to highlight her public appearance, which will also tell us something about her private life. She was born in Karlskrona in 1862. She was the daughter of a businessman, and her maiden name was Gustafsson. She never married, but she took the name Rathou when she started her professional career as a teacher. As a little girl, she read the then modern literature, and it has been said that she secretly read improper literature, like Strindberg’s Röda rummet (The Red Room), during class. She went to a girls’ school, and at the age of 16 she started at the teacher seminary in Kalmar. She took her degree in 1882 and then taught for a couple of years. During this time, she also took some university courses and language courses.18 She travelled abroad to Denmark, Norway and Germany, and she visited London in order to study women’s liberation and the temperance movement. During her travels, she studied social life and social movements. She saw travelling as means of education, and noted that she learned much more from travelling than she had learned from her school education.19 Thus, even if we cannot say much about Emilie Rathou’s private life or family connections, her education and career reveal resources that were central for women who wanted to get out of the private sphere at the end of the 19th century. The possibilities to travel and acquire an education show that she came from an affluent family and from a bourgeois, middle class background.

Her social background supplied her with resources that could be used as social capital. This capital derives from her social relationships, social connections, kinship, and friendships, and was an important capital in obtaining status and progress. Connected with this social capital is cultural capital, which means the ability to use a refined language, a refined style and the ability to master the cultural patterns or activities that can be called high culture.20 At the end of the 19th century, the right social background was also a condition for higher education. The middle class woman was by class affiliation considered to have ‘the natural requirements’ to become a teacher. The fact that Emelie Rathou had an education shows not only her social capital, but also that she had certain skills and knowledge. Education involves being well-read, having knowledge and a certificate, which when used as a resource can be called education capital. Consequently, she obtained experience and knowledge through her social background, that she could later use as capital in her professional career and as a movement intellectual.

The orator, the writer and the organizer

A White Ribbon association had been formed in Sweden in the 1880s, but it was not successful in recruiting members or mobilising activity, hence the association languished quite quickly. Emelie Rathou started her first White Ribbon association on Östermalm in Stockholm (the Östermalm association) in 1900 and she made the association prosper and flourish. She immediately affiliated the association with the WWCTU, the international organisation, which was founded in America in 1883. This international mother organisation was not only a role model for the Swedish affiliation; it was also more importantly a common arena for the temperance women all over the world. Emelie Rathou realised early the significance of unity, and the strength and power it could imply. She understood the benefits of uniting in order to attain change:

To the women of Sweden!
Dear Sisters! All you want people to do to you, you must do to them. Temperance is not everything, but everything is connected to temperance. Uniting is power. […] We seek to awaken women’s feeling of responsibility and of solidarity, and we also try to bring about a union of women from all social classes. […] Unanimously and firmly united we will become a force of power that can achieve much. Unity is strength!21

This quotation is Emelie Rathou’s appeal in the daily press in 1901. The appeal was printed in newspapers all over the country, and it was a recommendation to join The White Ribbon’s nationwide organisation. After the press appeal and a number of mission travels and meetings new associations were started and formed around the country. The number of associations within the organisation quickly increased. In 1902, The White Ribbon had 10 associations and 264 members, ten years later the number was 114 associations and 6,000 members. 1958 was a record year with 251...
associations and more than 10,000 members. The growth and the maintenance of The White Ribbon demonstrate a capability in recruiting and mobilising the movement.

Together with Maria Sandström, once a member of the temperance union The Blue Ribbon whom she had met at the Nordic Temperance Convention in Christiana (Oslo) in 1898, she became the pioneer of The White Ribbon in Sweden, Emelie Rathou as the ideologist and Maria Sandström as the organizer. The two of them started a national association in 1901, which they called the Central union. This National union, as I prefer to call it, worked as a link between the local associations around the country and as a mother association. For many years, Emelie Rathou travelled around the country proselytising and starting new associations. She also held high positions within the organisation. She was the president of the Östermalm association for many years, and the vice president of the National union. She also held the position of secretary in the latter. However, her main position within The White Ribbon was her position as editor of the organisation’s journal, *Vita Bandet*. She held this editorship from 1913 to her death in 1948. In this position, she could flourish in her chief role of movement intellectual, as the leading ideologist within the organisation and the temperance movement.

The decision to start the largest female organisation in Sweden was of course not a spur-of-the-moment idea. Naturally, her mission started long before the formation of The White Ribbon. In order to understand her intellectual positions we have to go back in time, to understand how she came to be a movement intellectual. Emelie Rathou was somewhat a pioneer in the women’s liberation movement. In the early years, she was conscious of the value of women’s liberation and human dignity, and had female suffrage very close to her heart. She also noticed the close connection between inebriation and the oppression of women. The interests in liberation of woman led her to the temperance movement and particularly to the Orders of Good Templar (IOGT), which was an organisation that by this time was seen as a platform for the obligations and rights of both men and women. Otherwise, it was rare for temperance lodges to allow women full equality in membership, to hold office or to speak.

Emelie Rathou joined the IOGT in 1884 and thereby started her fight against alcohol. In 1885, she took the Grand Lodge and she also became a lodge superintendent of the children’s department. In other words, she was able to use her education as capital in order to get a position within the organisation. Moreover, she was the first woman in the IOGT to obtain a position in the district council, and in 1886, she began giving her own lectures, speaking about temperance and morality. By this time, her ambition could not be limited by the teacher’s desk, she needed a larger field for her activities and she wanted to reach out to people. With the reforms of women’s liberation and temperance close to her heart, she wanted to produce change, and so, she left her job as a teacher to become a full-time travelling speaker.

She spent several weeks and months on the road. In 1887, she did a mission tour for six months. This was the first time a woman travelled according to a prearranged schedule as a speaker and lecturer in Sweden, and she attracted attention, which was not always positively received. A woman on the rostrum created a stir and was often seen as offensive. The contemporary writer Signe Walder indicates that Emelie Rathou was therefore regarded as ‘exceedingly dangerous and dangerous to society’, since, as she writes in a complimentary book of female biographies, ‘the one who will not follow the stream, will always be met with resistance in the public opinion’. As a pioneer she had to put up with threats of detention and being placed under police supervision, as well as abusive letters and being ridiculed and abused for non-female behaviour. In an interview in 1922, Emelie Rathou described the opposition she met:

*But of course it was hard sometimes. I met a general resistance. I was a democrat and my whole view of life was radical, and also, I was a woman. The fact that I was a young woman, certainly did not improve my position. Acquaintances stopped knowing me, and some tried to persuade me to give up my ideas, or at least keep quiet about them. I was spit at, and bad language was abundantly thrown at me. That was however not the worse part. What hurt me most were the many attempts to silence me with money.*

Emelie Rathou broke the prevalent image of the quiet, passive middle class woman, who normally stayed behind the walls of the home, within the private sphere. She not only propagated for temperance, she also spoke of
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women’s rights and obligations in the public sphere and on the political arena. It became a mission in her life to wake women up from their indifference, awaken their spirit of citizenship, and to make them conscious of their rights. It was very unusual for women to make public speeches and a travelling female lecturer was in those days a very rare occurrence, almost non-existent, and for that reason Emelie Rathou attracted a lot of attention. She was an eloquent rhetorician and despite, or perhaps because of, her gender she attracted large audiences. When her audience was too large to be accommodated in the pre-booked premises, which in fact happened quite often, she was sometimes welcome to move her lecture to the state churches. She is said to be the first woman to ascend the pulpit to speak. In 1888, she was invited to hold lectures in five churches in Jämtland.28 However, she was not always welcome and she experienced resistance among the religious, since, as she said, due to:

...the fact that the question of temperance up until then had been treated as an exclusively religious question and I always strove after the social ethical point of view. This modernity in phrasing also led to situations where I was refused the right to speak, not only in churches but also in chapels. The priests were often of the opinion that women should not speak in public. And when I felt the yearning of the human souls meet mine, I could not not tell my fellow humans, that we must first get the social questions under control.29

Sometimes schools and nonconformist chapels denied her entry and she was frequently forced to give her lectures outside. Once when refused to enter the reserved hall, she instead held her speech from a horse drawn carriage upon a bank of snow, an incident that got great attention in the daily press.30 The incident also shed light on the difficulties and obstacles women met when trying to cross the border into the male arena. Not only were they considered dangerous, they were often ridiculed by both the press and by men. Nevertheless, women like Emelie Rathou were also seen with admiration by some. Signe Walder, described Emelie Rathou as a tall and erect oratory figure, who could make an hour long speech without a manuscript. She had great passion for her cause, and, according to Walder, she radiated energy and purposefulness.31 She was a committed speaker

who could capture the interest of the audience with wise and logical arguments. She spoke, according to critiques, a fluent and proper language and she ‘stood out as an experienced and fearless speaker, a temperamental and polemical woman, who was not afraid of making herself unpopular if it served the good cause’.32

In 1891, Emelie Rathou was the first woman to make a speech on the May Day Speech of the Social Democracy Party on Gärdet in Stockholm. She spoke of women’s suffrage, ten years before the real suffrage movement started in Sweden. Brigitte Mral has carried out an analysis of rhetoric on Emelie Rathou’s lecture skills and depicts in the book Talande kvinnor (Women and Public Oratory) her speeches to be written according to classical rhetorical structure. She began the May Day speech, as so many others, with an historical summary of the entrance of the ideas of liberty and equality in other countries, then she brought up and rejected some of the most frequently occurring arguments against female participation in the political arena. Mral points out that Emelie Rathou was a good rhetorician, who in her speaking style took upon herself the role of teacher, prophetess and visionary. She argued with cause and effect, with statistics and logical contributions. She spoke about passionate scenarios to awaken feelings and to challenge predominant norms.33 She spoke in order to educate her audience, to influence people and to evoke a transformation. Emelie Rathou was not only eloquent; she used her eloquence as a resource in order to mobilize the organisation and to rouse opinion in favour of temperance and in the fight for women’s rights.

In 1888, Emelie Rathou participated in two international congresses in Copenhagen. She visited the congress of the Federation and the first Nordic women’s liberation congress, where she was the Swedish representative and held a lecture on ‘Why should women participate in temperance work?’ At an annual meeting of The White Ribbon in 1902 she held a speech with the same title, which makes me conclude that the two lectures had the same content. Mral’s rhetorical analysis of the speech points out that she used a classic rhetorical style in this speech as well as in others and that she created a colourful and passionate description of images of the home of drinkers, which gave the speech intensity. She also, very clearly, rejected the notion of women’s powerlessness and she urged women to unite.34
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Accordingly, even before she became an ideological leader for The White Ribbon, Emelie Rathou displayed her ability to articulate the voice and the will of a collective and the ability to illustrate the experienced need to change society. Moreover, her eloquence and her lecturing career point to her ability to use the language as not only cultural capital, but also as symbolic capital, in order to win public opinion.

Aside from her being an eloquent and good lecturer, I want to call attention to her ability to use a pen. She was a diligent writer and wrote both lectures and articles. Her writing style is said to be rabidly radical, like the subversive style introduced by ultra-radical newspapers at the end of the 19th century. Emelie Rathou’s writing career began with an interest in journalism and she obtained a position in a printing office, and later she moved on to become a co-worker at the newspaper Dalmasen (The Dalecarlian) in 1884. This paper was regional and polemised about the king, priesthood and the upper class. In 1890, she and Hjalmar Wernberg took over the editorial office, and later the same year she bought the paper. In order to get rid of the local label and to stress a more political direction she renamed the paper Svenska Medborgaren (the Swedish Citizen) and began her ownership with an article on universal suffrage, and she also started a series of article about women’s liberation. Emelie Rathou had the capacity to use language as a tool and as a means of acquiring cultural capital, in her profession and in her association life. She also had the capability to use language as symbolic capital in order to rouse public opinion regarding the temperance question and the liberation of women.

In 1895, Emelie Rathou sold the paper, still, she continued her journalistic path within The White Ribbon. In 1913, she became the editor of Vita Bandet (The White Ribbon), a position she held until her death in 1948. In her articles she emphasised the question of temperance and women’s rights, and as editor she gave information and wrote propaganda arguments for her cause. For 36 years she also edited the organisation’s yearbook called Kvinnokrafter (The Power of Women), which depicted the work and activities of the local associations and the organisation. From 1924 she edited the annual Mors dag (the Journal of Mother’s day) and for some years she was also joint editor of the annual Christmas journal, Jultoner (Tones of Christmas). Emelie Rathou was also an occasional co-writer in the well-known encyclopedia Nordisk Familjebok.

As we can see, she was not only an eloquent orator and not only using her cultural capital, she was also able to use the symbolic capital, the right language with the purpose of rousing opinion. She had the ability, the talent and the assets to run and edit a paper and to produce several journals, which gives prominence to her utilisation of resources, such as her educational, cultural and economic capital. The economic capital may sound like a resource of money, but it is not the money itself that is the resource. It is when the financial situation and ownership are the causes of or the reason for a position for example. More importantly, the economic capital is also about the skills related to and knowledge of the economy, finances and administration, which was a necessity in order to be able to run a newspaper and the other publications of the organisation.

One arena leads to another

Through her function as movement intellectual already in the IOGT, she had the opportunity of entering the large arena of associations. The international conferences of temperance and of women’s rights were arenas that entailed an opportunity for establishing new social contacts. At the Federation convention, she had the opportunity to make the acquaintance of Josephine Butler and other prominent women and men from Europe. More importantly, these occasions meant access to knowledge and information, as well as an opportunity to spread the same. The international conferences and connections gave the participating women experiences of different kinds, experiences that previously had not been available to them because of their gender. The conference women could then bring this newly won knowledge back to their own country and use these and their new experiences within their national associations. Through The White Ribbon more opportunities expanded for co-ordinated meetings and lectures both on the international arena as well as nationally.

Emelie Rathou suggested that the Swedish affiliation should host a Nordic White Ribbon conference, which she arranged in Stockholm in 1902. The conference was well-attended by representatives of the Nordic countries and the organisation received great publicity in the press. The conference was a big success and a breakthrough for the organisation. Emelie Rathou diligently attended WWCTU’s world conferences. She was the first Swedish representative at the first congress that the Swedish
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organisation attended in Geneva in 1903, a trip that she herself had to foot the expenses for, since the organisation at this point had no financial resources. She attended several of the WWCTU’s conferences over the years, and she also participated with her own lectures. For example, she gave a lecture, called ‘Is the contribution of woman necessary to solve social questions?’, at the Nordic conference in Copenhagen 1904. Thirty years later, when the Swedish organisation was hosting the world conference in 1934, Emelie Rathou was, naturally, one of the leading organizers and lecturers of this five-day convention, which was visited by 800 members of the WWCTU.

The White Ribbon was represented in a number of organisations and Emelie Rathou was for example the representative in the Temperance union, in the National committee of the friends of prohibition, in the Central association for temperance education, and in the National committee of the Christians’ prohibition movement, to mention but a few. This form of organisational representation was significant for women in those days, since it involved participation in different international conferences and it implied access to an even larger arena, to social connections and to new information. At the International congress combating alcoholism in Stockholm in 1907, Emelie Rathou gave a lecture at the congress and later on at the following public meeting at Skansen she gave a speech to the general public. It was still, in those days, very rare for women to deliver speeches at large conferences. Even if half of all the members of the temperance movement were women, they were very rarely allowed to participate as delegates or representatives of the mixed-gender associations. The representatives of The White Ribbon were rather often the only female delegates on such occasions, and they were for a long time the only women to give lectures or speeches on these public occasions. At a Prohibition conference in 1905 with the nationwide temperance associations, there were only four women among the 76 participants, which was actually a great increase compared to the year before when only one woman was allowed participation.

In those days, it would most likely also have been hard to make women want to attend conferences where the majority of the crowd were men. Even a hardy woman such as Emelie Rathou could feel lonely among all the men. When she, in 1924, was invited to a meeting for the formation of a new association to fight bootlegging of alcohol, she was the only woman invited. When she reported the meeting in the journal *Vita Bandet*, she wrote that she was the only woman among about 60 men and that she had hoped to meet some of her female friends on this occasion, by whom she meant those who did not promote the same line of prohibition as herself, but rather ‘some of those other women who are so warmly zealous for the good of the people by urging the continuous existence of the liquor trafficking’. She expressed her loneliness in the company: ‘Anyhow, I was and remained lonely in this anti-smuggling company! I felt dismal in this female-loneliness and I left the gentlemen as soon as the main governor had pushed through a motion regarding who were to be on the board.’

Being a former member of the IOGT, she was naturally very critical of the lack of female representation and of the inequality of the temperance movement:

Of 116 delegates at the annual meeting of the Good Templars last of July, only 5 were women (writing and saying five!), this although half of the members in the lodges are women. Where is equality, when women are being pushed aside like this? In the other temperance associations it is just the same.

She regarded the situation of inequality as just as bad in the committee of the Central association for temperance education, which organised temperance education for teachers:

6 male fellows and no woman. […] The Swedish people does not only consist of men, but also of women. The teaching staff has more female than male teachers, and the children, who will be taught, are at least as many girls as boys. The female part should therefore inevitably be represented.
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Inequality was, according to Emelie Rathou, just as bad within the temperance associations as in society as a whole. The rights of women and equality in society was an absolute basic condition in the struggle against the problems of alcohol. Inequality was probably a reason for abandoning the IOGT in order to start the female organisation of The White Ribbon. This action demanded organisational skills and the ability to recruit and to mobilize. When starting the female organisation Emelie Rathou quite simply used the resources that she had acquired through her education, her membership of the IOGT, and through her participation on the international arena.

By participating in different organisations women could consequently acquire experience and knowledge of various kinds. It could be knowledge of organisational, administrative or financial skills. To start an organisation called for economic capital. The administration skills related to economic capital were a necessity when starting and leading an organisation. That Emelie Rathou had the ability to use her economic capital is shown in her ability as a leader of her associations. However, other forms of capitals were also important. Membership in different organisations and the participation on a large arena of associations, did not only involve a wide social network and social contacts, it also contributed to her knowledge and skills of how to arrange meetings, lectures and conferences, and how to write petitions, official letters and appeals. Knowledge, experience and information could then be used as resources by the women to start their own association or for their public appearance. This resource can be seen as a specific form of capital, organisation capital. A capital that was earlier reserved only for men, since women did not have access to the higher positions or to leadership, nor were they allowed to make their voices heard in the life of associations, which were exclusively run by the male members. The organisation capital was very important for women at this time. Emelie Rathou could use her experiences from her participation and her representation in different organisations as a resource to form female associations, hold meetings, give lectures, and organize activities, cooperations and conferences.

Women were also given an opportunity to enter and participate on a wider, international arena through the organisations, and consequently they could acquire an additional resource to use in the public sphere. I call this resource international capital. The worldwide congresses gave the attending

women both knowledge and status, resources they could use in their work within the organisation and in their public appearances as well as in the political debate. The internationalism that actually characterizes the women's movement demonstrates that this international capital was a central asset for these women, since it affected and gave form to their work and activities at the national level. This is reflected in Emelie Rathou's activities as well. It is obvious that the international temperance arena was indeed important for her, as well as the arena of the women's movement, since it gave opportunities for new social contacts, an access to a wider network, to information, and to knowledge concerning practical arrangements and how to pursue a policy or a question.

Political interests

When Emelie Rathou wrote her appeal 'to the women of Sweden' in 1901 in the daily press, she was accordingly not a newcomer or a beginner in either writing, speaking or in organising. As we have seen, The White Ribbon was not the first organisation she was active in, nor was it the first association she founded. As early as 1892, she started a female worker's club. She called for a meeting in the newspaper Socialdemokraten in July with the words: 'Attention, Proletarian women! All proletarian women, married as well as unmarried, are hereby invited to a meeting this evening at half past eight [...] for the founding of a general women's club. Turn up in masses!' That evening she founded Stockholm's General Women's Association, with which she wanted to look after the interest of the female workers and try to awaken their understanding of social questions. However, Emelie Rathou left the association a few months later when it was decided that the club was to be affiliated with the Social Democratic party. In spite of the fact that she was invited to speak at the May Day speech by the Social Democratic party, and despite the fact that she founded a club for female workers, Emelie Rathou was not a social democrat herself. Even though she sympathised and expressly sided with female workers and her feminism was close to the one of the Social Democrats, she still considered the temperance politics of the party too liberal and not in line with her own idea of total abstinence and prohibition. She was, writes Mral, nearly rabid
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in her temperance eagerness. This temperance fanaticism is later channelled through the writing and editing of *Vita Bandet*. She was also, most probably, too radical to participate in an organisation subordinated by male hegemony.

The heavy commitment to working women and to temperance can also be reasons for why Emily Rathou never joined The Fredrika Bremer Association, FBA, (Fredrika Bremer Förbundet) which was one of the most famous female organisation in Sweden at this time. However, the FBA was more directed at middle class women, and also, at the end of the 19th century the organisation drifted towards the biological and gender complementary view on women as a mother, an attitude The White Ribbon and Emelie Rathou did not support. There were members of FBA that considered the situation of working women to be a problem for the labour movement, which contradicted Emelie Rathou’s view and the activities of The White Ribbon, which were directed towards all classes of society, and with a large number of directly practical activities and establishments for working class women.

The ideology of Emelie Rathou was indeed close to that of social democracy, but the party did not advocate the prohibition of alcohol, so instead she joined the politics of the liberals. Still, she was very popular among social democrats and she was elected to be the candidate for the party at the non-parliamentary Parliament of the General Public (Folkriksdagen) in 1893. This parliament was arranged by the social democrats and the liberals, and the participants were elected by those with a ballot paper in all the counties. Emelie Rathou was elected by two constituencies, but gave up one of these seats to Ellen Key, who in the end could not attend. Emelie Rathou was therefore the only woman among 123 representatives on this occasion.

The Parliament of the General Public was a weeklong convention where the members discussed by what means universal suffrage could be won. A manifest, dedicated to the people of Sweden, was written and a deputation visited parliament, the government and the king to deliver petitions. Through this convention Emelie Rathou could cross a border and enter the male arena of politics, on which she then had access to new contacts. Here she had the possibility to debate with politicians and debaters, like the future prime minister Hjalmar Branting, Julius Mankell who was a military officer, city council and a member of Parliament, and David Bergström, a political scientist, political economist, the president of Verandii, and journalist at *Dagens Nyheter*, to mention but a few. Emelie Rathou’s position in the Parliament of the General Public not only illustrates the recognition of the general public, but also the recognition of the actors on the political arena. Here, Emelie Rathou could acquire new social connections, status, and knowledge that could be used as an important resource, which can be called political capital. This capital is an important resource in the power hierarchy and it involves privileges of different kinds. Hierarchical positions involve a certain status and certain privileges that can be used in order to reach higher positions and gain access to a form of power.

The mobilizer and the organizer

Her participation in IOGT, in the female worker’s club and in the Parliament of the General Public gave her experience and knowledge to be used as capital in what can be seen as her life project, The White Ribbon. When she started the association on Östermalm and later on the National union, the symbolic, the organisational, and the economic capital were basic pre-conditions in order to get a national organisation going. Furthermore, assets like social connections, social capital and cultural capital, were required in order to be recognised and to be considered legitimate, as was political capital. The social network was central for the attraction of the right type of prominent women to join the organisation; something Emelie Rathou understood was an important aspect in mobilisation:

> Women with great experience of other associations will make many times the benefit within The White Ribbon, since they rarely are hesitant, and since they have an eye for the organisational, they have practised the
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As a movement intellectual Emelie Rathou did not only function as an ideologist, she was also the mobilising strength within The White Ribbon. She was the principal travelling speaker and she gave lectures and arranged public meetings all over the country, speaking at the annual White Ribbon meetings and conferences. I have already highlighted her capability as an orator and this talent can also be applied to her writing ability. The journal *Vita Bandet* and other movement texts implied a heavy commitment and was an important element in the mobilisation and recruitment of the movement. The journal was the voice of the organisation; it was its internal link and external voice. Additionally, the movement texts were important for rousing general opinion on the political field.

Before the referendum regarding the prohibition of liquor in 1922, the journal was filled with temperance propaganda and appeals to join prohibition. The referendum was extremely important to Emelie Rathou. She had worked hard to bring about this referendum and she strongly believed that her vision of a temperate society would become a reality through this referendum. She claimed that the prohibition of alcohol was the most important reform required to solve existing social problems. In order to spread the information she and The White Ribbon initiated a co-ordinated conference. Together with representatives of other female Christian associations she co-ordinated the Women’s prohibition conference (Kvinnornas förbudskonferens), in Stockholm in 1921. The conference was of great interest and a new nationwide organisation, The Central Committee for The Prohibition Work of Women (Centralrådet för kvinnornas förbundsarbete), was founded and Emelie Rathou was chosen to be its president. The Central Committee worked as a mother organisation and a link for local associations around the country, and co-ordinated gatherings, mobilised and informed women of the prohibition after the conference. As in The White Ribbon, Emelie Rathou actively organised conferences, public meetings, lectures and the written communication. She wrote manifests, appeals, and of course, great quantities of propaganda. She then reported in *Vita Bandet* how the work proceeded.60

The female citizen

As a movement intellectual and the editor of the organisation’s journal, Emelie Rathou followed the current political questions and the work of the Parliament. She reported on and distributed information about the debates and decisions of the Parliament in *Vita Bandet*, about proposed motions and governmental bills, which were passed and which were not. At election time, she agitated in order to influence public opinion, and afterwards she analysed the results of the election. She wrote about internal and foreign politics, about the question of suffrage in international comparisons, and international news. Just as in her speeches, she counterattacked the opposition’s arguments; she argued with numbers and statistics, and with vividly colourful, passionate images, all in order to prove the situation of society. Her tone could be hard and aggressive, but sometimes she was ironic, like when she reported on a suffrage debate:

*During the debate of female suffrage in the First Chamber of the House, Ed. C Broberg emerged with a brand new argument: women should not obtain the right to vote, because they use hatpins. If the same arguments would be used against men, you could say: men should not have the right to vote, because they have walking-sticks. The one assertion is as powerful evidence as the other.*

Emelie Rathou persistently urged women to fight for their right to vote and to participate in political work. Women were not only mothers she claimed, women were individuals and a part of society, who, without the possibility to participate, to a great extent nonetheless were affected by the politics and the decision taken. In an article from 1906, she wrote:

*It is a barbarian and an antiquated point of view that men have the right to be the guardians of women, or that men should have more rights in society and before the law than women have. This is nevertheless the idea.*
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still deeply rooted in men, and which far too many women fail to react against. But for the one who wants liberty and justice between people, for the one that wants to get rid of the prejudice and special treatment of rights of all kinds, an opinion like that is absurd. [...] The political vote is our right as citizens and humans, and every member of The White Ribbon should be eager to capture it.\textsuperscript{62}

Women were part of society and should have the right to participate in the decision taken. Therefore, it was important for Emelie Rathou to educate and to give women information in order to make them into citizens, since participating in elections was not something they had done before. Women were supposed to be awakened from the old belief that they only filled a purpose as a wife, a housewife and a mother: ‘They must learn to realise, that first of all, they should be conscious of their responsibility, not only are they responsible for their near and dear, but also for the whole world’.\textsuperscript{63} She claimed that women had a task both at home and in society, and she often used rhetorical concepts drawn from both family discourse and social discourse:

\begin{quote}
As a member of society, it is a woman’s right to make herself acquainted with this society’s construction and the care of this construction, but it is also her obligation to use her ballot paper in order to contribute to maintaining the construction in good shape, to open the windows for fresh air, to remove the dusty spider webs, to scrub the rust away, so that their fellow sisters, so that men and so that children can live there in good health and comfort.\textsuperscript{64}
\end{quote}

Before the municipal elections after the franchise reform in 1919, Emelie Rathou held information meetings all around the country under the lecture headline of ‘Women and the elections’, and in the journal she informed the readers of the newly won right to vote and briefed them on the whole voting procedure in order to teach them what to do and how to proceed.\textsuperscript{65} She urged women to use their new right to vote, which she put in the following terms:

\begin{quote}
Through this reform, women have been recognised as a very great power in society. It is now important to use this power in the right way and to get women to work in elections, and to go to the ballot boxes.\textsuperscript{66}
\end{quote}

However, voting and participating in election work was not the only way to affect power relationships in society. Emelie Rathou stressed the importance of female participation in social and political life, and she urged women to participate in municipal elections; and that they must get themselves elected into municipal councils, local commissions and boards. During the first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, women’s access to the national male arenas went through the life of associations and through participation in municipal commissions. When women were eventually given the right to vote and to be elected, Emelie Rathou called attention to the need for female members of parliament in her lecture ‘Women and the general election 1924’. In this lecture, she urged women to seriously make themselves acquainted with political life, and to join political parties in order to get women elected in the next election.\textsuperscript{67} Emelie Rathou herself never aimed for a political career, even though she was one of the women to initiate The Alliance of Women of the Broad-minded Liberal Party (Frisinnade Folkpartiets Kvinnoförbund) in 1924.\textsuperscript{68}

For participation on the political field, political capital was important for women as well as for men, but it was harder for women to acquire this resource in order to use it as a capital. Nevertheless, thanks to social capital, their profession, and education women could be elected to municipal commissions at the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. By participating in these commissions within the local political activity women were able to acquire political capital that could be used in order to obtain political influence on the political arena. Another possibility was to get a position as an expert advisor. During the first decades of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, it was still unusual for women to become expert advisors to parliamentary commissions or official committees. Although unusual, it did, however, happen.

Emelie Rathou was invited to be a member of the temperance committee, which was formed by the government in 1911, and was active until 1921, investigating the question of prohibition, and organising the preparatory work before the prohibition referendum. In 1919, she was also selected to be on the board for the official prohibition report that was the
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result of the temperance committee. She was the only female member of this board as well as in the committee.69 When, finally, the official report was finished, two of the board members made a reservation against the recommendation of the presented proposal to have a referendum after the decision of the parliament. One of these two was Emelie Rathou. Instead, she recommended a consultative referendum before the decision.70 Her decision was the one to be implemented, and consequently, her voice was powerful in the recommendation of temperance legislation.

The position of expert adviser became a gateway to the arena of politics for women, and it was an opportunity and a strategy for women to influence the political reality when they otherwise had no direct access to participate in the decisions of power. By being elected and offered a position in the Parliament of the General Public, and then later being an expert adviser in a committee for an official report, Emelie Rathou could influence the political debate as well as the political decision making. A few decades later, women more frequently held these positions as expert advisers. Still, not just any woman could be offered this opportunity, and when they were selected they were not asked in their capacity as women. They needed an asset of resources and special knowledge in order to be offered this position, which testifies to a certain degree of importance, status, and political capital.

During the first half of the 20th century, women’s paths to political positions and influence were neither straight nor quick. It was a path that required resources and the capacity to use them. Political capital was of great importance for women, just like it was for men, the difference, however, was that it was harder for women to acquire this capital, since they were generally excluded from the political arena. Through positions in municipal councils and commissions, women could pursue the cause of women within the political sphere and political institutions. Simultaneously, they could usurp experience, status, and connections, which could be used as political capital in order to reach higher positions and an arena, which women normally were excluded from or had difficulty in accessing due to their sex.
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connections, but also brought resources of skills and knowledge of different kinds.

To summarize, I claim that the competence and the ability to use her resources as forms of capital described in this text, gave Emelie Rathou the qualifications to be able to participate on male arenas, which in turn gave her recognition, status and privileges, and political capital; capital that made it possible for her to reach higher status, higher positions, and even power, just as it gave her recognition and credibility, not only within her organisation, but also on the political field and in society. In the process of entering the male arenas, and being recognised and selected for positions of hierarchy, she acquired power. Her intellectual position and her habitus gave her the ability to use her resources as intellectual activities; she could transgress the set limits and cross the border into the male arenas with the ambition to change society and the gender system.

We must not forget that women were limited by and excluded from public appearance both within the arena of male organisations and in the political sphere. It was unusual for women to speak in public, and often they were not welcome to enter the rostrum. Due to their inexperience with public appearances, we can also assume that perhaps they did not want to speak in front of an audience. Despite sex discrimination and defiance, some women did actually make themselves heard and obtained recognition in the eyes of the public and from the power elite. In my opinion, it is important to call attention to the ones that actually did make their voices heard, and it is about time that we give prominence to their achievements and significance in the development of society. Women like Emelie Rathou, who crossed a border, into the arena of men, were often ridiculed and mocked, they were even considered dangerous to society. Still, they made it their mission to change the situation for so many other women.

To claim the significance of individual women can highlight new interesting knowledge of the women’s movement as a phenomenon, but it can also spread light upon us as humans, and our ability to act, both individually and collectively. Women’s activities have for a long time been invisible or concealed in political historical writing, which deceptively accentuates women as passive, as not participating in society. However, the significance of the activity of individuals is, I believe, greater than we might realise, and if we study individual women, we can see that women were not passive at all; they were only forced to use different strategies and different arenas than men.

Emelie Rathou was only one of many women who actively worked to change women’s subordinated position in society, and I have here tried to illuminate some of the conditions that were fundamental for the prospect of entering and affecting the political sphere. Nevertheless, the study could have been about another woman who had and who used the same kind of resources as capital in the struggle against social problems and against women’s subordination and inequity. Many of the organisations of the women’s movement and their movement intellectuals are never mentioned in the books of history, despite the fact that they played a significant part, and also made a great difference in the evolution of the welfare state. Even if Emelie Rathou’s activities have not been credited any significance in history books, she was however, credited significance by her contemporaries. She was attributed the Swedish medal of award Illis Quorum in 1918 for her contribution to Swedish society. This award proves the contemporary government’s appreciation and the fact that her engagement was considered significant. Still, many of the women who participated in collective activities never received awards like Illis Quorum, and today they are forgotten. The female fighters of the women’s liberation realised themselves the importance of the individual, especially the difference it would make if these individuals united:

What the individual woman is capable of, one is inclined to believe that it means nothing, and that it has no influence on the whole, what the single individual does, but on the contrary it means a great deal. The whole humanity consists of a lot of individuals, who together make the world what it is. If the individual women unite, they are capable of achieving a great deal. What these women need is merely the practice of the art of unity in order to realise that they actually have the ability and the power to, in some way, improve both society and the world, but only if they seriously want it, and not be content and put up with a passive, unproductive will and pious hopes, but engage with an active, personal will in the work for the goals they claim to be desirable. And there are many such goals in politics, where many women think and feel rather the same. Around these we must unite.71

71 Holmgren 1921: Vita Bandet 1921:7 pp. 50f.
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A Comment on Åsa Bengtsson

Cecilia Björkén-Nyberg

Ìsa Bengtsson’s text ‘Emilie Rathou: Movement Intellectual Crossing Borders’ is a valuable contribution to an understanding of the specific conditions and restrictions a female intellectual who had the ambition to make her voice heard in the public sphere had to face in the decades before and after the turn of the century 1900. Using Pierre Bourdieu’s field theory, Bengtsson argues that Rathou’s background and, in particular, her studies to become a teacher, equipped her with both a cultural, social and symbolic capital. Moreover, she learnt how to acquire both an economic and organisational capital, the latter being closely associated with the so-called international capital according to Bengtsson, and one that she wants to draw attention to in connection with Rathou as a consequence of her international affiliations in working for the temperance issue and female suffrage. The common denominator for Rathou’s success in all the fields mentioned above was her exceptional rhetorical skills.

Emilie Rathou is a fascinating woman whose many speeches and writings show an intellectual capacity to be wondered at. However, her early career as a teacher is not so well documented and here the gaps in the writing of her life leave the reader with a great many questions. The result is a mystification. Bengtsson argues that she has not been able to find any private sources of her personal or family life; therefore information of Emilie Rathou’s private life has been gathered from ‘biographical dictionaries and contemporary biographies’ (p. 40). If it is the sad case that no additional information of a biographical nature is to be obtained despite more assiduous attempts, we could at least ponder what significance this has in the writing of Emilie Rathou’s life. There is one tantalising question elicited by Bengtsson’s account that haunts the reader towards the very end: Why did she decide to discard her maiden name Gustafsson and adopt a foreign-sounding and very unusual one? This piece of information, if any, belongs in a discussion of cultural and symbolic capital.

Rathou’s social background is described in imprecise terms; we learn that ‘[s]he was the daughter of a businessman’ (p. 40) and the fairly generalising observation is made that ‘[t]he possibilities to travel and to get an education show that she came from an affluent family and from a bourgeois, middle class background.’ Bengtsson claims that she is not interested in ‘study[ing] Emilie Rathou’s personality’ (p. 37) but to describe her social position with greater clarity and precision is not to engage in speculations concerning her personality. The question is whether it is at all possible to keep a public self intact and isolated from a private self, which then, by definition, is deemed less worthy of attention. A similar attitude perpetuates a simplifying approach of dividing life into a public sphere, on the one hand, and a private sphere on the other, without problematising such a division. This is problematic not least when it comes to the life and activities of a woman as it presupposes an androcentric assessment for valuing a life. On the whole, it is implied throughout the text that Rathou’s main ambition was to enter the male arena and be acknowledged there. Although it may have been the reality for Emilie Rathou, a necessity even, to create a platform for herself in the public sphere, it could perhaps have been pointed out that to enter the male arena was only a means to an end and not an end itself.

Bengtsson’s material would benefit from being illuminated through the lens of life writing. In the last two decades this theory has revitalised biographical and autobiographical studies by focusing on discourse formation in the process of constructing an identity. Some of the quoted statements made retrospectively by Rathou herself would be particularly interesting to analyse from this point of view in order to reveal to what extent she was active in writing her self into history. Bengtsson explains early in her contribution that she aims at achieving ‘more than just a narrative story of her life’ (p. 34) but it is doubtful whether any scholar can hope to do more than just that since the past as it presented itself to the person whose life and work he/she sets out to deal with is nothing but another text. Bengtsson’s linear form of presentation and the inclusion of phrases such as ‘in those days’ serve to plot the material and thus fictionalise it.

Rathou’s activity in the public sphere is traced from the 1880s through the greater part of the 1920s. This is a period of forty years in which society underwent major social changes. Appealing as Bourdieu’s theory is in

1 For an introduction to life writing, see, for instance, Linda Andersson 2001; Linda H. Peterson 1999; David Amigoni (Ed.) 2006; and Laura Marcus 1994.
mapping society at a given moment in history, it should never be
considered a permanent structure but one that is continuously refashioning
itself and being subjected to change. Bengtsson gives an impression that
the interrelation of the parameters of the cultural field does not really
dramatically change. It is as if Rathou moves from field to field in a
positivist spirit towards a set goal. An alternative approach could be to
choose a number of crucial years and make an investigation of the whole
field and compare these different pictures to each other to achieve a more
complex view. It would, for instance, seem natural to see the year 1921 as a
watershed due to the female suffrage.

For information about Rathou as an orator, Bengtsson mainly refers to
Brigitte Mral, a scholar in comparative literature. Rathou comes across as a
fearlessly courageous and committed speaker who could translate her
fervour in logically structured oral and written presentations. This
testimony is also corroborated by a selection of addresses by Rathou.
Rathou’s ‘writing style is said to be rabidly radical’ and ‘subversive’ (p. 46)
but instead of pursuing this idea further, Bengtsson relies on sweepingly
generalising statements without investigating them. This is interesting
reading but Bengtsson takes her sources too much at face value and does
not problematise sufficiently. It would, for instance, have been fruitful to
compare Rathou’s style to that of a male movement intellectual at the same
time. Moreover, the reader’s curiosity as to the contemporary response to
Rathou’s rhetorical skills, positive as well as negative, is not satisfied.

Emilie Rathou started her writing career in journalism and worked in a
printing office. She both bought and edited journals and newspapers and
made them serve her purposes. Therefore, it seems likely that Rathou was
both familiar with and knowledgeable about media technology. In
_Discourse Networks 1800/1900_, Friedrich A. Kittler shows how two
discourse networks clashed around the turn of the century 1900, the
classical-romantic discourse and the discourse network of 1900. The latter
relied to a great extent on the use of media. Just as the masses were
gendered female, media became the ‘language’ through which woman
could express herself. Rathou developed her rhetorical skills during this
formative media phase. An ambition to shed light on how the media ‘field’
influenced Rathou as a writer and orator would make for fascinating
reading. This particular aspect could be approached in different ways; her
concrete situation in the media world in terms of technical know-how
could be looked into and her use of figurative language could be analysed.
Such an investigation may reveal that Rathou was wary of being associated

with media technology due to a fear of not being able to draw on her
cultural capital to the same extent as otherwise.

Emilie Rathou is well worth studying as a movement intellectual and Åsa
Bengtsson has the delightful task to explore the work of this intriguing
woman and the world in which she was active. This is a promising project
and by applying Bourdieu to her material with greater sensitivity, being
aware of the fictionalising element, making use of the valuable analytical
tools that life writing provides and placing Rathou in the discourse network
of 1900, it has a great potential indeed.
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Travelling Savage Spaces: Jean de Léry and Territorializations of ‘Antarctic France’, Brazil 1555-60

Jonnie Eriksson

For five years in the middle of the 16th century, the French held a small colony on the coast of Brazil, in the area of modern-day Rio de Janeiro. Given the name La France Antarctique – a France on the other side of the world – it briefly appeared to some to be the beginning of French supremacy on the American continent, and by others to be a second France, in a Protestant New World. All such ambitions failed. Instead the territory entered the realm of literature – historical, biographical, fictional, and polemical – through the writings of Pierre Richer, André Thevet, Jean de Léry, Lancelot Voisin de la Popelinière and a great many others during the second half of the 1500’s. In a France torn by religious wars in the wake of the Reformation, the paradisiac land of promises and new beginnings became in hindsight a hellish world of perils, failures, lies and treason; in the minds of the detractors of the venture, it became a perverted place populated by demons and monsters, where even the French colonists reverted to a state of savagery and cannibalism. It was, in short, an arena of inhumanity. But, with a great deal of importance for the history of ideas, it also provided the Humanist and Enlightenment imagination, from Montaigne to Diderot and Rousseau, with visions of a lost paradise, a locus for the true nature of humanity before the invasion of culture, and with the dual image of the ‘noble savage’ representative of the innocence of nature, set against the barbarism inherent in Western civilization.¹ Such problematic interpretations of the native and the cannibal even left its imprint on the mainstay of literary imagination through William Shakespeare’s last play, *The Tempest* (1611), partly influenced by the Brazilian experience, through the mediation of Montaigne, Léry and others.²

When dealing with the event of Antarctic France, historians most commonly study the representations of the savage, and the cultural, religious and ideological codes governing such representations of the Other in the Western mind. The topos of a ‘radical alterity’ is thus posed as the opposite of the supposed normality and identity of the white man; and this is then what is problematized, most often with a slant of a critique of the ideologies of Christianity, imperialism and racism. Now, it cannot be denied that the general attitude of the European colonizers and missionaries towards the natives was marked by prejudice, disrespect, contempt, and even cruelty, all of which are blatantly obvious in the animalizing or demonizing portrayals of the ‘cannibal’ and the ‘savage.’ One could also argue, as is often done, that even the more appreciative depictions of the ‘savage’ as noble and innocent are a thinly cloaked discourse of denigration, resting upon suppositions of diminutive, child-like or effeminate qualities, which are sentimentalized. These viewpoints are now the dominant conventions of analyses in the issues of colonization and imperialism, even in much of the postcolonial studies which are influenced by deconstructionism. But there are several rather obvious problems inherent in this view itself. Historically speaking, there is a well-known anachronism to attributing an outright ‘racism’ in the restricted sense of this term, to 16th century clerics. (On the other hand, the precise issue of the American natives would possibly motivate such a designation, considering the idea of these people as non-Adamic, thus as part of a separate creation, which might warrant a notion of radical alterity.) And theoretically, the relationship between colonizer and colonized presupposes a structure of unilateral activity, of principles of identity, and of binary oppositions, which is still too grounded, I find, in an oppositional rhetoric of a metaphysical idea of subject/object-relations.

There is a measure of resistance to this tradition in some post-colonial theories of the ambiguity of identity, signalled by concepts such as in-betweenness, liminality and hybridity. While such notions problematize the crossing-points and intermingling of the constituent parts of identity, and thereby show the multiplicity of cultural properties and forces at work in the production of selfhood, I prefer to further dynamize these ‘borders’ by

---

¹ Cf. Lestringant 1999a; 1999b. See also Losse 1999 and, more generally regarding Enlightenment anthropology, Duchet 1995.

² The connection between Léry, Montaigne and Shakespeare has been argued by Janet Whatley in her essay ‘Sea-Changes’, Whatley 1999. The issue of Montaigne’s sources are rather controversial, though.
speaking of the movements and ‘travels’ as experimentations in the modes of being – briefly put, becomings, in a Deleuzian sense, or deterritorializations.

In the following I shall, therefore, shift the focus and relocate the function of subjectivity to that of the experience and representation of travel and the attempt to make sense of a foreign territory. I will look at how the traveller experiences the traversed spaces and his place in relation to them, as he puts into motion and displaces his identity by renegotiating the borders he crosses in discourse. Additionally, I retain the historically favoured designation ‘savage’, controversial though it is, as pertaining to the tribes of Native Americans, but also to the land and to the space as such, as it implies the encounter with or the experience of a dramatic novelty: that which is yet unrepresented (by ancient authority, by the Bible, by God) and that which must be represented, remembered, identified and incorporated. This essay consequently outlines the complex motion – an adventure of colonization in itself – between experience and representation, novelty and memory, alterity and identity. Or to put it simply, I ask: What is it to identify oneself as a traveller of places where identities become uncertain, where identities indeed give way to becomings? I will in this way try to provide something of a cartography or a topology, not an ethnography or anthropology, of the process of colonization. I shall study these issues mainly comparing the depictions of travel of Jean de Léry with those of André Thevet, concerning the French colony in Brazil.

But first allow me, for the sake of orientation in this historical terrain, to briefly recapitulate the main turn of events.3

Identification of a Place in Time

Since the Italian Giovanni da Verrazzano in vain claimed considerable portions of the North American east coast for France in 1524, after an expedition that same year, several attempts at colonization of various parts of the continent were made during the next century, the most successful being that of Canada.4 In a line of such colonizers, from Jean Ango and Jacques Cartier to Samuel Champlain, Admiral Gaspard de Coligny takes pride of place as far as historical importance is concerned. As one of the most powerful men in France at this time, and a political leader of sorts among the French Calvinists, he was involved in two expeditions which had concrete although ephemeral results: one that held part of Florida 1562-65, and an earlier that held the Guanabara Bay in Brazil 1555-60. In a time of religious strife between Catholics and Protestants, King Henry II granted funding for an enterprise of colonization, to be led by the colourful Nicolas Durand de Villegagnon (1510-72), Ambassador to England, Vice-Admiral of Brittany, Knight of Malta, and at least presumably a Calvinist in spé.

So, in July 1555, two ships set off for the American continent with a motley crew of nearly 600. The main part consisted of criminals released from prisons in Normandy, while Villegagnon assembled a private guard of Scottish mercenaries, and in addition a few clerics – among them the Franciscan almonier André Thevet (1516-92), who would later become the most prolific chronicler of the events, even though he spent most of his stay ill with fever and departed for France after a mere two months.

After a difficult crossing of the Atlantic, suffering dissent and desertion, they finally arrived in Brazil in November, navigating into the Guanabara Bay (the native Tupi name for what the Portuguese since their discovery of it in 1502 called Rio de Janeiro, ‘the river of January’). On a small, inhospitable island known as Serigipe (later renamed by the Portuguese and to this day known as L‘îlha de Villegagnon), Villegagnon established a military stronghold, the Fort Coligny, in order to battle the Portuguese competition and ensure control of the bay for further expansion; it seems he even declared himself Viceroy of America. Due to the sparsity of the crew and the sterility of their chosen island, however, they became dependent upon the native Tupi people – in particular the Tupinambas, ‘an exuberant, display-loving, cannibalistic tribe that dominated the coast of Brazil’5 – for food and manual labour, thereby entering into enmity with other tribes who were allied with the Portuguese.

In fact, conflicts were rife in the region. French traders and smugglers, often called the truchemens de Normandie (Norman interpreters), had already frequented the region for three decades7 (just as the commerce

3 What is now the city of Rio de Janeiro was founded on mainland by the Portuguese in 1565, when it was initially named São Sebastião do Rio de Janeiro.
4 Whatley 1986 p. 320.
5 McGrath (1996 p. 389) suggests that these French mariners may even have outnumbered the Portuguese, who formally held the territory.
would continue after the fall of the colony), and the project of colonization was in part a means to consolidate access to this trade, particularly with brazilwood (*pau-brasil*, a tree which gave the country its name, and valuable for extracting a red dye). Villegagnon’s methods, however, were in some ways counter-productive, due to his insensitivity to the native tribes and his religious condemnation of the tradesmen and mercenaries who had established amicable, even amorous relationships with the Tupi. (We might in this see signs of sexual exploitation, but any type of abuse was hardly the issue for Villegagnon.) Hostilities rose to the point of rebellion against the new authority, the culmination of which was a conspiracy on the 14th of February 1556 to murder Villegagnon, after he had forbidden his subjects to take native mistresses (he had instead requested from the King to send French women), in the end forcing them to marry under French law.

To quench the uprising and reform the colony, Villegagnon, in March of the same year, sent a letter to Jean Calvin, his classmate from the Sorbonne, requesting support for Calvinist missionaries to be sent in order to strengthen Protestant morals among the colonists. This resulted in the arrival, on March 7th 1557, of 300 men (and five women), among them fourteen Huguenot clerics, the most important of which were the Protestant minister Pierre Richer and, at least in retrospect, the 22-year-old Jean de Léry (1534-1613). This reinforcement was sponsored by Coligny, who officially converted in the same year, with the further intention of establishing a Calvinist refuge during the time of religious turmoil in France, leading up to the religious wars.

The harmony of the Huguenot sojourn was brief, however. Villegagnon showed signs of scepticism in the Protestant faith, which led to the fateful confrontation with the ministers concerning the Eucharist. Villegagnon insisted on the traditional interpretation of transubstantiation, that the bread and wine do in fact transform to the flesh and blood of Christ, while the Protestants held a consubstantiationist view, that the bread, wine, flesh and blood are all co-present in the matter involved. The further radicalism of the Huguenots is implied by Léry in his depiction of a discussion of theirs at the end of their stay at the fort. Supplies were at this time low, and those of wine and bread for the communion were soon depleted. While some Protestants advocated that they abstain from taking the Holy Communion in the absence of the orthodox prerequisites, other Protestants

---

8 The authenticity of the letter and Villegagnon’s authorship of it have however been disputed by some historians.


10 The three martyrs were Pierre Bourdon, Jean du Bordel, and Mathieu Verneuil; the remaining two were André La Fon and Jacques Le Balleur. Cf Lestringant 1996 pp. 141-153.
Durandi qui se Villegagnonem cognominat (1561) and Jean Crespin later contributed to the image of a Huguenot martyrdom, and thus to a mythological side to the political history, by incorporating two anonymous tracts in Histoire des Martyrs persequez et mis a mort pour la verité de l'Evangile [...] (1564, with many expanded reeditions). On both sides of the dispute, a plethora of propaganda pieces emerged.

It is, nonetheless, another quarrelling pair that has left the most indelible imprint in history, even though its members acted on the sidelines of the political arena. One was the cordelier-cum-cosmographer, André Thevet, who immediately had his version of the colonization of Brazil published as Les Singularitez de la France Antarctique (1557), reprised with some modification in book XXI of Cosmographie universelle (1575) at a time when Thevet had reached an elevated position in French society as cosmographer to the court of Henry III. The other was of course Jean de Léry, who had returned to France a year after the publication of Les Singularitez. He claimed to have immediately reacted to the falsifications and ‘lies’ of Thevet’s account (mainly due to Thevet’s barely having set foot on the mainland and reporting hear-say and fabulation, and more gravely – politically speaking – concerning his having conflated the insurrectionists and the Protestants, though the two disputes were quite separate in time as well as in motives); but hoping that the author would correct his errors in later editions, he refrained from responding. Noticing, however, in 1575 that Thevet had rather fortified his position, Léry took action and compiled the notes he had made while still in Brazil, and since shared with friends, reworking and publishing them as Histoire d’un voyage fait en la terre du Brésil (1578), which remains the most detailed and authoritative first-hand account of the French colony at Rio de Janeiro. At this time, Léry had taken refuge in Geneva, after the Saint-Bartholomew’s Day massacre on Protestants in August 1572 (during which Admiral Coligny was one of the first victims, as well as the most significant), an experience the brutality of which he had described in a previous text but which also colours his portrayal of the French colony, especially regarding the issue of cannibalism.

The last decades of the 16th century and the first of the 17th are characterized by a continuation of the strife, but now wielded on a vaster arena of history and geography, in the works of illustrious figures such as François de Belleforest and Agrippa d’Aubigné. The dispute has in some ways continued all the way into contemporary research, as even the veracity of Léry’s retelling, otherwise thought to be the most realistic, has been contested (along with that of Crespin) for reasons of religious bias; in fact, the very notion of ‘testimony’ as pertains to Léry apparent eyewitness account has been problematized in a Calvinist context.

All this being said, I shall, however, not dwell upon the actual, historical circumstances of this process of colonization, nor with the political, economical or ideological background of this venture, but with the very experience of the new territories, as portrayed by Jean de Léry, and compared to Thevet. In this respect, I will be distancing myself from issues of imperialism, nationalism and problems of racism highlighted by traditional historiography as well as by postcolonial theory.

11 Published the following year in a French translation as Réfutation des folles resveries, execrables blasphèmes, erreurs et mensonges de Nicolas Durand, qui se nomme Villegaignon (1562).
12 Thevet had in his youth been a Franciscan friar (termed a cordelier), which his Huguenot opponents ceaselessly reminded the public of; ‘cosmographer’ was the Renaissance term for geographers mapping the entirety of the world, usually on behalf of imperialist ambitions. What distinguishes cosmography from geography is, in ancient tradition from Ptolemy, that the former models his map of the world on the cycles of the heavens and thus on a geometrical schematization, while the latter details the actual topography of experience; on Thevet in relation to cosmography, cf. Lestringant 2003b pp. 199-203. Thevet enjoyed a career as cosmographer and historiographer to four successive kings of France, the last of the Valois line, from 1558 to 1589.
13 As Léry pointed out, Thevet had already left the colony when the rebellion began in February 1556, and more than a year before Léry and the other Huguenots arrived in March 1557.
14 Léry’s preface to his Histoire explains in some detail this historical background to his publication, including polemical attacks on Thevet; throughout later editions he reiterates his position against those of Villegaignon and Thevet.
15 Indeed, an attempt on the life of Coligny on August 22nd was the most direct cause of the massacre, due to the ensuing threat of vengeance from his Protestant supporters; though he survived the shooting, the injured Coligny was finally stabbed to death in his bed and thrown out the window on the night of August 24th.
16 Jean de Léry, Histoire memorable de la ville de Sancerre, contenant les entreprises, sièges, approches, bateries, assauts et autres efforts des assiegans.
17 Cf Léry, Histoire d’un voyage pp. 533-536.
18 McGrath 1996.
19 Frisch 2002.
Bodies of Work

The personages involved, long relatively neglected in history – and with them the events of the Antarctic France – were shown some general attention by historians such as Charles-André Julien in 1948, Olivier Reverdin in 1957 and Marcel Trudel in 1963, before being brought to wider attention by the authority of Michel de Certeau in 1975. In the past two decades they have been diligently analyzed by Frank Lestringant, arguably the leading authority on the subject, and by a host of researchers such as Andrea Frisch and Janet Whatley in the Anglophone world. In most of these cases, well in line with conventions in writing the history of travels of exploration and colonization (a quite prolific genre, at that), what is usually dealt with is the encounter between a French or European or Christian identity with an undetermined Other, determinable only in a negative fashion as savage, cannibal or heathen, or sometimes as coded by Ancient tradition into mythological figures of monstrous races (sirens, amazons, cyclops etc). The telling is then one of the exertion of power and imposition of identities by the colonizers on the colonized, coded in turn as part of the history of racism. Thereby, the situation and the relationship is structured in dualistic terms, in an asymmetric but static dichotomy.

A possible exception is Certeau, whose awareness of the genre of travel narratives discerns not a unilateral flow of power but a tripartite segmentarization, or an oscillation of sorts, with the representation of the Other lodged between two movements (the journey to and fro) which act as a framing device. Lestringant has similarly compared the different conventions in the narratives of quest and exile. It is this complexity and this mobility, this dialectic of progress and regress which challenges if not cancels out any unity, that I wish to bring to the fore. It should be remembered after all that Léry in his title purports to write the history of a voyage, an element lacking in the main books of Thevet, Richer and Crespin, chronicling instead the characteristics of the land or of the people involved. And while the bulk of Léry’s book, 13 chapters out of 22, provide descriptions of the physique and customs of the Tupi tribes which warrant his reputation as a proto-ethnologist, there is an important aspect to the telling of the travel itself, as something other than a framing of the tableau of the savage. In fact, even Léry’s portrayal of the Tupi people and their territory reveal a crucial difference if compared to his fellow chroniclers: at a distance from the colonial and missionary project as such, he does not write about what could be done with these others but about how these others remained the same and remained in their place, while the colonists themselves changed. There’s a fundamental difference between the idea of bodies to work with and bodies at work.

One of the key topoi for representing the savage is nudity; but this characteristic has a greater importance than that of simply being an indicator of barbarity to set next to cannibalism, cruelty and heathenism, because it carries over in the representation of space. This ‘carrying over’, this great metaphoricity of the body-space-identity discourse, is almost a causal chain connecting two surfaces to provide the illusion of the depth of the third term. In this tableau vivant, so smoothly represented in the colonial iconology, the savage body is a sign indicating the savage land, and both are there to be reformed and reshaped, to be ‘cultivated’, in a dual sense. We are brought back to the problematic issue of the identification of the ‘savage’ as such: the location of un-culture, to coin a phrase, in the body. Because in all his strangeness and exoticism, the savage body/space bears no mystery; there is nothing behind the other – that is, no God, no faith, no salvation. This other world is either a clean slate for inscription or a blank surface of spectacle. Nudity represents, in this Renaissance imagery,
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20 Julien 1948 pp. 163-221.
21 Reverdin 1957.
22 Trudel 1963.
25 This is very much evident regarding Léry in Certeau 2002 pp. 245-283, but also in his later study of Montaigne’s ‘Des canibales’ (Essais Lxxii; Michel de Montaigne, Les Essais [1580-88], ed. Villey-Saulnier (Paris: PUF/Quadrige, 2004), 202-214), which isn’t really the description of a voyage but supposedly still retains the literary form, Certeau 1986 pp. 69f).
a lack of properties, a sign of negation and privation. The interpretations differ, though.

To Thevet, the naked savage is of course without shame and decency, but also ‘without faith, without law, without religion, without civility’, and he thanks God that the Christians have been ‘enlightened’ and not left in such a state of animality and brutality, but rather have gained civility and humanity; he can only hope for the same development among the ‘poor Americans’. The naked skin is then not only the sign of an inhumanity of sorts but also a surface for the inscription of a European culture, or a mirror only to be polished so that it can reflect the light of God. Similarly, the American soil is ‘naked’ and left in a brute state; though rich and fertile, it is left uncultivated, just as the bodies are left uncultured, but could under the work and the ‘semination’ of European enterprise yield good harvests for the French empire.

Léry, too, almost instantly remarks upon the nudity among the Tupi, but he does so in a way that immediately ‘redresses’ them, focusing rather on what they in fact do with their bodies instead of clothing them. His very first encounter with the natives prompts a brief response: all of them, he says, men and women alike, are entirely naked, but ‘painted and blackened all over the body’. Furthermore, the men sport a polished green stone in their pierced lower lip; while but they think themselves adorned in this fashion, they are simply grossly disfigured, as if they had a second mouth. The women, on the other hand, have not pierced their lips but rather their ears, in which they wear large pieces of bone, giving them holes one could poke one’s finger through. They are, however, he emphasizes, not furry, as some have reported.

There is an obvious strategical shift in Léry’s portrayal of the savage: for every sign of alterity that he takes away from their nature, he reinscribes in their culture. In a way, it’s a matter of rationally explaining misconceptions: The Indians aren’t black, but they paint themselves so. They don’t have fur, but they adorn themselves in feathers. They don’t have strange out-growths of bone, but they pierce themselves with pieces of such. They aren’t nose-less, but they flatten the noses of their infants. In fact, Léry points out how healthy and decidedly un-monstrous the American natives are, how long-lived and joyous, how tall and well-structured, how rarely deformed or diseased. These are bodies that work. The aesthetization of the savage body evolves into a long and appreciative description of how the Tupis adorn themselves with dye from fruit juices, with stones, bones, feathers and shells – briefly put, how they wear their natural environment in and on their skin, as a cultural incorporation of the ecology. (This could be seen in the light of an entire culture of ‘incorporation’ primarily symbolized by cannibalism.) The savage body gains a general, almost sublimated, kind of eroticism. Certeau talks about how the literature of travel narratives creates a ‘body of pleasure’, signalling feast and excess, and inviting to a curiosity of the investigation, as does the surface of the body of the world.

It is commonplace to note that Léry emphasized the humanity of the American natives, to the point of all but inventing the cliché of the ‘noble savage’, but also that he does this in the interest of contrasting them to the inhumanity of the Catholics and of Villegagnon in particular. The procedure is therefore as much rhetorical as ideological. In this respect, the Huguenot experience of the French Reformation and the Saint Bartholomew massacre becomes the impetus to the appreciative reading of the exoticism of the Tupi tribes of Brazil. Three exiles are intermingled: the failed Calvinist refuge in the Guanabara Bay; the exile from Villegagnon among the natives on mainland; the exile from France during the religious wars. Becoming-colonial, becoming-savage, becoming-foreign.

With a view to the theories of Certeau, describing identity as a product of discourse in ‘spaces’ and history as the writing of other experiences or the experience of otherness (a ‘heterology’), as well as those of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari concerning the concepts of territory and deterritorialization (a ‘nomadology’) pertaining to a dismantling and dynamization of identity, I shall in the following look at the becoming-other of the traveller, as mediated by the experience of space and displacement. It could be said that these vantage points provide a dynamic

---

32 Thevet, Les Singularitez, fol. 51b.
37 For an obvious example, see Léry, Histoire d’un voyage p. 196, where he says that the savages ‘were without comparison more human’ to them than Villegagnon.
39 Deleuze & Guattari 1984; 1988. The literature regarding these notions and the philosophy involved is too vast to account for.
The topography of the becoming-colonial: the passage through spaces, the crossing of borders, the reflection of surfaces, the physical assimilation of the environment, the fragmentarization of territory are all variants of an experience of shifting perspectives, forcing new arenas of the subject-object problematics. The intermingling of issues of identity, textuality, physicality and territory entails what might be called a spatial negotiation of identity; and the travel is then not only one of discovering and exploring the new and the other, or the invasion and imposition of power, but also, in its capacity of experience and memory to be lived and told, a risk of the loss or the changing of life or self.

Reflecting Surfaces

As Michel de Certeau has shown, and as I have already said, *Histoire d’un voyage fait en la terre du Brésil* takes the symmetrical form of an oscillation in the journey there and back, passing through an intermediate stay; these movements are part of the conventional composition of travel narratives. This means that the writer looks back, remembers and reflects, thereby representing in writing what is otherwise lost; what escapes the writer, however, is the living presence of the savages, symbolized by their orality. This is the main theme in his chapter on Léry in *L’écriture de l’histoire*.

But this structure is clear early on in Léry’s work itself, and with other implications. From the very beginning of his book, on the first page of the first chapter, he declares that his intention is to describe what he has experienced (*pratique*), seen, heard and observed, at sea, going and returning, as well as among the American savages— all of this in apparent opposition to the cosmography of Thevet and the histories of others, who have mapped out the territory and taken stock of it. He thus takes a simple stance: the work is supposed to be a subjective account of what it is to be in this foreign land, and what it is like to travel to and from it, not an objective representation of the place itself. In this way, Léry proclaims to speak for himself, out of his singular experience (‘what I have...’), as opposed to the supposedly universal chronicling of ‘singularities’ proper to the land, as according to Thevet. (It is also a variant of the typical dispute between the true traveller and the arm-chair historian.)

This strategy is unsurprising from one point of view, at least. The dispute between the Catholics and the Calvinists, and between Thevet and Léry, is of course a struggle for power, both in the sense of how they relate to the French establishment and the dawning of the absolute monarchy under the last Valois, and more directly, in the sense of how they try to establish their various accounts as the truth, that is in a struggle for power over discourse and over the writing of history. While Thevet worked in the service of the King and for the benefit of an imperialist ambition, greatly symbiotic to his own careerist one, and consequently wrote an official report of sorts for the consolidation of the colony (a greater France), Léry was at the time of writing an outcast and an expatriate, a Protestant in Geneva depicting the lost possibility of a non-Catholic France-beyond-France (an other France). For Léry the colony was indeed a religious matter, and to some extent a Swiss project as much as a French one; as he says, Villegagnon’s request for reinforcement was received by the Calvinist Church of Geneva as a chance for the ‘amplification of the reign of Jesus Christ in so faraway a land, even on so strange a soil, and among a nation so completely ignorant of the true God.’

This distinction is of great importance, no matter how simple it may seem, and is reflected even in their respective denominations of the territory. Thevet’s term *France Antarctique* signifies a mirror-image of the homeland, a place of expansion where identity is relocated and magnified, indeed, but essentially unchanged – or, in the vocabulary of Deleuze and Guattari, a place of ‘reterritorialization’ – where the savages may be converted and a common ground be held in shared Christianity. For Léry, on the other hand, ‘Brazil’ is an entirely new world, in all ways strange and

---

40 In this range of motifs, I adhere superficially to the concern in Certeau’s writings to similarly affiliated, but more structurally posed questions of the self/other, of speech/writing, of body/spirit, and of spaces/non-places; I wish to emphasize, however, that I in no way seek to maintain these dichotomies.
41 Certeau 2002 pp. 245-283.
43 For a more general account of these political machinations, see Ladurie 1987.
44 The megalomania inherent to the imperialist ventures of several European nations, and more personally their instigators and supporters (chiefly Coligny and Villegagnon in the context of our story), have something of an equivalent in the self-aggrandizing willingness among writers to chronicle and actively participate in it. There is, for instance, perhaps only a slight hyperbole to Anthony Pagden’s somewhat insidious remark that André Thevet promoted French imperialism ‘if only to provide his towering ego with something to write about’; Pagden 1995 p. 65.
different, and the savage is, to his Calvinist mind, forever lost to God, essentially and eternally damned, a creature of comfort enjoying his brief time in this other Eden. But while it is for him the place of the Other, it is at the same time the locus of estrangement even of oneself – or of the risks involved in ‘deterioralization’ – as the seduction of the savage paradise sets in, and even infects the memory of the place and its people. To Léry, then, this is a place one cannot see oneself in without risking one’s self – passing through the looking-glass.

In a way, the colonial experience is one of risk – not at all in the sense of chance, but in the sense of being uncertain as to how a phenomenon is determined by providence. This matrix of experience is fundamentally Calvinist in all its pragmatism and utilitarianism; every encounter is deemed good or bad, helpful or harmful, but in an attempt to make sense of how God has predetermined the fate of the travellers. As Léry crosses the Atlantic Ocean, even as the ship sets out, an entire semiotics of strangeness is set in motion in the spectacle of the sea. All manner of beasts are patrolling the borders of the New World; this is the threshold, where oddity marks the beginning of alterity. Tortoise, porpoise, albacore, shark among other species are described, and the quality of their meat is judged, since the lives of the travellers depend upon whatever they may scavenge from the sea (including the Portuguese vessels, ruthlessly pillaged, even to the apparent remorse of Léry). The flying fish, in particular, gain a symbolical quality in face of their situation: jumping from the water into the air, they escape one set of predators only to fall victim to the birds of prey; such is too the fate of men. In fact, such is the fate of Léry and his companions, hurled as they are from one peril to another – the monsters of the sea, the storms, the rains, the heat, the starvation of the travel, and then the beastliness of the cannibals they encounter on land, and even the rage of their fellow Christians, especially Villegagnon.

In truth, Léry’s story is all about changes, revolts, conversions, even revolving around the central issue of transformation: the trans-substantiation of matter in the Eucharist. The displacements in space – the journey to America, the exile to the mainland, the botched escape and return to the isle for some, the return voyage to France for others, the later exile to Switzerland – are set in motion in response to these changes. They correspond to the project of expanding a French identity or relocating a Christian one; to the desire to consolidate such identities at the threat of a becoming-savage; to the attempted reformation of the colony; to Villegagnon’s imagined apostasy from the Calvinist faith; to the sympathetic experience with regards to the natives and the renegotiation of cultural values; to the reinterpretation of humanity and civility in the face of cannibalism; to the reimagination of Villegagnon as a murderous brute and a cannibal; to the becoming-martyrs of the three missionaries; to the consolidation of a Catholic identity of France which brings the savagery of the New World back into the old; and to a new escape to the Calvinist refuge of Geneva.

Léry keeps insisting on these perilous aspects of his journey, where the return voyage is a mirror-image of the journey out (only far worse), not only throughout his book but also in epistles addressed to members of the deceased Coligny’s family. For the traveller, the experience was an ordeal, one might say a trial, from which a judgement may be inferred: the fact that he has survived, and that he is able to recount his experience, is a testament to a divine blessing. God spared him and allowed him to live through the travels to and from (as well as the travails of) the New World, as if it were a geography fashioned for the trying of the Huguenot’s mettle. There is something of an allegorical slant to the entirety of Léry’s description of his travel; it reminds the reader of a pilgrim’s progress (and regress), the route of which is peopled with demonic forces, beasts and monsters, against which the virtue of the faithful Christian can be proven and enhanced. In this sense, identity is reaffirmed simply by the risk of its being destroyed or corrupted, a risk negated by the very act of writing its history. If the one who writes truly is the same as the one who travelled, all is safe.

Perhaps for this reason, Léry seeks to emphasize the identity between the act of writing (a being-here) and the event of being-there, the conflation of past and present, in a physicality even external to himself. This physicality is the text itself, his body of writing taken in all its materiality. We should not forget that one of the problems for Léry is that he publishes his account at a greater distance in time than Thevet (1578 as opposed to 1557), all the while insisting that only he himself writes from the view-point of having been there, for a longer time and in more places – that is, from a true first-hand experience, as opposed to Thevet’s corrupted text, tainted with gossip-mongering from the Fort Coligny and the shores of Rouen. How can Léry then establish his presence both there and here, then and now, to outdo Thevet’s authority? The answer is: by way of material continuity.

47 Cf Lestringant, Léry, Histoire d’un voyage p. 128 n. 1.
48 Cf Certeau 2002 pp. 249f, for a similar summation of displacements.
The book Léry has written is based, he says, on notes taken during his travels, ‘even in America’ (temporal presence) using ink made from the red dye of the brazilwood (material presence – the eponymous mark of the place). The Brazilian ink, the encre de Bresil, thus virtually anchors his text in the place and in times past; the written document alluded to reflects the history of the colony by incorporating its most readily distinguishing properties.

Thevet had another strategy: that of repetition and variation. By publishing new versions of his Singularitez and incorporating them in grander works, especially placing the original text on ‘singularities’ of a specific place in context in his universal cosmography, Thevet aligned his personal experience of a limited locality at a very limited time with the history of the nation and with the cosmological perspective on geography. His response to Léry, in order to reestablish his connection to the place, was to make a second voyage – ‘make’, I say, in the sense of textually inventing it, ‘making it up’. Because in his Histoire de deux voyages, written around 1588, he claims to have conducted another trip to Brazil along with the pioneer cartographer Guillaume Le Testu – not a return trip, not one more recently, but rather earlier, in 1550. This is authority by priority, and by plurality: he was there first, twice. In this way, Thevet also emphasizes his access to geographical knowledge, as formalized in maps, but does so by claiming to having been present at the making of these maps, at the charting of the territory. So, while Léry seeks a foundation for credibility in an immediately reflecting surface (a sheet of paper bearing the physical imprint of the place), Thevet seems to opt for the formalistic reiterability of representation (an atemporal and universal existence of the place in the nation’s history, an imaginary territoriality).

49 Léry, Histoire d’un voyage pp. 61f.
50 Cf the similar treatment, this time concerning the textual re-presentation of the savage, in Certeau 2002 p. 257: ‘Comme l’indique déjà la Préface, il est fait de « mémoires... écrits d’encre de brésil et en Amérique même », matériau doublement tiré des Tropiques puisque les caractères mêmes qui ramènent l’objet sauvage dans le filet d’un texte sont faits d’ « encre » rouge extraite du pau-brasil. On a side note, Frank Le stringant and Marie-Christine Gomez-Géraud use Léry’s expression encre de Bresil for the title of their collection of essays on Léry as a writer; Gomez-Géraud & Le stringant 1999.

The Isle and the Exile

As we have seen, Léry’s claim to authority over Thevet concerning the New World of the ‘Antarctic France’ is both temporally and spatially founded; that is, it rests both upon the length of his stay (more than a year, as opposed to barely two months) and the plurality of the places he frequented (not only Villegagnon’s island but also other islands in the bay and of course his stay among the native Tupis on mainland). In chapter VII of his Histoire, he provides a brief geography of the region, stating in implicit polemics with Thevet that he has ‘stayed and sailed’ (demeuré et navigé) there for ‘about a year’.52

His description is that of an eyewitness account, it seems, from the perspective of a navigation along the ‘river’, as the bay was erroneously called (the designation ‘Rio de Janeiro’ captures the same notion of the bay as a salt-water river, which was too the signification of the Tupi word Guanabara). He thus points out that entering the bay, the very mouth is difficult to navigate through, because ‘one must pass three small inhabitable islands, against which the ships are in great danger of being thrown and crushed, if they are not well steered’; then one must pass a narrow strait on whose left side there stands ‘a mountain and a rock in the shape of a pyramid, which is not only of marvellous and excessive height, but also which one would say, when seen from afar, was artificial’.54

The subjective perspective is further enhanced by the comparison Léry has previously made between the baie de Genevre and the lac de Genève; carrying with him the context of the Swiss landscape, from his homeland in exile, the mountains around the Guanabara ‘river’ are said to be not quite as high as those around the spacious Geneva Lake (he also points out that the latter is a body of fresh-water), but since the bay is narrower the land closes in on all sides, and the vista is therefore ‘rather similar’ to that of Geneva ‘as regards its situation’.55 By means of such a proportional displacement, a kind of natural trompe-l’œil, the two places become comparable from the view-point of the perceiving subject. This is the New World in a Renaissance perspective.

52 Léry, Histoire d’un voyage p. 197.
53 The monolith now called Pão de Açúcar, the Sugarloaf.
54 Léry, Histoire d’un voyage p. 198. Cf. the fearsome perils described as they are exiting the bay on their return voyage, Op. cit. 508-510.
Further into the 'river', Léry continues, they came upon a small, flat, rocky island, which they called *le Ratier* ('the Ratlike'); this was – at least according to Léry (though not Thevet) – the initial place of settlement, but the attempt at fortification quickly failed due to the onslaught of the waves, he says. The colonists therefore moved deeper into the bay, where they reached Serigipe and finally began building the fort.\(^{56}\)

This history, told through the topography of a journey, was of course not experienced first-hand by Léry, as it had been by Thevet in 1555, though they both move, of course, along the same itinerary. Léry represents the second wave of colonists who double the first arrival (at half the number) by moving through the same space, and thus, it seems, through the same historical process. By repeating the arrival in terms of an unchanged and unchanging topography, Léry stages the eternal recurrence of a process of colonization, even now that the colony is lost.

At the same time, and in contrast, this very topography shows the precarious conditions of the colonization. The colony cannot be quite determined in place. It simply isn’t ‘firm’, stable, secured on mainland, a second France (indeed, it is more of a copy of Geneva), but rather scattered on islands, virtually uninhabitable and seemingly more fit as strategical strongholds for military purposes than as places to settle and to populate. Léry describes just how inaccessible the island of Serigipe was, and points to the strategic advantages, only to move on to the unreliability of Villegagnon, who by giving up the Calvinist creed seems, in a twin treason (against faith and country), to give up the possibility of a durable Fort Coligny in a ‘France Antarctique’.\(^{57}\) He is then critical of Thevet as well, who tries to provide a solid foundation by dreaming up a colony on the mainland, the city of Ville-Henry or Henryville, a ‘ville imaginaire’, ‘vrayment fantastique’, which he places on his maps of the bay to please the King, even though Léry insists that there was no such settlement.\(^{58}\) Again, Thevet makes the place with his maps and images, seeking form and firmness, while Léry unsettles it and levels it with a traveller’s empirical eye.

He then proceeds even further into the bay, to a ‘beautiful and fertile island’ which they called ‘the great isle’, where there in fact were villages, but savage ones – because this island was inhabited by the Tupinambas, their allies – and around it were small, uninhabited islands where they dove for large oysters.\(^{59}\) The progress is apparent: the deeper one enters the bay, the more hospitable and less perilous it becomes. But Léry affirms the positive presence of the natives, leading an almost nomadic life among the multitude of islands, whereas Thevet tries to mark the territory as French and establish the empire on firm ground. This discrepancy may be attributable to Léry’s wanderings in the area while Thevet mainly stayed at the fort (and in bed, with fever), but also to their diverging concerns. As has been noted, Thevet was a man of the state, of orthodox faith and royal connection in his profession as cosmographer, while Léry was an outsider, an expatriate, a dissident of sorts.\(^{60}\) Thevet wrote the history and provided the imagery of a Valois monarchy not confined to France proper, but one expanding and relocating, basking in the glory of its imaginary conquests.\(^{61}\) But he was also cartographer of islands who viewed the entirety of the world in little pieces,\(^{62}\) as a great archipelago.\(^{63}\) The face of the earth, then, is presented as a problem for the building of an empire, all too scattered and fragmented to merit greatness; but at the same time, it is the interconnection of paths of navigation, a world of ports. So, order may be regained in the cosmography of the distribution of land in the oceans.

There is no such sense of the world for Léry. In his case, we see a nomadic experience which moves in opposition to the state power, to all fixed states, even that of one’s own identity, thus exemplifying a kind of deterritorialization in Deleuze’s and Guattari’s terminology. Léry is a traveller, for real, once; there was one voyage, but it was itself fragmented into micro-displacements, a travelling here and there without thereby expanding or consolidating an empire. Rather the contrary: the more Léry travels, the more the space reveals itself as savage – but in a positive sense, one not to be negated. Nothing saves, nothing salvages the savagery of this territory; all the aspects of deterritorialization finds its place there. Even all the monsters of the sea, the sharks and whales they met while crossing the Atlantic, are still there in the bay, visible from the island.\(^{64}\) There is no escaping the brutality of nature, no taming of the wilderness, just as there is

\(^{56}\) Léry, *Histoire d’un voyage* pp. 198f.


\(^{58}\) *Op. cit.* pp. 201-206. There was evidently a site of rudimentary buildings on the left side of the bay, used by the French when they went fishing, where the Huguenots stayed for two months after their expulsion and before they joined the natives; *cf. op. cit.* pp. 504.

\(^{59}\) Léry, *Histoire d’un voyage* pp. 206f.

\(^{60}\) *Cf.* Whatley 1986 p. 320.

\(^{61}\) *Cf.* Lestringant 1981 pp. 206-256.

\(^{62}\) Lestringant 2003b pp. 295-349.

\(^{63}\) Lestringant 2003a p. 11.

\(^{64}\) Léry, *Histoire d’un voyage* pp. 207f.
no conversion of the heathen; they are new, other, strange, and must remain so. The colony must fail; it is predetermined. The great irony, however, is that the failure is brought about by Villegagnon himself, the shape-shifter cannibal, the most inhuman of men, to whom the savage is greatly preferable. If it weren’t for him, Léry posits, there could have been more than ten thousand French there, and it could still have merited the name France Antarctique.\footnote{Léry, Histoire d'un voyage p. 506.} Still the dream of national relocation, of imperialist conquest? Still a reterritorializing reverie?

Of course, there’s some sarcasm to Léry’s appropriation of Thevet’s term. By another France he means an other France, a Calvinist refuge, and not at all what Thevet meant by that denomination: the extension of the monarchy. As Léry writes this, he has returned to Geneva, in exile from the war against the Huguenots, and he looks back upon two lost worlds. He has always loved his country, he professes, but it has become ‘Italinized’ (a reference, I assume, to Catherine of Medici); and in face of such ruination of Christianity, he says, in one of the most famous quotes of the book, he often wishes that he were among the savages: ‘je regrette souvent que je ne suis parmi les sauvages’.\footnote{Léry, Histoire d'un voyage pp. 507f.} No wonder then that he, perhaps in a nostalgic mood, compares the view of Geneva with that of the bay of Guanabara. The isles become topos of separation signifying a politics, and a topology, of exclusion and exile. But this, whether here or there, is now how he must identify himself; and in the sense that he can claim to master the narrative of the travel and the history of the territory, finding his place in relation to the lands that are lost, Léry is, in Saint John-Perse’s poetical turn of phrase, a ‘Prince of the Exile’.
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Postcolonial Concepts without Politics?
A Comment on Jonnie Eriksson

Anna Fåhraeus

In reading Jonnie Eriksson’s contribution to this volume, “Travelling Savage Spaces: Jean de Léry and territorializations of the “Antarctic France”, Brazil 1555–60”, from a literary perspective, what is striking is his desire to distance himself from the postcolonial despite the topic of his paper and his own acknowledgement that the motif of the ‘savage’ is a key topos in western colonial writing. Eriksson’s own writing thus raises complex issues as it can be linked to modern European awareness and anxieties about our colonial history as well as a certain frustration with the ubiquity of the postcolonial approach to the European experience. His analysis of André Thevet’s (who is erased in the title) and Jean de Léry’s different accounts of their experience in Brazil simultaneously uses postcolonial concepts and attempts to distance itself from the politics of postcolonial theory. This dual movement creates a tension in Eriksson’s paper that is repeated again and again in his discussion.

Though deconstruction is often criticized for its relativism, it has a valid purpose from a political postcolonial perspective with regards to temporally speaking pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial texts. While the new critical approach to texts, which was dominant through the 1960s, emphasized the unity of texts and their self-containment as texts, deconstruction emphasizes the places where texts fall apart, where they become ambiguous or more or less openly contradict themselves. As the following discussion will show, Eriksson’s paper raises political concerns and contains unresolved tensions as a temporal post-colonial text.

With regards to white historical European texts in general, the postcolonial perspective can be simplified as either a political stance with the main agenda of exposing racial prejudice and exploitation in the texts, or as a placement of the texts in a historical perspective, i.e. highlighting that the interpretation of a text is taking place after the colonial era. The latter is, however, either explicit or implicit in all analyses of European texts that take place today since we are objectively living in a post-colonial time.

The question is only to what extent this is acknowledged in the analysis. This unavoidability of the post-colonial becomes particularly apparent in a text like Eriksson’s because it is about texts written by white Europeans who participated in the early attempts at colonizing Brazil. Eriksson acknowledges this in the opening paragraph (p. 68):

"For five years in the middle of the 16th century, the French held a small colony on the coast of Brazil, in the area of modern-day Rio de Janeiro. Given the name La France Antarctique— a France on the other side of the world—it briefly appeared to some to be the beginning of French supremacy on the American continent, and by others to be a second France, in a Protestant New World."
Eriksson’s distancing from postcolonial politics is repeated again at a later stage in the paper when he sets out his intent to compare the writings of Jean de Léry and André Thevet. He admits that his interest is in their ‘experience of the new territories’ and he explains again that he will not deal with the ‘issues of imperialism, nationalism and problems of racism highlighted by traditional historiography as well as by postcolonial theory’ (p. 75). That said, he also says that his interest is in ‘becoming-colonial’ which entails what might be called a spatial negotiation of identity; and the travel is then not only one of discovering and exploring the new and the other, or the invasion and imposition of power, but also, in its capacity of experience and memory to be lived and told, a risk of the loss or the changing of life or self (p. 80).

How can one deal with ‘becoming-colonial’ and not deal with what it means to be a colonizer? How can one deal with the spatial negotiation of identity and not deal with the pre-existing occupants of that space, i.e. the Other? Eriksson tries to. The question is how successful he is.

This trapeze act of wanting to use the analytical concepts of postcolonial identity theory but not wanting to deal with its politics is also evident in Eriksson’s approach to the term ‘savage’:

I retain the historically favoured designation ‘savage’, controversial though it is, as pertaining to the tribes of Native Americans, but also to the land and to the space as such, as it implies the encounter with or the experience of a dramatic novelty: that which is yet unrepresented (by ancient authority, by the Bible, by God) and that which must be represented, remembered, identified and incorporated (p. 70).

The use of the term ‘savage’ is reduced to ‘a dramatic novelty’ and disconnected from its social and political effects. Only it is not. Eriksson forcibly reinstates the political materiality of the concept of the ‘savage’ as part of 16th century colonial writing and complicates the representational implications of his own use of the term when he explains Renaissance interpretations of ‘the savage body/space’:

Because in all his strangeness and exoticism, the savage body/space bears no mystery; there is nothing behind the other – that is, no God, no faith, no salvation. This other world is either a clean slate for inscription or a blank surface of spectacle. Nudity represents, in this Renaissance imagery, a lack of properties, a sign of negation and privation (pp. 77f).

Rather than being ‘a dramatic novelty’, the physical markers of the ‘savage’ are signs of ultimate difference in a time when Europe was dominated by religious signification; it is a sign of godlessness. Though Eriksson then goes on to explain about differences in interpretation, this in itself complicates the straightforward use of the term ‘savage’ that he wants to claim for himself.

His own use of the term becomes further complicated when he contradicts his earlier claim to reject ethnography in favor of topography, and discusses Léry as a ‘proto-ethnologist’ (p. 77). His discussion of Léry’s aestheticization of the native body is meant as an example of appreciation, but it falls short and Eriksson himself admits that it contributes to a narrative of the native body as a ‘body of pleasure’, which contradicts the evocative distinction Eriksson has made earlier when he states that ‘There’s a fundamental difference between the idea of bodies to work with and bodies at work’ (p. 77). The rationally explained and aestheticized body is a body ‘to work with’ even if that work is object observation and differentiation in order to reconstruct a framework for European understanding and aesthetic pleasure. In postcolonial terms this is an act of representation that is not neutral but that evinces an assumption of European power and authority that negates the autonomy of the studied object and its rights as a subject to self-definition in the public space. Eriksson implicitly underwrites the European appropriation of the right to definition of the native. Eriksson claims, ‘The savage body gains a general, almost sublimated, kind of eroticism’ (p. 79). European representation is considered a ‘gain’ for the native body which is categorized as ‘erotic’ even in its everyday non-sexual performance, i.e. the native body is objectified and its sexual aspect is given pre-eminence. This is in postcolonial theory an example of representational exploitation.

**Conclusion**

In ‘Travelling Savage Spaces’, Eriksson wants to use postcolonial concepts but does not want to accept the political ramifications of postcolonial theory for his discussion of Thevet’s and Léry’s accounts of their encounters and experiences in 16th century Brazil. In summary, he compares their travel experiences and the effects of that experience on the construction of...
their identity. The repetition of the context of their experience as part of early colonial efforts in Brazil and the use of postcolonial identity theory as a means of analyzing their texts makes Eriksson’s writing problematic. The repeated bracketing of the politics of the postcolonial, however, creates a tension in the paper that highlights what it does not do. It is Eriksson himself who emphasizes that he does not want to deal with the politics of colonization or the complexities of the human power relationships it denotes and connotes. Nor does he want to deal with the effects of representation on the colonized but rather on the colonizer — though not as a European colonizer with all of its implications but neutralized into a human traveller, which just happens to be European. The effect of this is to draw attention to his problematic position and to his word choices and their Eurocentric slant and bias, e.g. colonization is an ‘adventure’, the foreign islands are ‘inhospitable’, a white European account of the colony is ‘the most authoritative’.

As stated in the introduction to this comment, his writing exemplifies modern European awareness and anxieties about our colonial history but also a certain frustration with the ubiquity of the postcolonial approach to the European experience. Eriksson’s states his objections to postcolonial theory as a political practice in the following two points (p. 69):

‘...there is a well-known anachronism to attributing an outright “racism”, in the restricted sense of this term, to 16th century clergies...’;

‘...theoretically, the relationship between colonizer and colonized presupposes a structure of unilateral activity, of principles of identity, and of binary opposition, which is still too grounded, I find, in an oppositional rhetoric of a metaphysical idea of subject/object-relations’.

Yet, Eriksson’s article does not deal with the complexities of defining ‘racism’ in a pre- or early colonial context. His second argument, that the conventionally accepted theory of the colonizer-colonized is based on subject/object relations, is contradicted by his own stance in which he reduces the natives and the territory of Brazil to a non-autonomous and non-responsive entity to which the European traveller must react and position him- (or her-) self. Eriksson thus effectively positions both the land and the natives as objects against which the Europeans, Thévet and Léry, as travellers must respond and reconstruct their identity — but without any real attempt at dialogue. The invalidation of dialogue is emphasized in a distance that is both temporal and geographic in Thévet’s and Léry’s accounts, which are created from memory and notes after they have left Brazil.

This emphasis on the European experience is what Eriksson attempts to deracialize, but as I have shown, it is possible to see that there are recurring points in his writing that highlight tensions in his own positioning with regards to postcolonial theory and colonization. Attempting to write about colonial texts and “becoming-colonial” without dealing with the politics of colonialism is a problematic stance — especially if the colonial context and the negotiation of identity are central to the discussion, i.e. made explicit and emphasized.
The Engineer Paradox: 
International Migration as a Patriotic Act

Per-Olof Grönberg

Introduction

Is it the lure of gold or other riches that causes a man to leave his native country and spend the rest of his life in some remote part of the globe, enjoying and gloating over an ever-increasing hoard of accumulated wealth? No! It is hardly that. A man, born with the inclination and capacity for solving technical problems, would never be truly satisfied until he reached the proper field of activity for his particular capability. If this is not available in his own country, he had to seek it outside of its border.

This celebration from 1938 of Swedish-American engineers and their capability and contributions to American society was made by Lawrence E. Widmark, a 1910 electrical engineering graduate from the Chalmers Institute of Technology in Gothenburg. He reveals a 'spirit' where national borders hardly mattered at all when an engineer sought employment. Widmark claimed that an engineer who moved on to relevant tasks did more to honour his native country than the one who remained in technologically less advanced surroundings where his skills were not in demand.

This paper takes as its point of departure the pre-1930 emigration and return migration of technical school graduates from Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden between 1880 and 1919. I argue that while the engineer's search for knowledge and experience was 'borderless', it often had patriotic elements and was constrained by their national allegiance. Contrary to Widmark's statement, most engineers returned and found their proper field of activity in their native countries. The foreign experience made engineers think and act differently than their more tradition-bound national colleagues but this was in part done because they thought a more modern and rational industry was the best alternative for their countries.

Both international and national

At first glance, however, Widmark's statement may seem relevant for a large share of engineers educated in the Nordic countries in the decades around 1900. No other professional group crossed national borders more often during this period. The Norwegian historian Gudmund Stang argues that the engineers accessed a more or less worldwide labour market from around 1850. In 1906, the student paper at Chalmers wrote that an engineer’s knowledge could take him to shipyards and mechanical workshops in America, to railway construction sites in Russia, laboratories in Zurich and draftsmen’s offices all over the world. Nearly half of the technical school graduates in the Nordic countries between 1880 and 1919 went abroad for employment and/or university studies during more or less significant periods. If we add study trips; shorter journeys abroad to visit power stations, workshops, factories and the like without taking employment or enrolment at an educational institute; the figure for the registered mobility rate is around 55%. However, many engineers probably omitted submitting information about foreign study trips to the editors of the technical school directories, newspapers, and so forth, on which these statistics are based. Therefore, this percentage is almost certainly too low.

Widmark was right about some of his colleagues and probably felt this way about his own emigration, but as indicated his conclusion does not give a complete picture of the 'international engineer' around 1900. The average engineer was rarely a man who spent the rest of his life in some remote part of the globe. The Norwegian-American historian Kenneth O. Bjork describes the difference between engineers and ‘ordinary’ emigrants in America in the following excerpt:

Unlike a large portion of those whom left the country districts of Norway to take up land in the Middle West, the engineers burned no bridges

1 Widmark 1938 pp. 409f.
2 Op. cit. p. 410; Widmark found his ‘proper field’ in New Jersey, where he became chief engineer for an electric motor company. He also published several articles on electrical engineering; see Bodman 1929 pp. 290f.
4 In these statistics, architects studying at the technical schools (does not apply to Denmark) have been included in the engineer-cohort. At least in Norway, the borderline between architects and constructional engineers was indistinct and the groups often performed similar kind of work.
Björk was not alone in this observation. In a speech held when returned Swedish-American engineers and architects gathered in 1901, engineer Ivar Svedberg claimed that technical migration to America was rarely in order to settle forever, but to return with new experiences and utilise them at home. A huge majority of the Nordic international engineers who migrated before 1930 also returned; almost 70% from Denmark, Norway, and Sweden and 90% of their Finnish colleagues returned. Those engineers who had left on state grants, etc. were more or less obliged to return with the new knowledge they had required, but most decisions were taken on an individual basis.

The borderless and worldwide labour market emphasised by Stang was thus mainly utilised temporarily. National borders rarely constituted an obstacle when engineers sought knowledge and experience, but the return rates underline Björk's and Svedberg's statements. The 1904 letter from the Swedish engineer Ture Steen, written to Sweden’s largest director J. Sigfrid Edström at the electro-technical company ASEA as a response to an employment offer, also reveals this spirit:

I must deeply regret, Mister Director, that it is impossible for me to accept your kind offer in the nearest future, because I think I am too young and inexperienced to be able to fulfil such a place you are offering me in a worthy manner. My intention is however, before I settle down in Sweden, to complete my two years of valuable American practice with 3 or 4 years of equally valuable practice in Germany, and after that I would most certainly be more mature for successful work in my own native country, where the railway problem still awaits its 'electrical solution'.

In order to contribute to a better solution of the Swedish railway problem, Steen thought he needed more training than the years at General Electric and a railway company in Los Angeles had provided. This can be interpreted as an example of the Norwegian technology historian Håkon Andersen’s argument that engineers on the one hand base their credibility and legitimacy on international experience, but they are still one of the professional groups who participate most in the race between nations with regards to prosperity and development. Migration with the purpose of learning in leading industrial and educational countries may be viewed as a means to ‘create’ this legitimacy and credibility. The Swedish historian of ideas Henrik Björck has emphasised that engineers’ interests in introducing and working with new technology is connected to (1) an interest in the technology as such, (2) raising the status of the profession and (3) a better individual position.

We may add a fourth criterion, a will to contribute to the native country’s technical, industrial and thereby economic development. The so-called development nationalism which flourished around 1900 emphasised a prominent position for the country in a peaceful ‘competition’ between the nations in industrial development. Norway and Finland gained full independence in the earliest decades of the century; the former through the dissolution of the union with Sweden in 1905, and the latter after the country had loosened its ties to Russia in 1917. Increased prosperity was ‘proof’ that these new nations were ready for independence, while in Sweden and Denmark it showed that the countries had entered the modern age and were able to reconstruct their status in a peaceful context. The engineers shared these views; many were recruited from the upper social strata and had often more or less strong ties to important industrial companies and sometimes also to state authorities. As industrialisation proceeded, engineers were viewed as heroes safeguarding industrial development and thereby national prosperity. Acquiring experience from

---

5 Björk 1947 pp. 35f.
7 Grönberg 2006 p. 182.
8 Letter from Ture Steen to J. Sigfrid Edström, January 22, 1904. In: J. Sigfrid Edström’s collection, volume 89, National Archives of Sweden, Stockholm. Original in

Swedish: Jag måste djupt beklaga, Herr Direktör, att det är mig omöjligt att i den närmaste framtiden antaga Edert vänliga anbud, emedan jag ännu anser mig för ung och oerfaren för att kunna värdat fylla en sådan plats Ni erbjuder mig. Min afsikt är emellertid att innan jag bosätter mig i Sverige komplettera mina två år av värdefull praktik i Amerika, med 3-4 års lika värdefull praktik i Tyskland, och skall jag helt säkerst därefter vara mera beredd och ofverfört att framgångsrikt arbeta i mitt eget fosterland, där järnvägsproblemet ännu väntar sin 'elektriska lösning'.

9 Andersen 1997 pp. 172f.
10 Björck 1987 p. 298.
the leading industrial countries – often looked upon as models – became in this context a means for engineers to reach a certain status in their native country and at the same time contribute to its development. As for Finland, technology historian Timo Myllyntaus concludes:

Both studying in a foreign Technicum or Hochschule as well as gaining practical experience in a foreign country were highly appreciated by Finnish employers and enhanced engineers’ social prestige…. studies and training abroad improved proficiency in language and gave prestige, which enhanced opportunities of finding a job in the home country… in Finland engineers with a foreign education composed a significant and influential group. Many of them rose to key posts in the Finnish economy and joined the leaders of the new establishment when Finland became independent in 1917.12

There was a clear connection between foreign experience and occupational careers; the ones who had been abroad were more likely to climb to top positions.13

If an engineer wanted to learn about rational workshop organisation, he went to America as it was considered the best place to learn this practise.14 An engineer who wanted to learn about reinforced concrete had no problems making his way to Hennibique in Paris, the subsidiary in Düsseldorf, or a construction firm in New York, Chicago, or Detroit. Those who sought knowledge related to modern shipyards left for Boston, Philadelphia, Kiel, Hamburg, or Glasgow. Colleagues who wanted to experience employment within an up-to-date electrical industry were not prevented from going to General Electric or to the larger electrical manufacturers in Berlin or Pittsburgh. Engineers seeking experience in modern iron works also found what they were looking for in Pittsburgh, the ‘Steel City’.15

Foreign experience and actions upon return

Whereas learning certainly was international and ‘borderless’, the exploitation of the acquired knowledge and experience can be interpreted as ‘national’. Besides a will to promote their own careers by accumulating human capital abroad, many engineers thus migrated in order to acquire useful knowledge for the native country’s technical and industrial development. Somewhat paradoxically, their migrations abroad can be viewed as patriotic acts. How was it reflected in their work that the engineers had performed these border-crossings and experienced more technologically advanced environments?

The engineers who returned from the leading industrial countries brought new ways of thinking and solving problems. First and foremost, they often thought in a more rational way about organising the work-process. The Danish engineer and returnee from America, Jens F. Engberg, stated the following in a 1920 lecture in Copenhagen:

It is not only Dr. Taylor’s principles of scientific labour management one can learn over there, but also the Americans’ inborn talent to do the things in an easy and quick way. ‘Efficiency’ is the slogan in an American factory, and the one engineer exceeds the other in thinking of things that make the production more economic and easy. The Americans possess the Germans’ talent for system, but have received practical talent instead of the Germans’ heavy thoroughness as a special gift from above.16

Many engineers had experienced the American efficiency and rational workshop organisation in a more or less Taylorist and/or Fordist way, and returned to act in accordance with these patterns. Frode Kjems had been in America twice and came to the Copenhagen company A/S Titan in 1920 and performed far-reaching rationalisations. Chief engineer Robert Lavonius at the linen and iron manufacturer in Tampere in Finland is another example. He justified his journey in his 1911 grant application by stating that America had reached the farthest when it came to effective

12 Myllyntaus 1996 pp. 150f.
13 Grönberg 2003 pp. 100-105.
14 This was for example expressed in a 1907 letter to a Swedish engineer in America from ASEA’s managing director J. Sigfrid Edström, himself a returnee from the United States, see Grönberg 2003 p. 145. Germany was, however, also admired in this field, see Nilson 2006 pp. 56-58.
15 Grönberg 2006.
organisation and rationalisation. The Finnish technical journal reported about his upcoming trip and wished him a journey rich in experiences and useful for Finland’s future industry. Lavonius’s stay seems to have been valuable. According to an article in Hufvudstadsbladet, he was successful in Tampere due to his experiences in the United States. Joakim Lehmkuhl, who started a workshop in Oslo, and Emil Lundqvist, who rationalised and introduced mass production at ASEA’s workshops in Västerås in Sweden based on their experience from Westinghouse in Pittsburgh and the electrical industry in Berlin are two other examples.

At the Swedish Sandviken iron works, Eric Esselius introduced the modernisation of the rolling-mill and the forging department. Sandviken’s former bookkeeper recalled the meetings with Esselius and described him as extremely Americanised. The major idea was to increase production and at the same time decrease the number of workers. One of his actions was to install mechanical receivers behind the tube mill and thereby replace twenty-five workers. ‘Automatic’ was a keyword: Esselius wanted automatic receivers, reels, weighing-machines, transport tracks, electrical elevators, turntables and the like. He based his ideas on experience from Carnegie Steel Company’s works around Pittsburgh, where he had spent twelve years and where automation had been driven the furthest in the world around 1900. Carnegie’s strategy to install automatic steel making equipment was copied by Esselius upon his 1905 arrival in Sandviken. His experience made him think and act differently compared to the traditional way of solving problems. The encounter with him was not always smooth, even if he had the support of the management group. Esselius’s ideas led to conflicts, both with elderly engineers and the labour union. Several strikes took place the years after his arrival.

Esselius was far from alone: every third leading engineer in the early twentieth century Swedish iron works had come into contact with Carnegie Steel, and at Koski in Finland, Albert von Julin undertook modernisations based on similar experiences. Hugo Hammar at Götaverken in Gothenburg, John Lake at the Hietalahti shipyard in Helsinki, Ivar Knudsen at Burmeister & Wain in Copenhagen, and Edwin Aarhoug at the Norwegian navy shipyard in Horten had all experienced modern German and American shipyards and returned to undertake modernisations. Georg Holm and Johannes Andersin performed similar modernisation of pulp and paper works in Finland after they had experienced modern machines and organisations on the other side of the Atlantic. All the engineers listed here are examples of how foreign experience influenced their thinking and how they acted to introduce rationalisation and modernisation upon their return home.

Conclusion

Late nineteenth and early twentieth century engineers were international, but at the same time often patriotic. On the one hand, engineers were more internationally mobile than any other contemporary profession. On the other hand, they undertook their migrations to acquire valuable knowledge and experience. We shall not exclude the criterion emphasised by Björck as important for the engineer’s will to work with and introduce new technology, nor should we create a clash of interests with them, but the engineers’ migrations were at least partly also in order to be able to contribute to development in their native countries. The paradox is that leaving their native country became in part a patriotic act. If the engineer identified a need for a more rational domestic industry, he went to America – and sometimes to Germany – and studied what was being done there in order to work with it upon his return. If there was a need for modernisation in the domestic steel and iron industry, the engineers often went to Pittsburgh to learn in order to bring back knowledge thought valuable for the development in their own country. If the electric industry needed new solutions with regards to turbines, circuit-breakers or the like, an engineer studied this at the larger American or German companies in order to apply his learning after he had returned home.

The engineers’ experiences of foreign environments made them think differently about technical solutions, as our examples have shown. Their border-crossings often led to a new and more modern way of thinking and acting. While their actions and proposals were made to promote their own careers, the belief that their countries needed new technology and ideas was also important.

---

17 Fellman 2000 p. 216.
19 Grönberg 2003 p. 178-183, and quoted references.
20 Grönberg (forthcoming) and quoted references.
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The paradox of migration and patriotism:  
A comment on Per-Olof Grönberg

Kristina Gustafsson

In his contribution to this volume PO Grönberg discusses engineers from Finland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden and their opportunities to go abroad and acquire experiences and knowledge about technology and engineering in the years between 1880 and 1919. Grönberg argues that while the engineers search for knowledge and experience was geographically unlimited it also had patriotic elements and was constrained by their national allegiance. He notes that this is somewhat paradoxical and in several senses an act of patriotism since engineers who gave priority to going abroad and emigrated in search of knowledge also came back.

Of course, as Grönberg writes, the individual engineers acted like this for many reasons. It could have been an interest in technology as such or in raising the status of the profession and acquiring a better individual position. Still, Grönberg suggests, we should not underestimate the dream of taking part in developing the home nation in peaceful competition with other nations.

By reading this paper one obtains a picture of ‘the engineer’. The engineer is a young man, from the upper echelons of society who has the opportunity to study and go abroad. One also obtains a picture of an international exchange system that obviously works and gives prosperity to all participants, the young engineers as well as the welcoming industries in different parts of the world.

Although technology is at the centre of this study I will in this comment exclude that and take a closer look at the concepts of patriotism and migration. This is of course a consequence of my own academic experience in understanding patriotism and migration versus a more limited exposure to the field of technology. Following Grönberg I will start by reminding the reader of the opening quote in his chapter:

Is it the lure of gold or riches that causes a man to leave his native country and spend the rest of his life in some remote part of the globe, enjoying and gloating over an ever-increasing board of accumulated wealth? No! It is hardly that. A man, born with the inclination and capacity for solving technical problems, would never be truly satisfied until he reached the proper field of activity for his particular capability. If this is not available in his own country, he had to seek it outside of its border.¹

I think that the opening quote by Lawrence E. Widmark is an excellent choice by Grönberg because it opens up the possibilities for several analytical approaches. The quote not only celebrates dedication to engineering but also tells the reader that this is about men – not just any men but men with special skills and capacities. In the quote Widmark praises these skills and describes them as borderless and because of that they should come first. A dedicated engineer does not care if he has to leave his country as long as he has the opportunity to do what is his true mission, using and developing technology.

From this quote and from the other stories where Grönberg deals with engineers, they seem to be representatives of the ultimate free autonomous individual who is so highly celebrated by modern liberal societies.

Still I cannot help but think how these borderless skills and capacities, which these young engineers have, are in several respects very much linked to nationality, sex, socioeconomic situation etc. With an approach that stresses not just individual possibilities and skills but also structures that favour and give privilege to certain capabilities I am inclined to ask in what sense the world is wide-open and borderless to different categories, women, people of colour, lower classes etc? This question will guide my comment.

The enchantment in reading about engineers

It is stimulating reading about engineers going abroad to receive an education and then returning to build up their country. Reading about them gives a glimpse into another epoch which nourished dreams about the future, development and prosperity. It is also an epoch when the idea of the nation was still strong, Nationalism and patriotism were considered natural since all human beings in some sense also were part of a greater whole, a ‘people’ with certain mental and physical conditions as well as carriers of

certain traditions, customs, languages, religions, etc. These ‘people’ were
the nation. This idea becomes clear also in this paper where engineers go
abroad to collect technological experiences and knowledge in an
international world but where the very same knowledge is still considered

While reading I can begin to appreciate the feelings of a proud mother
overseeing the success of her sons and their impact in society and in their
nation’s development. In that way the ‘sense of time’ is very well
formulated. I think it would be hard to think in the same way today about
my own sons going abroad and climbing the career ladder. Today I believe
being a cosmopolitan or world citizen would be a more appropriate dream
than taking part in national development.

Patriotism and the idea of the nation in the early 20th century

From my early days as a student in ethnology I know of these men,
Scandinavian engineers who did not just take care of the technology and
machines but were also involved in politics and the planning involved in a
growing, modern welfare society. At the turn of the 1980s, several
researchers at the Department of European Ethnology in Lund where I
studied, as well as elsewhere, were interested in ‘class studies’ and especially
in the upper classes or the bourgeoisie inspired by the theories of for
example Pierre Bourdieu, Michel Foucault and Norbert Elias.

The first book we read as students introduced cultural analyses in a study
of how the Oscarian bourgeoisie became established as a culturally
dominant and economically influential class in Sweden during the later part
of the 19th century. Another book was written by Lissie Åström and dealt
with three generations of upper class men. From these books as well as from
others we learned how the nation of Sweden developed hand in hand
with the notions of development, democracy, equality, etc. All these books
told stories about strong and determined Scandinavian men inspired by the
prospect of changing a traditional society into a more modern one.

The opening quote in Grönberg’s paper would fit very well into these
stories and so would the whole paper. The material is very interesting and
as I wrote initially a very interesting part of Swedish history. Like the

2 Ehn, Frykman & Löfgren 1993; Frykman 1985; Löfgren & Frykman 1979; Åström
1990.

3 The purpose in writing Den kultiverade människan (Löfgren & Frykman 1979) was to
get knowledge and understanding of the contemporary society.
Migration in a world without borders

If I find the story of patriotism enchanting and connected with feelings of pride I nevertheless find the idea of moving around in a borderless world even more challenging. As stated above about the young engineers being the ultimate autonomous individuals, their migration also seems to be a kind of ultimate dream. Just think about it, being able to go anywhere in a wide-open world. I think it would be useful to scrutinize the experiences of the engineers in this worldwide and borderless world just to dig a little bit deeper into how borders might be experienced and how they might be established in the intersection of different power relations and therefore I will look closer into the concept of migration.

The concept of migration

From my point of view, as a researcher within the field of international migration and ethnic relations this paper is about what we could call ‘spoiled’ migration and about privileged people managing in a changing world. In one revealing part of Grönberg’s paper he quotes the Norwegian-American historian Kenneth O Bjork who describes the differences between engineers and ‘ordinary’ emigrants, or what I would call ‘forced emigrants’ to America:

Unlike a large portion of those whom left the country districts of Norway to take up land in the Middle West, the engineers burned no bridges behind them; in fact a majority had every intention of returning to the homeland after acquiring experience, perhaps a fortune, and possibly, too, a great reputation. They had no farms to sell and no families to care for. A ticket for the voyage to America, a few dollars to keep them going until they found a job, some articles of clothing – these with exceptions were all that they carried with them. In a short time they would return to visit parents and friends in Europe; a few years more and they would return to take over engineering posts in Norway.

This quote involves an almost superior attitude and naïve celebration of how free and privileged these young engineering men are. From that aspect the concept of ‘spoiled’ migration seems quite well founded. But the concepts of ‘spoiled’ as well as ‘forced’ migration are of course not perfect tools and especially the concept of ‘spoiled’ might sound a bit sarcastic. There are several much more sophisticated ways to describe different forms of migration within the field of international migration and ethnic relations. For example the concepts of forced and voluntary migration are often used in contrast to each other. The engineers then would be voluntary migrants.

Another concept, which might be both descriptive and useful, is to call the engineer’s trans-migrants or cosmopolitans and to explore their position as cultural developers in a global world.

The concept of the transmigrant starts from the position people have living in diverse societies and nations and developing so called multi-local attachments as they are included in several cultural and social environments. Transmigration as well as the even more positively loaded concept embodied by cosmopolitan individuals presumes the possibility of moving several times and in different contexts and to different environments as well as to be influential in some respect. It does not necessarily mean that a transmigrant or cosmopolitan has acquired substantial financial resources or high social status; the situation of multi-attachment might occur anyway. But probably the possibility for most forced migrants to uphold and to return to their homeland is small, at least in a short-term perspective. The social scientist Erik Olsson has in several studies covering a period of over twenty years observed and interviewed Chilean political refugees in Sweden. In an appropriate title he paraphrases the situation of being a transmigrant as ‘living next door to an airport’.

I use the term forced and spoiled migration although they are somewhat stereotyped and are not so nuanced. My reason is that the word ‘spoiled’ underlines the aspect that this migration is not just voluntary but also possible because of the privileged status, which is not necessarily individual but structural. To be able to cross borders without effort, and to experience the world as borderless obviously is a privilege not possible for everybody, whether we categorizes migrants as voluntary, ordinary, or forced.

---

4 I will here make a cross reference first to Grönberg’s chapter where he gives reference to: Kenneth O. Bjork 1974, Saga in Steel and Concrete. Norwegian Engineers in America, Northfield, MN pp. 35f.

5 See e.g. Hammar, Brochmann, Tamas & Faist 1997 and 1999.

6 Basch, Glick Schiller & Szanton-Blanc 1994.

7 Olsson 2000.
About borders and boundaries

Obviously there are borders which the engineers experience by going abroad – namely national borders. In this case it is interesting to see how these borders seem to be open. They are like swinging doors that make it possible to move around and even be welcomed everywhere around the world. This was, I suppose, around the turn of the 20th century just as unusual as it is today. By that I mean that most people around the world have hardly ever been able to cross these borders without great effort and at great cost.

I think it is very challenging and important to both historically and contemporarily study the people who can cross national borders and move around the world. And, maybe this is to exaggerate or be speculative but it seems like these people, at least in this example, at the same time become the guardians of the very same borders as they see themselves – or are seen as by others – as national heroes taking part in the development of nationalism. This is obviously how they have been seen within those studies in ethnology, which I referred to earlier, as builders of the modern welfare nation.

Aside from national borders I think the concept of boundaries would be useful in this study. Boundaries are an analytical concept that refers to how links and borders are created, produced and reproduced between people in interaction. Very often researchers within the field of international migration focus on underprivileged people and how, what they call people at boundaries, are struggling with inequalities, constraints, stereotypes, power relations, imagined differences and distinctions that have an impact on people's lives. However in reading Grönberg's paper it becomes obvious that privileged people also deal with boundaries or at least take part in reproducing and defining them, often without being aware of it (probably).

Finally I will repeat my main reflections from reading Grönberg's paper. I think his research is an important contribution to the field of migration research where those who are privileged or to use my term 'spoiled' hardly ever are dealt with. Still, I think that it is of great importance also to make clear that beside this history about one category, there are others about people who cannot take part in this kind of migration nor patriotic project, not just because they lack the necessary skills, but because of their economic situation and level of education as well as their gender, ethnicity and/or race and obviously also because of the idea of nations. I believe that today within research there is a demand to make structures more obvious and not to fall into the trap of making something very exclusive seem 'normal', or 'neutral'. From a gender perspective for example, this is definitely a story about men, not women.

I think that a broader discussion about migration, technology and patriotism would be fruitful and that there are a number of perspectives from the field of international migration and ethnic relations, global theory, discourse-analyses, postcolonial approaches and gender-studies that could be useful for these kinds of discussions and analyses.

Bibliography:


Borders, boundaries are everywhere present in Peter Weiss’ last novel, Die Ästhetik des Widerstandes (1975-1980).1 Exiled in more than one sense, the life of the narrator, the novel’s ‘I’, is constantly defined by borders.

The nameless narrator (from now on I will refer to him simply as P) becomes excluded from his native Germany while still living there, when the Weimar Republic is overthrown by the Machtübernahme. In physical space, his exile turns into an odyssey through Czechoslovakia, Spain (where, once again, P’s place of living, the Spanish Republic, dissolves and disappears, defeated by Fascist insurgents), France, and finally to Sweden where he apparently has settled for good when the novel ends in the summer of 1945.

However, the political borders that are to be found on maps are probably the least important factors shaping and defining P’s life through the novel. Ever-present is also the intangible but very real border that separates the powerful from the powerless, the exploiter from the exploited – a border that the working man’s and woman’s bodies constantly experience in everyday life, in Karl Marx’ words the border defining the working class ‘in itself’. Ever present is its counterpart, the border that excludes P and his equals from immaterial riches: art, music literature, education, knowledge. Ever present are, finally, the borders that include and define the ‘imagined community’ that is central to P’s identity: the Proletariat, the working class ‘for itself’. However, during the time span of the novel (1937-1945) these

---

1 Only the first of the three volumes have hitherto been translated into English (The Aesthetics of Resistance, Duke University Press 2005). In this paper quotations are from Ulrika Waldenström’s translation into Swedish: Motståndets estetik. Stockholm: Arbetarkultur 1976-1981. The translations into English are my own.
borders delineate a mental space that is unstable, unpredictable, ever changing, where 'all that is solid melts into air'.

Peter Weiss’ novel is the object of several scholarly books and articles, which discuss issues of literary form, of political ideas or philosophical concepts. For this paper I have chosen a straightforward, one might even say naïve method of reading: I have used *Die Ästhetik des Widerstands* as a *chronicle*, a work that tells its reader about the events during eight years of 20th century history, and as taken down by a chronicler as he observes and participates.

This might seem outright absurd. Peter Weiss was not a historian but a playwright, author and painter. The book is a novel, as was the author’s intention – its front cover even bears the full title *Die Ästhetik des Widerstands. Roman*.

At the same time the text is a chronicle. The events did occur. The agents – well-known persons such as the physician Max Hodann, the member-to-be of SED’s Central Committee, Karl Mewis, the authors Bertolt Brecht, Karin Boye, Nordahl Grieg – did exist. And so did the less well-known: the Swedish civil servant Robert Paulson, the member of the Swedish Communist Party Sonja Hansson, the German worker Hans Coppi, member of the resistance group known as ‘The Red Orchestra’ and executed by the Nazis in 1942. In the multitude of personas there is but one who are fictitious: the protagonist/narrator *P*, modelled on Peter Weiss himself. He can be seen as a counterfactual hypothesis, the possible answer to a question put elsewhere by the author:

Wie wäre ich geworden, wie hätte ich mich entwickelt, wenn ich nicht aus bürgerlich-kleinbürgerlichem Milieu käme, sondern aus proletarischem?

In this paper I will not, however, deal with the events recorded in the novel-cum-chronicle. They are, after all, well-known and well described already. What interests me here is what the chronicle tells about the chronicler himself – through the events chosen and the events left out, through comments, reflections, actions. Or more precisely: how does *P* experience the borders – of exclusion and inclusion – that he encounters throughout the book? How do these borders contribute to shaping his life, his existence, his identity? And how do his life, his existence, and his identity contribute to the construction of the borders?

This may seem like an absurd choice of object for a historical study. Although he is set in historical reality, *P* is an altogether fictitious character. His thoughts, feelings and actions are henceforth not ‘real’, not proper parts of History. For the purpose of this paper I will nevertheless presuppose that they are real, that there is something to be learnt from the experiences of a purely literary character. Or, put otherwise, what we can say about Peter Weiss’ novel is what is said in the novel about Francisco Goya’s painting *El tris de Mayo*:

He projected an image in which every detail seemed to correspond with factual circumstances; still, nothing had ever happened exactly as depicted on the canvas.

Alongside the empirical starting point; the novel; there are also two starting points that will be used as a provisional theoretical foundation. One has to do with the part played by borders and boundaries in the forming and upholding of identities, while the other deals with where and from what substance boundaries can be created.

Furio Cerruti has, in a text dealing with group identities and political identities, suggested two metaphorical concepts that can be used as analytical tools: the mirror-identity and the wall-identity. The mirror-identity is dependent on the values, normative principles, life forms and life styles, within which a group recognises itself. This process essentially consists of the group members recognising or mirroring themselves in those values, and through this mirroring they form their image as a group ‘Self’, as something that gives sense to their behaviour as a group. The mirror-identity creates a ‘we’ but it does not create an ‘other’. The wall-identity, on the other hand, is more ambivalent. A wall gives support; it gives consistency to a group, preventing disintegration in times of political or social crises. A wall is also enclosing; it separates the group from other groups; it efficiently shuts out the Other. Which of the two walls will dominate or prevail depends on the wall’s constitutive elements (universal-integrative or self centred-exclusive) as well as on the trials (e.g. existential or political threats) to which the group is subjected.

Cerutti argues that in stable and prosperous societies the momentum of the mirror and the wall are in equilibrium. In such a society its members act in (conscious) unity, not primarily because they consider themselves

---


4 Cerruti 2001.
different from (and superior to) others, but rather because they share collective plans for creating a higher degree of autonomy, or well-being. Here, the wall’s supporting qualities are more important than its capacity to separate, enclose, exclude. In times of crisis or upheaval the equilibrium will be disturbed. The wall’s enclosing function becomes more important. Occasionally, if the group loses faith in the universalist values and virtues that previously served as guidelines for the future, the enclosing wall also becomes the only available mirror in which members of the group can recognise themselves. Identity is now defined by codes of separation and opposition directed towards everything external. Well-known examples can be found in 20th Century European history; Cerutti reminds us of fascist racism and ethnic nationalism, the radical class-consciousness of communism and fundamentalist sectarianism.

The Finnish geographer Anssi Paasi reminds us that since identity is intrinsically coupled to boundaries – symbolic, socio-cultural and/or physical dividing lines separating us from the Other – identity is not merely an individual or social category, but also – crucially – a spatial category. When drawing a boundary we therefore also create a place. A place, however, must not necessarily be of the kind that is found on maps, nor are boundaries necessarily physical, perpetually frozen lines in atlases. Paasi suggests that ‘place’ - the spatiality of personal life – also (or preferably) might be understood as a cumulative archive of personal spatial experience, which is not necessarily bound up with some specific location. This also gives the boundaries a liquid quality. Paasi quotes his British colleague Doreen Massey who has pointed out that even if places (in this experiential sense) do have boundaries round them these boundaries do not embody any eternal truth. Boundaries are socially constructed, and power relations are thus highly decisive for their constitution.

Living in exile means living outside a boundary, and being an exile (even when exile is self-chosen) is to be excluded. Following Paasi it is, however, reasonable to say that exile, as part of a personal spatial experience, also constitutes a place and that one might be bounded in exile. And, following Cerutti, the life in exile becomes part of the mirror forming the identity as well as of the wall that supports and delineates this identity. The place, the mirror, and the wall will be recurrent elements in my attempts to reconstruct the experiences of Weiss’ alter ego, the fictitious chronicler P.

---

5 Paasi 2001.

2.

P’s life as an exile is marked by the constant presence of excluding walls. As has already been said, this exile starts before P even leaves his native Germany where he suddenly finds himself in a foreign and hostile country, forced to hide his true self behind a sign on the door that says ‘Reader of the Völkischer Beobachter’:

Outside this cell, behind the disintegrating stone walls, the stair beams, the dark shaft of the backyard, nothing was to be found but hostility, interspersed with similar enclosed chambers, but they became much rarer, harder to find, or ceased to exist altogether.7

Encircled by enemy territory P leaves for Spain and the International Brigades where he serves as a medical orderly. Here, suddenly, mirror and wall are in equilibrium, the wall is no longer a wall of exclusion but of support. For a few months P is at home – till the disbandment of the brigades in September 1938:

Spain had become our country. We couldn’t face being expelled from our land. After deportation nothing but exile remained.8

From then on, P’s ‘proper’ exile begins and the walls of exclusion once again rise around him. This happens first in France, among other unwanted former volunteers, regarded more or less as criminals, and then, from November 1938, in Sweden. Here, too, he is regarded with suspicion, not much better than a criminal (the Swedish volunteers that went to Spain from March 1937 onwards were in fact criminals, even if the Swedish government in October 1938 entered a _nolle prosequi_ regarding their enrolment). He knows what is expected of him: to keep still, to keep silent, to deny all revolutionary inclinations. He has only his father’s good standing among European Social Democrats to thank for his temporary residence permit that is to be reviewed every third month and granted on the condition that he refrains from all kinds of political activity.

_It was this imposed dumbness that tormented me during the first month, and this dumbness was dictated not by a necessary political responsibility_.

---

7 Weiss 1976 p. 29.
Slowly, gradually P allows himself to rediscover the other wall, the secure and supporting wall, and to reassure himself that the old mirror is still there, just as it was in Spain.

However, in 1938, in the suffocating atmosphere of mendacity, deceit, and distrust that has filled Europe, it is hard to preserve faith in the familiar framework of values and norms that once were so convincingly obvious: the solidarity of the working class, the belief in the revolution. It is the wall, in its function of separating, which now acts as the mirror where P can get a glimpse of himself and of his fellow comrades.

The trouble is that he cannot accept what he sees. The separating wall is an ever-present reminder of the devastating split in the labour movement that is part of the explanation behind the triumph of fascism. The wall draws the line separating the loyal and the renegade; in the struggle against a formidable enemy, criticism from within the own ranks becomes a serious threat, and whomever the leaders deem unreliable must be thrown out of the community. A tactic and temporary deviation from the old principles but nevertheless a deviation that stains the mirror, that dims the promising picture of the future. P is constantly torn between the acceptance of what he is told is a necessity and the dreams and hopes that once led him to take a political stand:

Once again the problem arose how to behave if Party interests demanded that I should withdraw from my friends. Regarding the founding principles and aims of the Party I had no objections. For me, the Party had always been an immediately accessible tool in the struggle. It was the Party of my class. Even without a membership card I counted myself a member. I did not believe that by subordinating to majority decisions one also had to give up the independence and voluntariness that went together with joining the Party. But never could one be allowed to shove rationality into the background, never could metaphysical claims be accepted.10

He is not alone in this struggle. The physician Max Hodann, his friend and mentor all through the novel – in Berlin, in Spain, in Stockholm – confronts the Party commissars when he suggests that the wounded soldiers under his care should study and discuss the political development as it reached them through the news bulletins:

While Diaz called upon them to show ideological firmness did Hodann explain that our solidarity could never be harmed by our claims that even the politics we had chosen as ours should be subjected to criticism. Those who dared to speak out walked a tightrope, on the one hand eager to clarify, on the other hand anxious not to say anything that could infringe official decisions. We know, cried Hodann, that your stand is unimpeachable, you do not have to try hard to get the wording right, that you express yourselves as you have been taught, instead you should tackle that which is still undecided, inexact. But the inward tension, the fear of being accused by the Commissar, could not be eliminated.11

When the telegrams arrive telling the story of the Moscow trials (in March 1938) Hodann, too, is forced to take refuge in double think. The events, he says, must be interpreted according to principles that are necessary today; anxiety and insecurity cannot be allowed, the troops must stay convinced that the Soviet Union will come out of the fight with its inner enemies unscathed and strengthened.

There is but one voice of dissent, one voice that questions not only the debasing trials in Moscow but also the purge that has taken place within the Spanish republic, that even dares to defend the independent Socialist party POUM and its assassinated leader Andres Nin, but she is alone.12

Through her refusal to accept the dividing wall she meets a fate that is not only unavoidable, it is also forgettable:

It was no longer possible to help Marcauer, now that her warrant was issued. We wished to minimise the importance of the trials that awaited her. Surely Hodann's medical certificate would spare her a severe punishment. Her deeds would be acknowledged, her statements traced back to over-exertion. But at the same time we knew that we would push aside the thought of her who came from Hamburg, from a bourgeois Jewish family.13

12 It is worth noting (and has been noted before by many commentators) that it is the women in Weiss' novel who criticise the blindness and abuse of power on both sides: Marcauer, Rosalinde von Ossietzky, and P's mother among others.
The wall that contributes to P’s belonging to the working class for itself has taken the shape and character of another well-known wall: that of exclusion and deprivation, that which has marked P as a member of the working class in itself. One of the themes recurring throughout the novel is the experience of being deprived of art and literature simply because those in power also have had the power to deem others unfit or incapable:

At school, well into my twelfth year, I was subject to the brutal system under which we were brought up. Not a single teacher would ever, through encouragement have tried to help us develop our talents; we were, as children from a working-men’s district, predestined to becoming nothing, any word that bore witness of reflection was beaten down with fists and sticks.\(^\text{14}\)

P and his friends are constantly fighting these boundaries imposed upon them by others. They strive to expand their landscape of consciousness by making new interpretations and analyses of classic works, interpretations resting on their own experiences. They refuse to surrender to the conditions that have led so many workers into passivity and indifference and they demand the right to choose for themselves what to learn from. Leading Party members may condemn Kafka’s *The Castle* as decadent and recommend Klaus Neukrantz’ politically correct *Barricades in Wedding* but P refuses to choose. Neukrantz gave the clear-cut answers, spurred the reader to step in without hesitation, but equally necessary were Kafka’s ever present questions, asking for the meaning of what was discernible, the purpose of what happened. To give up Kafka is for P to give up the very reason why he has sided with the Party. The Party had been the wall of support, so indispensable in the struggle for independence and freedom to shape one’s future. Now this wall had become one of exclusion.

P understands very well the mechanisms behind this change. In a time of Fascism triumphant it is hard to keep trust in a future where the universal norms and values of the revolutionary labour movement can be realised. The wounded soldiers at the military hospital in Spain, the exiled Party members, the ones still living in Germany – they are all forced into passivity, put in a situation

…where partiality gave external unity, while discord, doubts, helplessness and anguish reigned within.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{14}\) Weiss 1976 p. 375.

There are but two alternatives left: either to stay on the chosen side of the wall, even if it might lead to actions contrary to your own beliefs, or to turn away and face a loss of history, a loss of roots, a loss of identity. In the former case the exile never becomes absolute and even if the identity might be battered and stained it can still survive. In the latter case one is relegated to a wasteland of despair.

Once again it was shown that exile took the strength only from them that didn’t know where they belonged, whereas for the others, those who had never forgotten their belonging, exile was just an interlude from which a fresh start was possible.\(^\text{16}\)

P can still put his faith in this feeling of hope during the last days of the war. In May of 1945, when his forced exile has come to an end, he corrects himself. There is no fresh start; the wheels cannot be turned back. The exile itself had provided a firm basis but now the ground is moving under his feet.

Over and over again it should be as if all previous expectations were thwarted inasmuch as the necessary conditions had ceased to exist. But even if things didn’t turn out as we hoped it never changed the expectations. The expectations would prevail. Utopia was necessary.\(^\text{17}\)

During the eight years there had been but a few brief glimpses of equilibrium when P had been able to experience the mirror and the wall in balance. These periods can be described as times of open conflict rather than of crisis, periods when hesitation is superfluous, when the only possible alternative presents itself as a matter of course, when answers are as simple and straightforward as in Neukrantz’ novel. Most of the time the image in the mirror is blurred and the wall is a threatening obstacle that efficiently blocks all attempts to raise questions and, like Kafka, asks for the meaning of what was discernible, the purpose of what happened.

The boundaries that thus define and delineate P’s identity also define and delineate his ‘place of experience’, the spatiality and the temporality of his life that shape his identity and at the same time are shaped by those actions, thoughts and feelings that are dependent on that very same identity. And the place, as Anssi Paasi says, is not bound to a specific

\(^{16}\) Weiss 1981 p. 325.
physical location but follows $P$ as he moves through the Europe of the cartographer, it changes under the influence of events and actions.

3.

But still... what is the point of analysing the identity of a purely fictitious character, a novelist’s fantasy?

Let it first be said that the aim of this paper is very modest. It is not to say anything definite and certain about identity formation among exiled members or sympathisers of the Communist Party during World War 2. It is nothing more than an attempt to contribute to the search for a point from which a further exploration of the self’s – any self’s – experiences could start.

The historian’s plight is that all historical studies have human beings at their centre. True, one can try to eliminate the problem by concentrating on the surroundings that may be reconstructed from reliable and verified sources. One can also, from the same sources, reconstruct the actions performed in the past. But humans do not act at random, nor as puppets that involuntarily react when the threads of the structural web are pulled. Humans may act unintentionally or after careful deliberation, but to describe or analyse human behaviour while leaving human consciousness out of the account means that we are telling stories full of gaps.

Historians are by no means unfamiliar with lacunae. Our sources are full of them. We reconstruct a meaningful whole out of fragments and we embed our conclusions in careful phrases such as ‘most plausible’ or ‘highly probable’. As the Danish historian Erik Arup wrote in 1914, writing history is to creatively narrate over those facts that can be verified, from them all, not against them or beyond them.\textsuperscript{18}

Can consciousness be ‘creatively narrated’? Can we ever enter the mind of another person? Once again, historians do that all the time. We make assumptions about rational behaviour, we speculate and formulate hypotheses about what’s going on inside the heads of historical persons: ‘It is highly unlikely that Disraeli, under these circumstances, would have...’ And in the same way we construct fictitious representatives, Weberian ideal types, to whom we assign the motives and deliberations that are necessary in order to make their actions rational and understandable.

\textsuperscript{18} Arup 1914. The Danish original has ‘digte over Kendsgerninger’. The verb ‘digte’ has no exact correspondence in English.

We are, however, very careful when doing this. Maybe even too careful? Surely it is possible to create a narrative of not only decisions but also underlying thoughts and feelings from verified facts, all facts, as long as we do not go against them or beyond them?

Novelists do.

Peter Weiss’ own comment on the topic might be a bit far-reaching for the conscientious scholar, but there might also be something to learn from it:

\begin{quote}
All this has really the same degree of truth as the experiences of the so-called real world. And what is the real difference, when looking back into the past, between the devised and the actually experienced – in both cases it is no longer possible to catch, to verify, the real and the invented are, qua past, of the same substance.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

The British literary scholar David Lodge has argued that literature, and especially literary fiction, gives us the opportunity to possess a continuum of experience that we never are able to do in reality. Lodge takes Kate Croy, one of the characters in Henry James’ novel The Wings of the Dove, as his example:

\begin{quote}
Kate Croy is not, was not, a real human being, who could report her experience. There is no empirical reality against which we can check the truth of Henry James’s account of her consciousness. It cannot be regarded as scientific knowledge. However, it is also true that we read novels like The Wings of the Dove because they give us a convincing sense of what the consciousness of people other than ourselves is like. We feel we have ‘learned’ something from them; we have acquired new information.\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

There is much to be learnt from Peter Weiss’ work, and not least a convincing sense of what it could have been like to live in the exile community of revolutionaries, radicals, and anti-fascists during the war; struggling to maintain beliefs and stable points of reference in a world full of contradictions and change.

It cannot be regarded as scientific knowledge. But through it we can acquire new information. Herein lies a contradictory statement, albeit one that maybe should not be taken too seriously – history does but rarely produce scientific knowledge. If the framework is reconstructed of verified

\textsuperscript{19} Weiss 1985 p. 372.
\textsuperscript{20} Lodge 2002 p. 30.
facts it should not be impossible to meticulously (re)construct thoughts and feelings in a way that allows us to say what Peter Weiss said about the characters in his novel:

I have tried not to charge them with anything that they could not have done or said.

Borrowing a dichotomy – or, rather, a complementarity – from Jerome Bruner, we may say that Peter Weiss succeeded in creating a narrative marked by verisimilitude. After reading Peter Weiss' novel we (or some of us) put the book aside with the feeling that we have been in touch with an experience of borders, exclusion, inclusion that is, somehow, 'true to life'. Maybe not true in a scientific sense, but right. Can that feeling be used when we, as historians, try to understand the past?

Verisimilitude, Bruner says, does for narrative what verification and verifiability does for science and logic. Still, although a lot has been said and written about how we can find and define truth, much less is said about what makes anything truth-like. For historians, who write narratives of a particular kind, there might be good reasons to dig deeper into the relationship of (narrative) verisimilitude and (scientific) verifiability, to get a grip on the constituting elements of the two, of how they differ from one another, and of the relevance of this difference.
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Towards a Phenomenology of Borders: A Comment on KG Hammarlund

Jonas Hansson

There is a close relationship between borders or boundaries and identities. Borders are necessary for making definitions, a word derived from the Latin noun *finis*, meaning limit or boundary. Arguably, the practice of definition is necessary for the construction of identities. The border cannot be thought without the identity. The border defines what is home and not-home (exile). Like borders, identities always separate us from others (alienating us, exiling us). As a consequence, identities may be dependent on physical and geographical positions, on space. It is this logic of border/space/identity that KG Hammarlund expands on in his thought-provoking text on Peter Weiss' novel *Die Ästhetik des Widerstands*.

Hammarlund draws on Furio Cerutti's distinction between a) the mirror-identity and b) the wall-identity for the understanding of the novel's 'I':

a) Members of a group mirror themselves in (universalist) values, and recognise themselves in this mirror. It creates a 'we', but it does not create an 'other'. Members are not primarily viewed as different from others.

How does this relate to the logic of the definition, above? According to this logic, definitions (of borders/identities) always produce both a 'we' and a 'them'. On the other hand, definitions are spatial metaphors (the limit, the boundary), and we should perhaps ask ourselves whether spatial metaphors are as essential in the case of values as in the case of boundaries (although a mirror, of course, needs a place to hang).

b) The wall gives support and prevents disintegration. It is universal and integrative but it can also become enclosing, leading to the exclusion of the others. In prosperous societies, collective plans shape identity, and the wall's supporting qualities are more important. Exclusion defines identity when a people fall upon hard times, in times of crises, e.g. in fascism and communism.

Cerutti discusses forms of group identity. Is this discussion of the identities of groups relevant for the analysis of Weiss' novel? I am thinking of the distinction between social identity on the one hand and personal identity on the other. Between the mirror and the wall stands one single man, the novel's 'I', in the text also called 'P'. However, with Anssi Paasi's concept of identity as a spatial category, 'place', which Hammarlund also brings into the discussion, we are dealing with 'the spatiability of personal life' as a 'place of experience'. This is pertinent for the novel's 'I'. The 'place' follows the 'I' as he moves through Europe. Hammarlund speaks of 'the spatiality and temporality of his life' (p. 125). In the *Ästhetik des Widerstand*, both political borders and social borders (borders of exclusion as borders of exile and borders of deprivation) play important parts. Hammarlund registers a double movement. Borders contribute to shaping the life and identity of the novel's 'I', at the same time his life and identity contribute to constructing the borders. Identity comes across as something fluid, changing over time, with movements in space. Who is 'P', really?

Life in exile becomes part of the mirror as well as of the wall. Germany becomes a wall of exclusion; in Spain, the mirror and the wall are in equilibrium, the wall is a wall of support. France and Sweden are experienced as walls of exclusion, although momentarily the supporting wall and mirror are in place in Sweden. The mirror stands for values, 'the solidarity of the working class, the belief in the revolution' (p. 122), while the separating wall acts as mirror when it is a reminder of the split in the labour movement, and (Stalinist) tactics of denunciation seem to 'dim the promising picture of the future' (p. 122). The pattern is thus one of crisis – equilibrium/open conflict – crisis – equilibrium/open conflict, where equilibrium is reached when hesitation is superfluous (and belief is strong).

It is not easy to tell to what extent the walls and mirrors are 'subjective' and 'objective' phenomena. On the one hand, I guess that Hammarlund would want to argue that they are 'seen' as such by the narrator, since he reads the novel as 'P's own experience of the history between 1937 and 1945. On the other hand, the mirror and the wall are supposed to be group identities. This points to a structural peculiarity of the novel, i.e. the admixture of autobiographical and historical ingredients. It is a document of both personal and collective experiences (a 'chronicle' is Hammarlund's choice of term). It seems to be impossible to separate the experiences of the
novel’s ‘I’ from those of his friends, or personal identity from social identity. ‘P and his friends are constantly fighting these boundaries imposed upon them by others’, Hammarlund comments (p. 124). That is to say, personal identity is bound up with the identity of the working class. While the supporting wall is the wall of inclusion, the wall of exclusion is the wall of deprivation. Hammarlund interestingly compares the two kinds of walls to Marx’s distinction between the working class ‘for itself’ and the working class ‘in itself’. The boundary is defined by the workers ‘for themselves’ when they believe in their (universalist) values (the mirror of the future revolution), while they are defined by others only in relation to their current position in society (the wall erected from without).

In the novel the universalist values are represented by communism. But how is this to be squared with Cerutti’s view of communism as a ‘crisis’ identity, and as such dangerous to others, the excluded? This is alluded to when the ‘I’ in several places in the novel is speaking of his and his friends’ hatred of the bourgeoisie as a defining moment of their world-view. More generally, one may ask how wall and mirror relate to the question of universalism versus particularism? Which metaphor is most apt to describe communism (Stalinism) of the 1930’s and 1940’s? Perhaps this is the key to the identity trouble of P?

The communist party is crucial for P’s identity (the working class for itself, representing the consciousness of the proletariat) as well as for his identity trouble. In Hammarlund’s words, ‘The party had been the wall of support […] Now this wall had become one of exclusion’ (p. 124). This ambiguity of communism was demonstrated by the Berlin Wall, the ‘anti-fascist defence wall’ (the metaphor as the real thing), defining the (anti-fascist) identity of the German Democratic Republic through a double movement of inclusion/exclusion, where ironically the included became excluded, and the excluded would remain included. The party thus acts both as mirror and wall in the struggle between fascism and communism. Taking these metaphors as our point of departure, we can imagine the political struggle as an everyday reality, as embodied politics, occupying places and erecting walls within and without. The novel is in fact staged as an ideological drama.

The relationship between personal identity and social identity is presumably always problematic. The relationship between the ‘I’ and the working class (represented by the party), is made difficult when the ‘I’ is forced to perform ‘actions contrary to [his] own beliefs’, by the very same party that functions as the only ground for the belief in the necessary victory of working-class values (‘utopia’). The alternative would be ‘absolute’ exile, a ‘wasteland of despair’, resulting in loss of identity (p. 125). In psychoanalytical terms we can say that the party oscillates between being a good family and being a dysfunctional, even schizoid, family.

So who is P? And who is the subject of the novel? Weiss called Ästhetik des Widerstand’s his ‘desired biography’ (‘önskebiografi’). But what is desired here? The understanding of the novel thus hinges on the fact that the ‘I’ somehow according to its author is a false identity (although making use of Weiss’ own biography). Of course, the narrator is fictional or fictitious, since it is a novel. But can it also be seen as in some sense faked? Are we justified in interpreting the ‘desired biography’ as an effort by Weiss to break away from his own bourgeois environment, his ‘place of experience’, a ‘resistance’ as much to his own origins as to fascism (or perhaps bourgeois society as the putative origins of fascism)? The novel holds up the working class as an object of identification (desired object), as a substitute home for the exile (as Marx and Engels said, ‘the working men have no country’). As the moral subject of the narrative, the working class speaks through the ‘I’. The novel on this reading would be nothing less than the mise-en-scène of the ideal subject of history (the consciousness of the proletariat), a phenomenology of the proletarian Spirit, a reconstruction, to be exact, of the experiences of the proletarian ‘I’ during the 1930s and 1940s.

‘I come out of my hiding place’, was the title of a speech held by Weiss at Princeton University 1966, when he emerged as one of the leading writers of the New Left. His earlier hiding places were associated by him with his bourgeois background.² If we, as Hammarlund suggests, regard ‘place’ as bound up with identity, then the change of place also entails a change of identity. The hiding place of the bourgeois subject is abandoned by the engaged writer, seeking a new identity as a working-class hero (the ‘desired biography’, his ‘compensatory proletarian alternative/parallel life’).³ Seeing the bourgeoisie (bourgeois family) as the hidden/displaced boundary/identity to be ‘overcome’ (as ‘false consciousness’) through the fictitious biography, would also explain the enigmatic construction of a passive narrator.⁴ As a spectator, the ‘I’ betrays the author’s real bourgeois identity
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1 Quoted in Bergh 1999 p. 7.
(namely a lack of real experience from the battles of the working class; for example, contrary to the novel’s ‘I’ Weiss never went to Spain).

Can consciousness be ‘constructed’? This important question is raised in the final methodological section by Hammarlund. Now, as a trained historian he is of course aware of the problems involved, but still he is inclined to give an affirmative answer. He mentions the possibility of making assumptions about rational behaviour, following Weber in the (re)construction of ideal types. ‘Surely it is possible to construct not only decisions but also underlying thoughts and feelings from verified facts […].’ (p. 127). He agrees with Arup that historians creatively construct their narratives from facts, not against them and not beyond them. But must you not go beyond the facts to ‘construct’ one person’s consciousness of history?

Being an historian of ideas I believe that it is possible to reconstruct ‘thoughts and feelings’, although I would at the same time like to be able to differentiate between ‘reconstructing’ and ‘constructing’ history, without denying the merits of novels in helping us to a better historical understanding.

Going to the Ästhetik des Widerstands, there is a difference here between Weiss, who is to some extent using his own memories, and the historian, who will have to look for other sources. But is the novelist interested in ‘what actually happened’? About the characters in his novel, Weiss writes: ‘I have tried not to charge them with anything that they could not have done or said.’ Now, this is the fundamental difference, according to Aristotle’s Poetics (1451a38-b7), between poetry and history. Whereas the historian deals with what in fact happened, the poet tries to show us what could and would happen. Is Weiss’ poetic strategy (Hammarlund speaks of ‘experiences of a purely literary character’, p. 119) also valid for historians?

According to Hammarlund, the aim is not to (re)construct what actually happened. He is much more interested in the possibility of (re)constructing experiences. This takes us back to the question of individual vs. collective consciousness (the ‘I’s’ relationship to the class). Given Weiss’ lack of personal working class experience, perhaps the possibility of historical understanding in his case is grounded in the partaking of the ‘consciousness of the proletariat’ (if that entity has any phenomenological meaning)? In other words, is not Weiss relying on his ability to identify with the ‘consciousness of the proletariat’ as the ‘horizon’ from which the (hermeneutical) reconstruction of the events between 1937 and 1945 becomes possible, in order to be able to construct/impersonate the memory of the ‘I’ as/in the role of a working-class hero?

Every (re)construction of experience necessarily implies a perspective from somewhere, a given place (‘horizon’). Not even the (pseudo)universal consciousness of the proletariat can do without the singular experience. That is the explanation why Weiss needs his own ‘subjective’ memories to supplement the ‘objective’ communist interpretation of the events in the 1930s and 1940s. Therefore, any (re)construction of a subject’s experiences (implicitly or explicitly) involves the notion of what Merleau-Ponty has called ‘the body subject’. This seems to me to be corroborated by Hammarlund’s discussion of the border/space/identity-complex.

With Paasi, Hammarlund views exile as part of a ‘personal spatial experience’ (p. 120). As mentioned earlier, Hammarlund is mainly interested in experiences, experiences of borders to be exact, and the idea of Ästhetik des Widerstands as a reconstruction of the experiences of P (pp. 118f). But at the same time he is aware of the further possibilities of this approach, when he states that the aim ‘is nothing more [or less, we may add] than an attempt to contribute to the search for a point from which further exploring of the self’s – any self’s – experiences could start’ (p. 126). Although the focus is on human consciousness, it is important to notice that consciousness cannot be separated from bodily experience, for example in the ‘constant presence of excluding walls’ (p. 121), or when P’s home in Germany turns into a ‘cell’ (quotation p. 121). In other words, ‘mental space’ is always tied to bodily experience. This goes for the experience of borders too; as underscored by Hammarlund a border is something ‘that the working man’s and woman’s bodies constantly experience’ (p. 117).

However, this applies only to the working class ‘in itself’, in their experience of exclusion. The working class ‘for itself’, on the other hand, is to be regarded as an ‘imagined community’, where the experience is one of inclusion. Could this be maintained as a phenomenological fact? Can values (as mirrors) function as a non-spatial (thereby non-excluding) basis for identification? Since values like the ‘utopia’ are not ‘in’ time and space, they have no borders either. But then again, does ‘value’ correspond to any phenomenological fact?
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Anti-Englishness and Sectarianism in Scottish Sport and Society: the '90 Minute Bigots'

Ronald I. Kowalski

Introduction

As Grant Jarvie and Ian Reid concluded, ‘... sporting culture... is invariably political' and that of 'stateless nations, arguably, is more acutely political...'.

Few would deny their conclusion. Yet with respect to Scotland it does beg some questions. What is Scotland, and what is its political and sporting culture? Territorially, the Scots have had no doubts for centuries, and for decades the major roads leading from England have had signposts welcoming visitors to Scotland – though (Sir) Alf Ramsey, manager of the English football team which won the World Cup, apparently expressed some pithy doubts about the welcome his English team would receive in 1966. Quite why too Berwick Rangers play in the Scottish football league as geographically the town itself is several miles south of the historical border with England is a peculiarity. Yet English and Scots alike for long have accepted this fact with equanimity, despite a recent poll conducted by Independent Television's main terrestrial channel in which just over 60 per cent of the town's inhabitants voted to become part of Scotland.

To a West and North European audience this undoubtedly appears to be a trite statement of the obvious. But elsewhere the 'Berwicks' have become hugely contested: in former Yugoslavia; and in the Transcaucasian republics of the former Soviet Union.

For the Scots territoriality is not a problem. But an acceptance of territorial borders (or geographical space) per se does not necessarily lead to the creation of a homogeneous and benign community. This is certainly true of Scotland. Internally, fundamental divisions persist. Sectarianism, rooted in a centuries' old Protestant hostility to Catholicism, is a far from resolved problem. Historically, racism became as much part of this hostility as religion. In the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the Irish, or Scots-Irish, long were regarded as an inferior and dangerous species. Another distinct, if still relatively under-researched, element of racism persists in Scottish society, in what is an overwhelmingly white society. The small Asian community certainly has been subject to racist abuse and assault. Whether the English minority living in Scotland – over 400 000 according to the 2001 Census and certainly then outnumbering all the other immigrant communities in total – has suffered similarly is less certain.

The purpose of this paper is to explore these darker sides of Scottish society though the prism of sport. Why sport, some may ask? One persuasive answer was given by Patrick Reilly, Emeritus Professor at the University of Edinburgh. In 2000 he astutely developed the conclusion of Jarvie and Grant about the politics of sport and remarked that with respect to prejudice, certainly in Scotland, sport (he meant football) 'was always less circumspect in concealing [it]' He repeated more bluntly this conclusion some four years later: sport reveals 'insights into the nastier corners of [Scottish] society...'.

The ways in which sport has reflected these 'nastier corners', the sectarian (and racial) divisions that many consider continue to blight modern Scotland, and also a seemingly lurking anti-Englishness, are the issues that demand renewed consideration. Recent causes célèbres in football have cast fresh light on sectarianism, while new research has raised doubts whether the majority of Scots harbours much antipathy towards the English. This exploration will inevitably have to confront the persisting Scottish myth, 'wha's like us' (who is like us?), and re-examine just how open, inclusive and welcoming 21st century Scotland is.

1 Jarvie & Reid 1999 p. 98.
2 Sunday Herald 17.2.2008.
During the 2006 World Cup Finals the newspaper columnist for the Guardian, Simon Hoggart, wearily mused on what he described as the time and emotional effort wasted by the Scots in wishing England nothing but failure in the competition. It was a manifestation, he concluded, of the Scots simply ‘detesting the English’. He could have added that this sentiment also was evident during the 2002 World Cup Finals when the appeals of numerous politicians, including leading members of the Scottish National Party, for the Scots to grow up, jettison their antipathy and support England reportedly were met with near universal derision. This contrasted markedly with an opinion poll conducted during the 1998 World Cup which found that three fifths of those questioned wished England well. The fact that the Scottish team had qualified for the 1998 tournament might explain why public opinion was more favourably disposed to England. 2002 and 2006 were different cases.

Two months after Hoggart’s plaint Roy Hattersley, once Deputy Leader of the Labour Party, returned to this theme. He too sadly reflected that the response of many Scots to the 2006 World Cup – ‘Anyone but England’ – reflected the ‘deeper malaise’ of a still strong, if outdated anti-Englishness within Scottish society. What he failed to comment upon was the anti-Scottish bile directed by many in England towards Andy Murray, the rising Scottish tennis star, two months earlier when he joked (so he claimed) that he would support anyone playing against England. Perhaps, as a Scottish columnist in the Guardian surmised, some populist editors of the dreadful tabloids were simply playing to, or winding up their majority English audience. Most probably, Hattersley quite understandably missed this very small report in the paper for which he writes and arguably would have questioned the tenor of the attacks on Murray.

And yet it would be foolish to dismiss their gloomy thoughts out of hand. At first sight the history of Anglo-Scottish sport (football for much of the twentieth century and rugby union since the 1970s) seems to bear out Hoggart’s and Hattersley’s pessimism, that sentiments approaching xenophobia towards England and the English were pervasive north of the border. Many academic commentators previously had reached similar conclusions. Bert Moorhouse, for one, contended that as far as Scotland was concerned sport had nurtured a continuing national resentment against England. Sport has not necessarily been the ‘benign’ symbol of the nation posited by Mike Cronin and David Mayall.

It is historically true that many Scots have taken great delight in any victory over the ‘auld enemy’ (and no doubt will continue to do so). For long the popular Scottish press had nurtured this sentiment by evoking folk memories of Bannockburn on the eve of any encounter with English teams. But whether delight in victory and a failure to rally behind England amounts to chauvinism or xenophobia is another, much more problematic matter. The polls conducted in 2002 and 2006 revealed little of the reasons why the majority of Scots refused to support England. Moreover, the anecdotal evidence offered by some participants at the conference of the British Society of Sport Historians in 2006 – ‘I faced abuse in Scotland for being English’ – is scarcely scientific.

Let us examine the evidence. As a submerged nation within an English-dominated state, sporting encounters, especially against England, acquired great importance. Victories evoked great rejoicing, and on occasion generated much vitriol. Yet in themselves they fail to prove conclusively a hatred of England and all things English. The matter is considerably more complex. Here we must consider what Neal Ascherson in his Stone Voices – the Search for Scotland identified as ‘the St Andrew’s fault’. Scots, he argued, remain full of ‘self-doubt’ and lack ‘self-confidence’ about their own identity. Or as another ex-pat Scot, Andy O’Hagan, more recently and much more damningly described his nation: ‘A delinquent spoiled brawling child tight in its tartan babygro, addled with its punitive needs and false memory syndrome.’ The paradox is that the Scots have much to be proud of as a nation. The US historian Arthur Herman quite recently has lauded the philosophical importance of the Scottish Enlightenment in shaping the way in which the modern world has seen itself, to which could be added the many medical, scientific and technological advances pioneered by Scots, from the telephone to TV, pneumatic tyres to modern roads, anaesthetics to antibiotics. Yet for all these seminal achievements, politically Scotland did remain submerged, and most Scots remained unaware or curiously dismissive of their achievements. Compensation was sought by an emphasis on the ‘wha’s like us’ myth.
For many Scots, football epitomised this myth despite Scotland’s repeated failures on the world and European stage from the 1950s. Matches against England seemingly became a matter of life or death, to quote the late and great Scottish manager of Liverpool, Bill Shankly. Reflecting on the annual football fixture against England in 1974 Ian Archer, football correspondent of the Glasgow Herald, pointed out that it had become a Scottish ‘virility symbol’, if one ‘elevated out of all proportion.’ Victory, especially against England, ‘brought hope and stature to a nation so often insecure and concealing of its insecurity and provided solace ‘for a lost and neglected land’. The humbling of England by the Wembley Wizards in 1928 achieved legendary status in Scottish folklore, as did the 3-2 defeat of England, then world champions, in 1967. Such victories, achieved with a swagger, certainly reinforced the ‘wha’s like us’ mentality, yet were not accompanied by any perceptible display of hatred of England or the English.

However, the 1970s revealed a darker side, one verging on xenophobia, to this mentality. In the encounter in May 1974 that had prompted Archer’s musings on Scottish identity, Scotland convincingly defeated England 2–0 at a Hampden bedecked with Lion Rampant flags. The victory, however, was marred by chants of ‘We hate the English’, which degenerated into chants of ‘if you hate the fucking English, clap your hands’. These were later condemned by Frank McElhone, the Under-Secretary of State at the Scottish Office, as an ‘ugly manifestation of Scottish nationalism’. The rise of chauvinist sentiment continued during the 1976 Home Nations championship. When England came to Hampden, the (British) national anthem was greeted with a barrage of booing. In part, this was caused by the refusal of the Scottish Football Association to adopt ‘Flower of Scotland’ as its own anthem, a move favoured by much of the Scottish press and the Scottish team. Why, some Scots felt, could not the English have the sense to adopt their own anthem? Some acerbic wits north of the border, prompted by the apparent antipathy of many England supporters to Germany, recently have suggested the Dambusters march as appropriate.

Without wishing to minimise the ire roused over the anthems sung or not, other reasons must be sought for the groundswell of anti-English feeling expressed at Hampden Park in the mid-1970s. Among others
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dug up parts of it as souvenirs; and broke the goalposts. The question is what did this behaviour signify? Writing in the *Daily Mirror* on the morning of the game Frank McGhee concluded that the bi-annual descent of Scots on London had become an 'unpleasant, ugly and idiotic' experience, with the city under siege from hordes of lurching and drunken Scottish hooligans. It would be naïve to deny a degree of truth in McGhee’s assessment. But his reports on the Monday after the game were disproportionate, and tinged with an element of his own xenophobia. The headline run by the *Mirror* was 'Jock the Ripper', and McGhee castigated the Scottish supporters for their arrogance, stupidity and violence. The *Sun* adopted a similarly intemperate tack, describing 'boozed supporters' going 'on the rampage'. Some quite costly damage was done to Wembley, yet the Minister of Sport, Denis Howell, and the Metropolitan Police, agreed that the Scots had been euphoric rather than vindictive. There is little to indicate that anti-English xenophobia had inspired the Scots supporters to act as they did. As the *Herald* 22 years on commented, the English media reaction to 1977 had been ‘vicious and unjust’.18 However, fixtures against England still evoked a level of passion, and some instances of thuggery. The last Home Nations fixture at Wembley in 1989 certainly was marred by a degree of violence. Some English politicians were outraged, with the Conservative MP for Hayes and Harlington, Terry Dicks, venomously condemning the Scots as ‘pigs and animals’. Xenophobia apparently was more marked south of the border. It would be hard to contest that a minority of Scots fans (sic) had gone to London intent on wreaking mayhem, as the Scottish press conceded, if not on the grounds of a deep-rooted towards the English. More likely, organised hooligans, the so-called ‘casuals’, who had grouped around leading clubs north and south of the border in the 1970s and 1980s, had planned to use the occasion to confront their rivals, and other unsuspecting bystanders. What the truth of the matter was is difficult to untangle. Yet there are grounds to suggest, as the *Scotsman* did, that racist National Front ‘hangers on’ who had infiltrated the English support were as much, if not more, culpable for sparking off the violence than the ‘lunatic fringe’ which had followed Scotland to London.19 To the relief of many Scots, 1989 marked the end of this experience, with the city under siege from hordes of lurching and drunken Scottish hooligans. It would be naïve to deny a degree of truth in McGhee’s assessment. But his reports on the Monday after the game were disproportionate, and tinged with an element of his own xenophobia. The headline run by the *Mirror* was 'Jock the Ripper', and McGhee castigated the Scottish supporters for their arrogance, stupidity and violence. The *Sun* adopted a similarly intemperate tack, describing 'boozed supporters' going 'on the rampage'. Some quite costly damage was done to Wembley, yet the Minister of Sport, Denis Howell, and the Metropolitan Police, agreed that the Scots had been euphoric rather than vindictive. There is little to indicate that anti-English xenophobia had inspired the Scots supporters to act as they did. As the *Herald* 22 years on commented, the English media reaction to 1977 had been ‘vicious and unjust’.18 However, fixtures against England still evoked a level of passion, and some instances of thuggery. The last Home Nations fixture at Wembley in 1989 certainly was marred by a degree of violence. Some English politicians were outraged, with the Conservative MP for Hayes and Harlington, Terry Dicks, venomously condemning the Scots as ‘pigs and animals’. Xenophobia apparently was more marked south of the border. It would be hard to contest that a minority of Scots fans (sic) had gone to London intent on wreaking mayhem, as the Scottish press conceded, if not on the grounds of a deep-rooted towards the English. More likely, organised hooligans, the so-called ‘casuals’, who had grouped around leading clubs north and south of the border in the 1970s and 1980s, had planned to use the occasion to confront their rivals, and other unsuspecting bystanders. What the truth of the matter was is difficult to untangle. Yet there are grounds to suggest, as the *Scotsman* did, that racist National Front ‘hangers on’ who had infiltrated the English support were as much, if not more, culpable for sparking off the violence than the ‘lunatic fringe’ which had followed Scotland to London.19 To the relief of many Scots, 1989 marked the end of the annual encounter with England. Not least amongst them was the Tartan Army, Scotland’s self-appointed legion of ambassadorial fans who followed the team abroad but disassociated themselves from the ‘amateur
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reflected, was to remove ‘the burden of emotional expression’ that the Scots had placed upon football. Reporting on the failure against England in 1999, Brian Meek concurred. Football did not simply matter as much to the Scots as it once had, though he did remain critical of the Scots ‘immaturely’ drowning out the national anthem at Hampden. Collier’s perceptions notwithstanding, and despite the fact that these last encounters with the ‘Auld Enemy’ were scarred by occasioned violence in Glasgow and London, by all accounts caused by a small minority of English skinheads, aided and abetted by some Scottish ‘scum’, there was little to suggest xenophobia on either side of the border. Yet reviving an annual fixture, many concluded, would do little to create a healthier, more mature relationship between both nations. Whether the Scottish nation has reached maturity quite yet is another question. However, as Ian Bell cautiously pointed out, 46 % of Scots now looked to the new parliament in Edinburgh to provide a better future, 31 % to Europe, and only 8 % to London – while conceding an adolescent anti-Englishness still lurked in the hearts of some Scots. So there are some grounds for hope that, as Ascherson suggested several months before the 1997 referendum convincingly approved the creation of a Scottish Assembly, for most Scots now ‘there [was] more to being Scottish than a desire to thump Englishmen’, even on the football field. How well founded these optimistic conclusions are is an issue to which we shall return shortly. Certainly they run counter to Collier’s perceptions of anti-Englishness. The question remains to what degree Scottish resentment was the product of Tony Adams, the England captain, proclaiming England’s undoubted superiority – and the issue of the national anthem yet again, with even the Scottish Conservatives, diehard Unionists, moved to protest about the latter. The decline of football as a fulcrum of Scottish identity coincided with rugby union becoming an increasingly nationalist, even chauvinistic, arena for the expression of the concerns and aspirations of many Scots... Before the 1970s, the annual fixture against England generated little of the popular frenzy that football against the ‘Auld Enemy’ had. Class had much to do with this, as many historians have argued. Outside the Borders it had remained the domain the upper and middle classes, educated in elite public schools where they acquired a sense of Britishness. This legacy was to mute the intensity of Anglo-Scottish rivalry on, and off, the rugby field for a century.

Since 1970, not the 1990s as some erroneously contend, rugby union itself has become caught up in the swell of the new nationalism, especially evident when England visited Murrayfield. It was relatively muted in the 1970s. In 1971, for example, the Scottish press complaining about a pro-English bias in the BBC when it failed to report Scotland’s crushing victory in its news broadcasts. However, as the nationalist tide swelled during the Thatcher years, so did the passion surrounding rugby, arguably reinforced by the pride taken by Scotland’s success in winning the ‘Grand Slam’ in 1984, the first since 1925, and the concomitant decline of Scottish football. National fervour reached extraordinary heights of intensity in March 1990, when the English came north again, for a match of unprecedented importance, with not just the Calcutta Cup, but the Triple Crown, the ‘Grand Slam’ and the (unofficial) title of champions of Europe at stake. The fervour was fuelled by much-hated the poll tax, which according to the Scotsman had become a real threat to the Union, as Scotland had been the testing ground for it a year before it was imposed in England. The national anthem was another source, with many Scots and much of the press approved the creation of a Scottish Assembly, for most Scots now ‘there [was] more to being Scottish than a desire to thump Englishmen’, even on the football field.

The Scottish team itself was conscious enough of its potential place in history. It had prevailed upon the SRU to agree that two verses of the ‘Flower’, just adopted as the official anthem of Scottish rugby, be sung on the day – and the Glasgow Herald obligingly printed them on its front page. When the teams took the field, with the Scots marching out like gladiators, the crowd erupted into voice. The singing of the ‘Flower’ ‘certainly stirred the blood of every Scot’, as Bill McLaren, the doyen of rugby commentators, recalled. The Scottish XV was inspired and, contrary to English predictions, defeated an England team that hitherto had seemed to be unstoppable. Afterwards, there was much rejoicing in the streets of Edinburgh, to use another famous McLaren-ism, with many Scots on London – while conceding an adolescent anti-Englishness still lurked in the hearts of some Scots. So there are some grounds for hope that, as Ascherson suggested several months before the 1997 referendum convincingly approved the creation of a Scottish Assembly, for most Scots now ‘there [was] more to being Scottish than a desire to thump Englishmen’, even on the football field. How well founded these optimistic conclusions are is an issue to which we shall return shortly. Certainly they run counter to Collier’s perceptions of anti-Englishness. The question remains to what degree Scottish resentment was the product of Tony Adams, the England captain, proclaiming England’s undoubted superiority – and the issue of the national anthem yet again, with even the Scottish Conservatives, diehard Unionists, moved to protest about the latter. The decline of football as a fulcrum of Scottish identity coincided with rugby union becoming an increasingly nationalist, even chauvinistic, arena for the expression of the concerns and aspirations of many Scots... Before the 1970s, the annual fixture against England generated little of the popular frenzy that football against the ‘Auld Enemy’ had. Class had much to do with this, as many historians have argued. Outside the Borders it had remained the domain the upper and middle classes, educated in elite public
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mence 14 years earlier had defended the singing of the national anthem, was
illuminating. In an editorial on the morning of the game it had come out
vehemently against ‘God Save the Queen’. It described it as an ‘awful
dirge’, an ‘obsequious hymn’ lauding the vanquishing of Scotland by its
oldest enemy which Scots had sung for far too long! Thank God, too, that
even the highly conservative SRU had come to its senses and embraced the
‘Flower’, which would help all Scots reacquire an identity long ‘suppressed’.
Middle-class Scotland, or a significant part of it, had found one voice! It
was not alone. The Scotsman published a letter critical of the English
Broadcasting Corporation (in fact, the BBC) for the notable absence in its
5.00 p.m. national news broadcast on Saturday of any mention of
Scotland’s victory. If England had won, the letter added, in all probability
it would have been a leading item! In an Editorial the Scotsman was equally
scathing of the BBC denying the SNP any response to the forthcoming
budget. Unless equal treatment was applied to the SNP, then no party
should have the right to defend or attack the budget. Those interested, after
all, could tune in to the proceedings of Parliament, which now were
televised.

A year and a half later, in October 1991, rugby union witnessed another
outpouring of national passion. Before the semi-final of the World Cup
between England and Scotland, to be played at Murrayfield, Gordon
Brown, an ex-international forward, declared: ‘The people see this game as
more than a rugby match. This is about life and politics in Scotland, the
poll tax and Whitehall rule. Even the players say, while they like to beat
anyone, even Japan, and love to beat the Welsh or Irish, they live to beat the
English.’ A current Scottish player agreed. Given the sad decline of
the Scottish football team, he anonymously stated, rugby had become the
symbol of nationhood. ‘So I dare say,’ he continued, ‘we have been chosen
in this match to right the ills of Thatcherism, the poll tax and the
Westminster government. You might say the people see us playing for the
rugby-loving Celt Kinnock [leader of the Labour Party] against the cricket-
loving, po-faced English government.’ Yet some were anxious that there
was a darker side to this upsurge of national identity. In the Scotsman, Nick
Cain feared that Scottish patriotism was becoming xenophobic and turning
into a blind hatred of all things English, while Brian Meek in the Glasgow

Herald cautioned against ‘tribal outpourings of bile about the English.’ If
so, it was not confined to Scotland. Messages of support for the Scots, so
the Glasgow Herald claimed, were received from Ireland, Wales, Australia,
New Zealand, and even the United Arab Emirates! Scotland lost by the
narrowest of margins, 9-6, and was not to defeat England again until 2000.
The game in 2000 again evoked much national fervour, and no small
trepidation. The hitherto rampant English, it seemed, only had to turn up
to walk off with the ‘Grand Slam’. The bookmakers certainly thought so,
making England 14–1 odds on favourites to win. Astonishingly, Scotland
won, inspired, as Andy Nicol, the Scottish captain declared, by the zeal of
the crowd, which sang the ‘Flower’ with a gusto and passion not heard
since the early 1990s. Victory caused great rejoicing. Yet it also was the
occasion for more mature reflection about Scottish identity. John Beattie, a
former international forward and then rugby correspondent for the Herald,
admitted that denying England the ‘Grand Slam’ was ‘so sweet’. But he also
raised serious questions about the nature of Scottish national feeling in the
21st century. Echoing Cain’s and Meek’s observations some nine years
earlier, he was highly critical of the apparent xenophobia of many Scots:

The trouble with hating the English is if that’s your sole reason to cheer on
… a Scottish team, then we are sunk as a country. When things get so bad
that the English race is the target of our hatred, then it just goes to prove
that we have reached an all time low.

It was time, he implied, for the ‘new Scotland’, with its devolved assembly,
to transcend defining itself simply by antagonism to England. Scots must
grow up and take a more positive view of themselves, as the SNP earlier
had urged with its new vision of an independent Scotland in Europe
promulgated in 1988. Some seven years later Beattie rather sadly added that
English rugby supporters had ‘stooped to our level’ and become much more
overtly and vociferously ‘anti-Scottish’. Quite why this is the case as yet
has not been fully researched. Devolution is probably part of the answer as
well as the increasingly aired argument that higher levels of public spending
and better public services in Scotland are funded by the English taxpayer.
However, this is a matter for another article, or for my English counterparts
to explore.

Beattie’s pessimistic conclusions warrant serious attention. Nevertheless, it is quite possible that he exaggerated the ‘hatred’ of his countrymen and countrywomen towards the English. Writing in the Guardian Lesley Riddoch, English by birth but Scottish by parentage and upbringing, was considerably more optimistic. Recent studies, she argued, suggested that ‘anti-Englishness is on the wane’. The large English minority in Scotland (8% of the population) seemingly is no longer subject to the levels of harassment, or simple verbal abuse, it once endured. The Commission for Racial Equality confirmed that this was the case, though the question does remain open whether all cases of verbal abuse have been reported, or just ignored as the ranting of some individuals. Devolution, she concluded, had worked. Echoing Bell’s earlier optimism she averred that Scots now focused their grievances on the Scottish Assembly, not on the English and an English-dominated Westminster. Optimistic as Riddoch’s assessment is, there remains a problem with her analysis.

First, some recent studies cast doubts on the intensity of the anti-English sentiment that she had presupposed. Let us return to Watson, who cautiously concluded that it would be unwise to confuse a climate of anti-English feeling’ painted by the media, and one must add by the anecdotal accounts of English football and rugby supporters, with the experiences of the English living in Scotland. Other migrant communities, he continued, particularly those from the Indian sub-continent have experienced far worse, with their property and persons much more often subject to violent assault. Welcome as his conclusion with respect to the English if not Asian community is, perhaps he remains far too sanguine about the degree of anti-Englishness that afflicts the Scots. Most significantly, in February 2008 the Moderator of the Church of Scotland contended that anti-English sentiment was still rife in Scotland. Her statement prompted many immediate responses, not least by the highly respected paper, Scotland on Sunday. On its behalf Eddie Barnes, an Englishman living in Scotland, conducted a personal, admittedly not socially scientific, investigation amongst his fellow English living in Scotland. His findings echoed those of Watson. He reported that when it came to sport English ex-pats were still saddened that many Scots refused ‘to ditch their knee-jerk opposition to England’ and continued to take much satisfaction from England’s failures. Yet he also discovered that few of his English compatriots in Scotland felt
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being fully behind England. Which nation, many of them wondered? Arguably, most Scots were simply weary with all the media ‘hype’ surrounding England, and not inspired by a deep-rooted Anglophobia, as the Guardian had reported four years earlier. The media coverage of rugby union has been afflicted by a similar myopia, at least in the eyes of many Scots. The classic case surrounded the game in 1990, when even the Times conceded that reporting in England had been hubristic. With unwitting irony it added that it had no doubts that the all-conquering English XV would destroy the Scots. Bill McMurtrie, rugby correspondent for the Glasgow Herald, exasperatedly illustrated this phenomenon. A Scottish supporter, he reported, wondered if the English team had flown north, adding that it ‘could have travelled by a balloon powered by all the hot air generated south of the border in the past ten days or so.’ Several days later, Brian Meek recalled that just before the game began Nigel Starmer-Smith, a former international English scrum half and then a television commentator, had asked him if the Scots were ready to take ‘their punishment’. It was little wonder, Meek continued, that with such attitudes the English were little liked wherever they went. The Bannockburn spirit (another Flodden was unthinkable) was roused, with the Daily Record imploring the Scottish team to send the English home ‘tae think again’! Ironically, media hubris served England badly. As John Jeffrey, a Scottish wing-forward on the day, recollected: ‘The English were more talented than us but they believed the [media] hype…. They thought they only had to turn up to win…. They were cocky, way beyond arrogant.’

Accordingly, it is possible to suggest that there is far less fundamental anti-Englishness in 21st Scotland than the pessimists fear and that manifestations of it reflected in sport are ephemeral. Most English migrants seemingly have been accepted in Scotland, and perceive themselves to have been so. Yet that should not be taken to mean that the Scots are universally tolerant of all incomers. An opinion poll conducted in September 2002 by System Three found that one-quarter of Scots questioned considered themselves to be ‘racist’. One opinion poll is far from conclusive as historians, and political scientists, know all too well. But research carried out by YouthLink Scotland during 2007 revealed that 60 % of young adults felt that there were too many immigrants in the country. Quite why this was the case was not explored in detail, with some attributing it to fear of loss of employment opportunities and others to scaremongering by the media. What is clear is that the ‘One Scotland, Many Cultures’ campaign launched by the Scottish Parliament in 2002 still has some way to go in its promotion of multiculturalism and tolerance. As has its efforts to extirpate sectarianism within the country…!

Sectarianism

Sectarianism, as the historian Tom Devine remarked some years ago, has been Scotland’s shame. In particular, anti-Catholicism has been a persistent feature of Scottish society since the Reformation. It was strengthened in the second half of the 19th century by the influx of hundreds of thousands of Irish Catholics, fleeing poverty, and famine, for employment in Scotland’s (and England’s) then new industries. In a staunchly Presbyterian country they were subject to discrimination by the dominant Protestant, even racist, majority, which looked down upon the Irish as an inferior species, ‘white negroes’ in Joseph Bradley’s pithy aphorism. The ‘Kirk’, the established Protestant Church in Scotland, embraced and proselytised this myth well into the first half of the twentieth century. John White, one of the leaders of the Church of Scotland before the Great War, had no doubts that the Irish immigrants were a race of a lower order than the Scots Protestants and campaigned for their forced deportation. Defending himself against charges of bigotry he countered that his campaign was ‘a racial rather than a religious matter.’ Writing almost a century later Willy Maley, Emeritus Professor of English Literature at the University of Glasgow, and a self-professed atheist, concurred. He observed that ‘anti-Irish racism remains one of the longest lasting and most lamentable prejudices afflicting modern Scotland.’

Before proceeding, however, it is necessary to consider the issue of terminology. What is sectarianism, as opposed to discrimination or bigotry or prejudice? Reflecting on bigotry, the press and radio commentator,
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Nicky Campbell, himself a Scot, remarked that racism was easier to categorise, as enmity was directed against those of a different 'skin'. The question of bigotry as opposed to partisanship, even pride as opposed to prejudice was a 'much greyer area'. His uncertainty reflected a heated debate within Scotland’s intelligentsia on this very question. Michael Rosie and David McCrone argued that discrimination is a form of systematic behaviour which deprives the groups discriminated against of 'jobs, housing and educational and other social opportunities...'. On the basis of this definition, they concluded that there was no measurable evidence to support the view that Catholics in modern Scotland were subject to discrimination. Sectarianism could not be measured so precisely, as it was a matter of 'attitudes and prejudices', a 'street-level bigotry'. ‘Shadowy’ as this concept is it will be deployed in the remainder of this paper, even though Rosie subsequently muddied already murky waters further by redefining sectarianism as ‘systematic discrimination’ and '[w]hat passes for sectarianism in modern Scotland is better described as bigotry or prejudice.

Undoubtedly, sectarianism did recede but not disappear in the later 20th century. Even Paul Dimeo and Gerry Finn, who remain critical of the divisions that continue to bedevil Scotland, conceded that '[r]emarkable advances have occurred in inter-communal and inter-faith relations... especially over the last thirty or so years. As Bert Moorhouse pointed out, recently 40 % of all marriages were 'mixed', between Protestants and Catholics, a figure that has risen to 50 % more recently. John Foster concurred, contending that sectarianism remained held in check even in the grim 1970s when unemployment rose to over 100 000 and 'the troubles' in Northern Ireland escalated into terrible violence. The report commissioned by the Scottish Government, Religious Discrimination Sectarianism in Scotland: A Brief Review of Evidence (2002-2004), also suggested that discrimination certainly was on the wane though a poll conducted by NFO System Three Social Research in May 2003 found that 13 % of the respondents claimed to have suffered sectarian abuse.

Welcome as most of these conclusions are, recent episodes in football have revealed a disturbing persistence of sectarianism.

Football in Scotland historically has been blighted by sectarianism. Its major locus, and the focus of most research, has been the rivalry between the 'old firm' Glasgow Celtic, founded by and associated with Irish Catholics, and Glasgow Rangers, the epitome of Protestantism and the Orange Order in Scotland. This is unsurprising as 'religious hatred and sectarianism [has been] particularly prevalent in the west of Scotland'. Yet it has not been confined to there. Similar, if less well-known, divisions are to be found in Edinburgh. Hibernian (Hibs) emerged from the expatriate Irish community there while Heart of Midlothian (Hearts) manifestly remain part of the Protestant ascendency. This was revealed at the Scottish cup semi-final between Celtic and Hearts in April 2005 when a large and vocal section of Hearts’ fans refused to honour the minute’s silence in memory of the late Pope John Paul II.

However, a number of worthy initiatives have been taken in football to stamp out sectarianism. The first, ‘Bhoys against Bigotry’, was sponsored by Fergus McCann, the Canadian businessman who took over Celtic in the mid-1990s, and only belatedly taken up by David Murray, the Rangers’ chairman, in 2002. Fairness, however, requires acknowledgement of earlier steps made by Rangers. In the late 1980s Murray did support the then manager, Graeme Souness, when he had the temerity to abandon a century old rejection of signing Catholic players. Welcome as these moves have been, they have not eliminated the problem of sectarian violence. In previous papers and articles, the spate of stabbings and arrests since the mid-1990s in the aftermath of matches between the clubs was presented. Let us recall the worst of them, briefly: a Glasgow schoolboy, Mark Scott, died in one such case in October 1995, seemingly for just wearing a Celtic scarf; and in May 1999 one Rangers fan was beaten to death in West Lothian, while another 16-year old Celtic fan, Thomas McFadden, also was stabbed to death. At worst, some researchers claim that there have 11 sectarian murders since the mid-1990s. Others suggest only five – only five?

As Bert Moorhouse pointed out, 13 % of the respondents claimed to have suffered sectarian abuse. In Devine 2000, p. 200.
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wearing the wrong football colours. Such tragedies led to legislation by the Scottish Executive in June 2003 that ‘allowed police to treat religious [sectarian] hate crimes as an aggravated breach of the peace’. Yet the problem persists. The number of prosecutions for sectarian abuse or violence, virtually non-existent before the 2003 law, rose from 450 in 2004 to over 500 in 2005 and then to over 700, with the vast majority again following the ‘old firm’ clashes. The change in law most probably led to such crimes being formally recorded. While 90% of these cases involved no physical assault, and thus in the opinion of Steve Bruce, Professor of Sociology at the University of Aberdeen, indicated ‘religious intolerance was a minor problem’, others would disagree as other recent history reveals sectarianism, and its potential for violence, has not gone away.

Let us consider two well-publicised, yet arguably not isolated, instances. The first concerns Neil Lennon, a Northern Irish Catholic who joined Celtic in 2000. In 2003 he was attacked on the street by two students, one of whom was reading Medicine, for no other reason than that he was a Catholic and then captain of Celtic. As he acidly remarked, this assault unquestionably demonstrated that bigotry in Scotland was not simply a loutish working-class phenomenon but pervaded what might paradoxically be described as the ‘upper depths’ of Scottish society. A few years earlier, Donald Finlay, a well-regarded Scottish lawyer and then vice-chairman of Rangers, had been captured on video, singing along about how gleeful he was to being ‘up to his knees in Fenian [Irish Catholic] blood’. Lennon added that he had found bigotry to be more intense in many places outside Glasgow. While he did not specify where, one can surmise that he had some staunchly Protestant towns in Ayrshire and Lanarkshire in mind.

Another recent cause célèbre again has involved Rangers, or at least a section of its support. After its home and away ties with the Spanish side, Villareal, in the Champions’ League on 22 February and 7 March 2006, Gerhard Kapl, an Austrian UEFA official, brought a case against Rangers for tolerating sectarian chanting and songs. Kapl’s case was incontrovertible. Press reports confirmed and video evidence clearly revealed a section of Rangers’ support profaning the Pope (Fuck the Pope). Some supporters were also caught singing that charming (sic) ditty known as ‘The Billy Boys’. One (abbreviated) version follows:

\begin{verbatim}
Hullo! Hullo! We are the Billy Boys
Hullo! Hullo! You’ll know us by our noise
We’re up to our knees in Fenian blood
Surrender or you’ll die
For we are the Brigton [sometimes Derry] boys
\end{verbatim}

(Sung to the tune of Marching through Georgia)

What was far more curious was that UEFA’s Control and Disciplinary Body (CDB) absolved Rangers’ fans of ‘discriminatory chants’. Its justification for doing so was Kafka-esque. The words of the judgment speak for themselves: the CDB conceded that ‘supporters have been singing the song the ‘Billy Boys’ for years during national and international matches without either the Scottish football or governmental authorities being able to intervene. The result is that this song is now somewhat tolerated.’

Scottish Catholics, one can but imagine, certainly do not tolerate it, apart from Michael McMahon, the Member for the Scottish Parliament for Hamilton and a Celtic supporter, who contended that the Old Firm ‘anthems’, and the flags flown by Celtic supporters (the Irish tricolour) and by Rangers supporters (the Red Hand of Ulster), are no more than ‘[g]enuine expressions of Irish and Ulster-Scots culture [and] have been demonised unfairly and labelled as sectarian.’ Who indeed is like us, if an elected politician in Scotland can put forward such an argument, with little regard for the potential harm done by the perpetuation of such symbolic divisions? The tricolour no doubt is like a red rag to some Scottish
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Protestant bulls but it is not necessarily a sectarian flag. It can be regarded more benignly as an emblem of Celtic’s Irish historical roots and those who condemn it have no idea that it was devised as a symbol of the unity of all the Irish, Green and Catholic and Orange and Protestant alike.

In another sense UEFA was correct in its judgement. For over a century the Scottish Football Association (SFA), the police and the press in fact have tolerated sectarianism. Graham Walker’s denials that this has been the case cut little ice with many Scottish, not just Celtic, fans.69 In a refreshingly direct article in the News of the World, the sports journalist, Davie Provan, and let it be said clearly, a former Celtic player, launched an assault on Scotland’s ‘shame’. The authorities in Scotland, the SFA in particular, Provan contended, had woken up 100 years too late to the problem of sectarianism. Few demurred, at least openly, though Provan cited a spokesman for the Rangers Supporters Trust: ‘UEFA have found Rangers not guilty. This sends out a message that these chants may be unpleasant and offensive but they are not discriminatory. Education is the key, not condemnation.’ Perhaps education is central to an answer to the problem, but banning the offensive arguably is also a key part. How do you re-educate a bigot, Provan mused, before insisting that the only way forward was for the authorities to wade in to arrest and then convict those found guilty of sectarianism. He added too that, unlike David Murray, he did not believe in the idea of ‘90 minute bigots’, with sectarian bile capable of being turned on and off like a tap.70 Maybe Steve Bruce, who has studied sectarianism in Scotland extensively, if only to minimise its presence, should pay more attention to Provan. Bruce’s rather sanguine depiction of an educated professional attending an Old Firm game; hurling sectarian abuse ‘with ironic detachment’ and singing vile songs simply as a ‘wind up’; and then returning to his comfortable middle-class, non-sectarian home where he (yes, usually a he) returns to a tolerant normality arguably requires further consideration.71

The patient and thoughtful listener or reader now must wonder where Celtic fit into this gloomy saga. Considerable credit is due to its directors for eliminating most of the paramilitary chants in support of the IRA that were heard at Parkhead in the 1970s and 1980s. The vast majority of its supporters responded to such initiatives. The Fields of Athenry is still sung but it is a lament for old Ireland, neither offensive nor sectarian and

Certainly not an IRA anthem. As Lawrence Donegan observed, the notion of a parity of prejudice or bigotry in Scotland is unfounded: ‘the sectarianism found at Ibrox [the home of Rangers] is worse than anything you will find at Parkhead…’72 Moreover, Celtic supporters were rewarded for their increasingly mature behaviour by being granted the Fair Play award from UEFA for their conduct at the UEFA Cup Final in Seville in 2002.

Problems persist, however. Peter Lawwell, chief executive of the club, conceded that some of Celtic’s away support had not yet risen above their historic bigotry. Brian Quinn, the club chairman, also admitted ‘offensive songs and chants’, e.g. The Boys of the Old Brigade which did celebrate the IRA, often were prevalent at away fixtures in Scotland, if not Europe, though what measures were to be taken to curb them were left vague.73 Indeed, elements of the away brigade appear to have let the club down again, for singing alleged sectarian songs in the Camp Nou in Barcelona in a European tie in March 2008.74 Celtic supporters also did themselves no favours, Nicky Campbell mused, apart from looking foolish at best and bigoted at worst, when some of them sang that Chris Burke, a Scottish Catholic playing for Rangers, was nothing but ‘the Fenian in the blue’.75 Quite how the current case mounted by the Rangers Supporters Trust that the term ‘Hun’ used by Celtic fans to depict a Rangers supporter is a sectarian slur awaits judgement.76

While there were no arrests for the sectarian chanting and singing at Ibrox against Villarreal, in August 2006 Artur Boruc, Celtic’s Polish goalkeeper, was given a legal caution for blessing himself with the sign of the cross during the game against Rangers at Ibrox in February 2006. Boruc’s ‘crime’ (or breach of the peace), so it appears, was to be guilty of inciting anger and violence amongst Rangers supporters. To many the lack of action taken against Rangers fans and the weight of the law directed against Boruc smacked at the very least of double standards. The majority of Scots, politicians, Church leaders, and ordinary ‘punters’, if not the Rangers Supporters Trust, fear that the decision will make Scotland the ‘laughing stock’ of world football. Whilst the legislation introduced by the Scottish Assembly in 2003 to treat sectarian in a similar manner to racist
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offences was a move welcomed by many, its application to Boruc is consternating and probably counter-productive. Gerald Seenan’s foreboding has come home to roost. He pointed out that ‘the tradition of players blessing themselves before taking a penalty kick or after scoring a goal is… part of a the global football tradition…’. Only in Scotland, Richard Wilson bemusedly concluded, could ‘an act that is commonplace… around the world elicit such an outcry.’ As some Scots weary yet humorously remarked, will crossing a football at Ibrox now be designated a crime?

Whilst football has exposed the persistence of sectarian divisions in Scotland, and according to Scott Styles among many others, if not Steve Bruce and Michael Rosie, the ‘Old Firm’ rivalry has contributed to their preservation, the whole matter has become a matter of more general, certainly heated, but possibly healthy, debate in the past ten years. It hit the headlines during the Edinburgh Festival in August 1999 when James Macmillan, the Catholic composer, launched a swingeing assault on what he described as a ‘visceral anti-Catholicism’ in Scottish society. Whilst conceding that only a minority were overtly bigoted, he continued that anti-Catholic prejudice remained ‘endemic.’ This prejudice was most manifest in the campaign mounted by what he implied was a Protestant dominated media against separate, state-funded Catholic schools which Macmillan defended as providing an excellent education for Catholics and a significant minority of non-Catholics alike. There are few grounds to contest the educational achievements of Catholic schools. Aidan Donaldson pointed out that much comparative sociological research undertaken in the United States, Austria and Canada supported Macmillan’s argument, and added that in Scotland pupils from Catholic schools also were less prejudiced.

Yet the whole issue in Scotland is more complex and contentious than Macmillan suggests. First, some would agree with Graham Walker that Catholic schools possess a number of privileges, including ‘a legal right to religious instruction…; the Catholic Church enjoys power over teaching appointments and promotions; and Catholic schools have avoided closures where there have been clear [economic] grounds for it.’ He surmised that opposition to them was not simply or necessarily a product of bigotry but might well be based on questions of equality of treatment that concerned, even provoked resentment among, Protestants and raised questions about the creation of a more united national identity in the 21st century. The highly defensive response of Michael McMahon, and Michael McGrath, the director of the Scottish Catholic Education Service, both of whom fiercely resisted any examination of the seemingly privileged position of Catholic schools, has done little to further an open debate.

In the second place, recent surveys indicate that four-fifths of all Scots, and, much more significantly, almost three-fifths of Catholics, are in favour of phasing out all denominational schools, Protestant and Catholic alike. The Catholic Church in the main has rejected even the most cautious of moves towards the integration of schooling, for example, the suggestion put forward in May 1988 that separate Catholic and Protestant schools in the Townhead district of Glasgow should be located on the same campus. It opposed a similar initiative in Dalkeith in early 2002. However, in 2004 it came to pass that St David’s Roman Catholic School and Dalkeith High School agreed to share a common campus. Arguably, it is too soon to evaluate the impact of this initiative. However, Lauren Morris, an 18 year old Protestant at St David’s, commented that teachers, in her perception more particularly Catholic teachers, still sought to exercise a ‘strict segregation’ between ‘Fenians’ and ‘Proddies’. For her separate schools was a continuing problem as outside the educational system she questioned just how many of her generation really cared whether you were Catholic or Protestant. Lauren’s is but one young voice, and perhaps not typical, yet one Scotland’s Church leaders at least should explore further.

Her perceptions raise the third, very much related, question. Six years ago the columnist, Joan Burnie, argued that separate schools divided ‘wee Tims’ (Catholics) from ‘wee Prods’ (Protestants) at the age of five. She added that the school system ‘might not be the sole or even root cause’ of sectarianism, yet it certainly reinforced in very young children an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ syndrome. Andrew Wilson of the SNP responded, disputing the
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whole notion that separate schools contributed anything to sectarian divides. Whatever rationale there was for separate Catholic schools in the past, in providing education for the Catholic underclass, whether they have a positive role to play in Scotland of the 21st century is a moot point. More generally, what is the place of religion in the school curriculum in Scotland, and elsewhere, in an increasingly multi-cultural world? Richard Dawkins, Professor of Biology at Oxford University, and admittedly a renowned atheist, condemned the labelling of children Protestant or Catholic (one could add, Muslim, Jew, Sikh, whatever), as this created dominant religious ‘in-groups’. He continued that the abolition of separate denominational schools would lead to the end of segregation, or sectarianism, within a generation.86

Whether Dawkins’ optimistic conclusion is warranted is another matter. As a historian the evidence, certainly with respect to Scotland, is lacking. Equally, the task of the historian is to seek both to empathise with the subjects of their studies and also to be objective. But history too is the most political of the sciences, as M.N. Pokrovskii once remarked, and the historian is influenced by her or his beliefs and values. Hence it is only fair to make explicit my own views, some might say biases, should they remain too implicit in the preceding account. The education of children when it is funded by the state should be secular; as a very lapsed Calvinist I accept the study of comparative religions should be part of the curriculum, whatever set of beliefs (or none) pupils hold, as that study might help them all to understand more and in Voltaire’s best of all possible worlds learn to be tolerant of diversity in an increasingly multi-cultural and multi-religious world; but the promulgation of any one faith should not be supported by state taxation imposed on all. Irony of all ironies, I find myself proselytising!
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‘...sport – like religion – is ideal in expressing boundaries between us and them.’

A Comment on Ronald Kowalski

Jonas Svensson

The discourse on sports and politics had a revival during the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing. As usual commentators raised the question whether the twain could, or rather should, be mixed. Calls for a boycott were met by the standard response that they should not – sports are apolitical.

This is a fairly strange view. Staunch supporters of international sports events often refer to their potential for enhancing global understanding and international cooperation, which is quite a political aim. The official sponsoring of the Beijing Olympic Games by large corporations was forecasted to be the largest in history. The Olympic Games are big business, and since when is big business apolitical?

I would claim that sports and competitions often have an intimate relation to politics. Sports events, whether on a local, regional, national or international level form culturally legitimate arenas for the expression of in-group chauvinism and distinctions between ‘us’ and ‘them’. The boundaries separating ‘Self’ and the ‘Other’ constructed in these contexts are important for internal solidarity and a sense of common belonging.

On a national level, Swedes, who usually do not view themselves as particularly nationalistic, revel in nationalistic fervour when the national team, or any Swedish individual, succeeds in an international contest. The media adds to this, being more than happy to zoom in on any member of the royal family – i.e. a media-nurtured symbol of the ‘imagined community’1 of Swedes – that happens to be present. In the victories of the national team, internal dissent, conflicts and injustices are forgotten; we are one, ‘we are all the winners, we are all the best’ as a once popular tune in Sweden has it.

Ronald Kowalski’s contribution provides additional examples in this context. Football and rugby, when studied in the Scottish context are
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political, both can be linked to the conflict between the Scots and the English, and to the conflict between different ethnic or religious groups among the Scots. Sport becomes part of both political self-expression and boundary construction.

I am not an expert on sports (rather the opposite, and proud of it!), nor on Scotland, nor on the matter on historical scholarship. I am a scholar in the field of the study of religions, and in this capacity find the academic discourse on this particular aspect of the relationship between religion and sports in Scotland quite interesting.

There is an ongoing discussion within the field of the study of religions on how to study sports in relation to religion. In this, there is a basic distinction between theorising the relationship between sports and religion, and theorising on sports as a form of religion, a distinction much connected with the ongoing, and never ending, issue on how to define religion.

In 1998, in the Buenos Aires area of Rosario, the Maradonian church was instituted, worshipping what they believe is the greatest man ever, Diego Maradona. This year is AD 50, AD meaning After Diego (i.e. the year he was born). In Rosario, there is the ‘Hand of God chapel’, relating to the famous incident in the 1986 World Cup championship match between Argentina and England, when the footballer scored with the help of a hand, that according to himself was not his, but God’s. The Church now has its own website (http://www.iglesiamaradoniana.com.ar/) where it is possible to purchase different forms of Maradonian paraphernalia and read the ten commandments of the church.

The seriousness of this example may be, and has been questioned, but serious scholarly attention has been directed at the very question of religion and sports, both in terms of whether sports can be viewed as a form of religion and in terms of how religion and sports may intersect. The Centre for the Study of Sport & Spirituality at York St. John University provides an extensive bibliography of scholarly works on these topics, and has established the International Journal of Religion and Sport.

Scholars have noted that there are many similarities, particularly regarding function between religion and sports. So, for example, just as religious beliefs and practices create a sense of belonging for individuals, collective support for a team or the rallying behind a particular sportsman furthers internal group solidarity. As Kowalski shows, sports – like religion – are ideal for expressing boundaries between us and them.
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reminded by what a colleague once told me about his experiences in India, of similarities between followers of Shiva and Vishnu and football supporters. As in religion, there is in sports a multitude of symbols that express ‘in-group’ belonging: songs, slogans, banners, colours are functional equivalents to hymns, confessions of faith and distinctive dress codes in the context of religion. Kowalski further notes how there in sports are myths of a glorious past, and a particular historiography, just as is the case in religious traditions. The players are cultural heroes that fight against the ‘evil-doers’.

Public sports events furthermore display similarities to religious rituals. They are governed by rules, and during such events, actions that are otherwise controlled or even forbidden in society, become legitimate. The violence on the arena in sports such as boxing, ice-hockey and rugby would be punishable by law if it occurred outside the ‘ritual’ context. Supporters express bigotry, racism and rage in a way that they would not do outside the arena. As in some forms of religious rituals, the dos-and-don’ts of ordinary life and common civility are set aside for another, sacred, set of rules or even an absence of rules, at least in what is termed as the liminal phase of the ritual process. What comes to my mind, as a scholar in the study of Islam, is of course the hajj, the pilgrimage where ordinary rules of gender segregations do not apply, and the Shiite celebration of ’ashura in commemoration of the martyrdom of the Prophet Muhammad’s grandson al-Husayn in 680. The bloodshed in the latter is not, contrary to in other contexts, considered polluting, but can instead be considered purifying in a sense.

Kowalski raises an important question that is relevant also in relation to religion. Is it possible to be a 90-minute bigot, i.e. is it possible for an otherwise tolerant person to go to a football ground and express hatred, contempt and racism against other people, and then, when the game is over return to her or his old tolerant self? In the case of religious rituals, I would like to suggest that such a distinction between the ritual context and ordinary life is possible, but on the other hand, the person who experiences the ritual as a transformation of the self, as a religious experience, must have a certain foundation in the form of a commitment and belief in the truth of what the ritual expresses. As in the case of sports, furthermore, the separation between ritual time and space, and everyday time and space, may not be that clear-cut. Just as hooligans will start fighting before the football game, and continue doing so after it has ended, some people who
participate in religious rituals may very well continue to ‘live’ in the ritual even when it is formally over, as is shown for example in the political events in the context of the Iranian revolution in 1979, when the celebrations of ‘ashura transmuted into revolutionary action. Like sports events, religious rituals are useful for political mobilisation because of heightened sensitivity. Aggression, in a ritual or in a sports event, may, as Kowalski shows, become politically problematic when it spills over to the outside when the spectators become part of the game, but are still outside the boundaries of the games/the rituals proper, and hence are not bound by its regulations.

To sum up: There are functional similarities between sports and religion in the sense of providing belonging, expressing boundaries to the other, strengthening communal solidarity and providing rituals that separate ordinary time and place from ‘sacred’ time and place. However, to claim from these similarities that sports is religion is problematic.

On the issue of football and religion in particular, I would here like to quote the sociologist of religion Steve Bruce, whom Kowalski also mentions in his chapter (as an example of a 90-minute bigot, maybe):

To say that football may share some features of a religion is to raise interesting research questions about the resources fans devote to football, the psychological states they attach to success and failure, the attitudes of some fans to the arenas in which their teams play and so on.5

In the book God is Dead, Bruce argues that one should not confuse the phenomenon with its consequences. Although religion may have consequences such as strengthening group solidarity, expressing difference, providing meaning or structuring perception, not all phenomena (including football) that have these effects can be termed religions. If everything that shares these particulars becomes religion, the analytical value of the concept is lost. In order to avoid circularity, one has to be able to define an object as separate from the functions which this object is supposed to have. As Bruce states;

The identification of parallels also raises the important counterbalance of differences. Few football fans marry only women who support the same team or whose fathers support the same team. Few shun those who do not share their allegiance. Few suffer debilitating trauma when they lose faith, or construct elaborate moral and social codes around their footballing interests. Few will found political parties that claim a distinctive moral
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Hence, Bruce contends, a perspective that equates football with religion is limiting, because it overshadows the interesting aspect of religion and sports and how the two intersect, i.e. the issue of sports and religion, as distinctive from sports as religion.

Such an aspect involves, for example, discussions among Muslim religious scholars on what forms of sports are legitimate according to the religious sources, a discourse that is often gendered. Questions about what sports a good Muslim can engage in, or what sport events one can watch on TV are posed to the scholars, and answers are given in fatwas, i.e. religious responses. The study may also concern the religious symbolism in certain sports, e.g. martial arts and the rituals associated with them. In American Christianity, there is a notion of ‘Muscular Christianity’ and the view that a good Christian man works out, as part of fulfilling his service to the Lord (thereby countering a feminisation of religion). One important aspect, in connection with Kowalski’s discussion, is the way distinctions in religious affiliation may intersect with other forms of social distinction, in a mutually reinforcing manner.8

What Kowalski writes about sports not functioning in a ‘socio-economic or politico-cultural vacuum’ rhymes very well with my basic view on religion, any religion. Religion, both on the level of the individual and on the level of the collective, always exists in a context, a context which forms the way in which basic values, dogma and norms are interpreted, lived and expressed. In Scotland, as in many other contexts, religion forms part of the cultural context in which football functions. The intersectionality between the two is clearly shown in Kowalski’s discussion on sectarianism and the conflict between the ‘old firm’ Glasgow Celtic and Glasgow Rangers, as related to the conflict between Roman Catholics (Irish) and Protestants. Distinctions based on allegiance to the team, religious affiliation and ethnicity, and maybe even class and discrimination mutually
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reinforce one another when they, as in the case presented in Kowalski’s article, overlap.

When one hears that sports have nothing to do with politics, or politics has nothing to do with religion, these are not statements of facts, but of wishful thinking and apologetics. One hears at times for example that conflicts between Protestants and Roman Catholics in Northern Ireland (or Scotland), or between Hindus and Muslims in India, are not ‘really about religion’, or that violence between football supporters has nothing to do with sports. For the first claim to be true, one must have a fairly narrow definition of religion, focussed mainly on personal belief and individual spirituality. Such a view on what religion ‘is’ may be relevant in the exceptional situation of a thoroughly secularised society, such as Sweden, but in many other parts of the world, and in history, it is fairly awkward. In most parts of the world, what someone who asks ‘what is your religion’ wants to know is not what you believe in but where you belong.

Religion may be a matter of faith, but it also has bearing on identity and identity construction. It structures social solidarity, marriage patterns, sexual conduct, economic transactions and security, and maybe also allegiance to this or that team in the Scottish football league. This is also where Richard Dawkins, to whom Kowalski also refers, and whom I otherwise much admire, goes wrong in describing religion, ending up proselytising for a correct understanding of what religion should be – a fairly interesting position for an atheist! In his book *The God Delusion*, he criticises a British newspaper article for describing children as ‘Muslim’, ‘Christian’ and ‘Hindu’, which he equals to naming children ‘marxist’, ‘liberal’ or ‘socialist’. To him, religion is dogma and belief. To many others, including the supporters of the Old firm and Glasgow Rangers, religion is also identity, regardless of what you as an individual believe in. Dawkins’ limited view of what constitutes religion is equal to describing football as merely a pastime where 22 individuals chase a leather ball only for mutual amusement, a reduction of the phenomenon indeed.

---
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The process of political modernisation that occurred in Sweden between 1880 and 1920 meant foremost that a modern party system replaced older, more traditional coteries – national party organisations were created and the electorate was organised along party lines – but also that the notion of ‘party politics’ began to enter the local arena. Liberal groups were an important part of this political modernisation, albeit today somewhat forgotten. Hence, old boundaries within politics changed – were exceeded and found obsolete – and new ones emerged due to the modernisation process.

**Boundaries**

Boundaries, changing and emerging, within politics can be seen in at least three different shapes: within an ideological context, between a national and a local level, and between traditional praxis and modern behaviour.

As for the liberals, already the use of two different name tags – one for the party working within parliament (the Liberal party) and one for the national organisation (Frisinnade landsföreningen) – indicates a clear boundary between two different ‘world views’: the liberal one, with its roots in student radicalism and urban milieus, and the ‘free-spirited’ stand, deeply anchored in the popular movements (temperance movements and non-conformist churches) in the provinces. Contemporary observers on a regular basis have highlighted the two distinct mentalities that had to gel with each other within the liberal party, differences that have often led to different standpoints in various political matters: the defence question, but particularly the case for prohibition caused a lot of anguish – the latter eventually led to the 1923 split of the party. The common denominator, and the unifying factor, was for a long time the struggle for universal suffrage.

Scholars have pointed out that it took quite some time before politics, emanating within parliament, was also implemented on the local level. According to Sven Lundkvist it was not until the election of 1911 that party guidelines also had to be met by the local organisations that previously had had a great deal of autonomy.¹

Simultaneously, traditional political praxis was being challenged, both in parliament and at the local level, but on different time scales. As Lundkvist and others have pointed out there was a huge difference between what occurred – and how it occurred – in parliament and what transpired in local politics. The main reason was that the local level was not ‘politicised’ in the same way as in parliament – instead of seeking advantages for a specific group, local politics were all about working for the common good.

**Boundaries within – the liberal case**

We often tend to forget that liberalism was one of two left wing alternatives (the other was of course the Social Democrats) in Swedish politics at the beginning of the 20th century. The liberals/the ‘free-spirited’, were between 1902 and 1914 the largest party in the second chamber. On three occasions the party formed governments (minority governments) under its leader, Karl Staaff. At the end of World War I the party regained power (1917-20), this time in coalition with the Social Democrats. After the Liberal party was divided in two in 1923, the ‘free-spirited’ have governed on two occasions: between 1923 and 1928 in a coalition with the liberals, and alone between 1930 and 1932. Difficulties in gaining stable governmental situations – so called *vågmästeri* – during the 1920s, gave the ‘free-spirited’ a strong and strategic position during this period.²

When it comes to organisation, the early history of the liberals took place mainly within Parliament, but important inroads were made in other fields as well.

During the 1840s, Reform societies were founded in a number of cities. On three occasions around 1850 so called Reform meetings were held in Örebro. Demands for a reformation of the parliamentary system were made. Several of the leading persons within the reform movement were

---

² Vallinder 1984.
liberal MPs but also outside parliament there existed important persons, most of them attached to the growing liberal press. The newspaper *Aftonbladet* had been founded in 1830, *Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfartstidning* a couple of years later in 1832. Publicists, as the influential and highly reputable Lars Johan Hierta and S A Hedlund, were the leading men. Even in the provinces liberal newspapers sprung up. One of the more successful was *Nerikes Allehanda*. The newspapers gave the liberals a platform from which to agitate. Between 1840 and 1866, when the old four estates Diet was abolished and replaced by a dual chamber parliament, liberalism made strong gains.

There were also several liberal organisations outside parliament that were important for liberalism’s further development. During the 1880s workers, reform, and suffrage organisations played important roles. Workers’ organisations were an older phenomena, with a slightly different agenda, while for the others the prime cause was to mould public opinion in a liberal direction. Many of the latter were Stockholm-based but provincial branches developed quickly. All of them strived to implement universal suffrage.

The 1880s was the start of the first phase of political modernisation of the party system. This can be attributed to two main causes: firstly, a general process of industrialisation that swept the nation, and secondly, the solving in 1892 of one of the longest running political disputes – the tax question (*grundskatterna*).

In 1890, *Sveriges Allmänna Rösträttsförbund* was founded as a national organisation in order to work the suffrage question. It lasted until 1900. Its members were leading liberal politicians and publicists (on many occasions they were the same people) both within and outside parliament. Much of the work was carried out through the so-called People’s Parliament, assembled in 1893 and 1896. On a local level, much of the work was handled by local suffrage organisations.

Within parliament, *Folkpartiet* (the Peoples’ Party) was founded in 1895. Originally initiated by provincial publicists who wanted a liberal party within parliament but put into effect by liberal MPs. This party did not last long though. Instead the Liberal Party was founded in 1900 to function as the vehicle within parliament. Two years later, in 1902, *Frisinnade landsorganisationen* was created as the national organisation. One important reason for the creation of both those organisations was to counter the perceived threat from the Social Democrats but also to organise the electorate before the unavoidable reformation of suffrage that would lead to an increase in the size of the electorate.

This division of a national level and a more local one lasted until 1923 when the Liberal party split into two factions: the liberals and the ‘free-spirited’.³

### Political organisation of the liberals – emerging boundaries

Early spring 1902 saw the founding of *Frisinnade föreningen* in Örebro. Immediately it attached itself to the national organisation, *Frisinnade Landsorganisationen*. From now on there was an organisational platform for liberal agitation in Örebro.

The first meeting was called by Carl Malmrot, the editorial secretary of the liberal newspaper *Nerikes Allehanda*, and was held at the Betel Chapel (belonging to the Baptists). Twenty-six people attended.⁴

From the first list of members it is clear that the majority of the organisation consisted mainly of white collar employees and owners of firms (85 percent of the members). A rather large part of these (14 percent) were members of nonconformist churches or belonged to the temperance movement.⁵

From the very beginning there were channels to political power – in 1902 eleven of the 42 city councillors (*Stadsfullmäktige*) were members of *Frisinnade föreningen* (26 percent of the council).

As a result of the widening of suffrage from 1907, a period of intense organisation followed. The different political parties strived to organise as many of the new electorate as possible: travelling agitators crossed the county on hectic lecturing tours. For the liberals, this organisational process was very clearly conducted within the context of a distinct popular movement – it was in the chapels and the temperance halls that those meetings took place. The result was the establishment of numerous local organisations.

The boundaries of this particularly organisational process were not internal – instead they served to delimit against other political parties, especially the conservatives and the farmers.

⁴ *50 år som liberalismens vapendragare 1902-1952*.
⁵ Member list, Örebro Frisinnade förening 1902-1904.
In 1910, a breakup of Frisinnade Föreningen occurred. A group of members, followers of the liberal Karl Malmrot, left and formed an autonomous liberal organisation, leaving behind a true ‘free-spirited’ organisation. Boundaries, this time internal and apparent since the start, now became visible for everyone to see. Also when it came to the press, boundaries were clear. Malmrot’s position as the editorial secretary at Nerikes Allehanda placed the newspaper firmly in a liberal camp. Nerikes Tidningen, the second newspaper in Örebro, led by the fiery Elof Ljungberg, kept the ‘free-spirited’ flag flying high.

Differences in mentalities, such as discussed above, clearly influenced the intra-organisational process. Malmrot’s and others’ break with the ‘free-spirited’ majority in Frisinnade föreningen was ultimately caused by different backgrounds – social, geographical, educational etc. – and ultimately by different political outlooks. Örebro and the surrounding county were to a large extent very influenced by nonconformist churches and temperance organisations, and therefore predominantly ‘free-spirited’.

Political praxis – boundaries of a political question

The political question I will use to exemplify my discussion on changing and emerging boundaries, is part of the defence question. In 1901, parliament had passed a bill that introduced compulsory national service. This reformation of the armed forces would be extremely expensive and it was therefore necessary to offload some of the costs on to single cities and towns. They would in turn be compensated by an increase in tax revenues. Örebro was in December 1901 asked if they would provide free land to a military establishment – Svea Trängkår, stationed in Stockholm.

How the defence question was handled at the local level

At the beginning of January in 1902, the city council of Örebro dealt with the request for free land for Svea Trängkår. The positive aspects given in an official inquest were an increase in local tax revenue, a more positive climate for business and new job opportunities. The sole negative aspect was that the debts would increase.

After a long and gruelling debate in the city council, a vote was taken and it was decided to turn down the offer (19 for, 20 against). A few days later though, a new motion was submitted that would make it cheaper for Örebro to accept the offer because it involved trading land rather than buying it.

This is the starting point for popular resistance. In a matter of days, three different meetings were called in order to stop the proposed exchange of land. First it was the Labour Union, then the local organisation of real estate owners and lastly the Workers’ club. All of them passed resolutions that demanded that the proposed motion should be withdrawn.

The piece of land that was considered as a trade-in had been donated to Örebro, and was supposed to pay for poor relief. In the proposed motion it would be traded for suitable land that could be used to house Svea Trängkär. Of the two instances within the city council responsible for preparing the motion only one seconded it. In the following debate, a conclusion was reached – again after a vote had been taken – this time to accept the motion (20 for, 19 against).

In the beginning of March, a complaint was filed against the decision taken in the council. Behind it were people that belonged to Frisinnade Föreningen, Örebro Peace Association and the Workers’ club. The decision was contested on technical grounds – the council had no right to trade land that had been donated to the city. After a lengthy investigation, a verdict was put forward in late May by the County administration. The complaint as a whole was dismissed but if a voluntarily agreement could be presented, where the owners/leaseholders agreed to the trade, then the County administration would accept such an agreement.

After negotiations with representatives, agreements were in place in September.

In October, the proposed trade was discussed in the council. Again it came to a vote – the result was even: 20 for, 20 against but the casting vote of the chairman pushed the proposal through.

As before, this decision was contested by groups that opposed Svea Trängkär. On grounds that one of the contracts (with Novemberstiftelsen, a...
philanthropic organisation that held one of the leases of the land) that regulated the trade was not valid because not all of the members of the board had signed it, a new complaint was sent to the County administration by people from Frisinnade föreningen and the Workers’ club. Once again it came to nothing.\footnote{Landskansliet Dnr. 85-299 1902.}

The last recourse concerning Svea Trängkår, according to Nerikes Allehanda, would be for those opposing the deal to attend the annual meeting of Novemberstiftelsen, and see to that the agreement was rejected by voting against it. Usually, the annual meeting was attended only by the board and those eligible for support but this time roughly 60 persons had come to decide the question. With 32 votes against and 25 for, the proposal fell through.\footnote{Nerikes Allehanda 29.10, 31.10.1902.}

By late December, after busy negotiations, the city council had reached agreements with all the parties concerned. Then the majority of the council members accepted the proposal and it was decided to start negotiations with the Department of Defence over terms for Svea Trängkår. A contract was signed in February 1903.\footnote{Örebro City Council. Minutes, 11.2.1903.}

As seen above, this question turned out to be very complex – the decision to offer free land for Svea Trängkår was decided on already in the beginning of 1902 but was held back because of several appeals against the deal. Those against seized every opportunity to delay the process. Leading members of this coalition were involved with Frisinnade föreningen and associations close to it.

\subsection*{Arguments and motives}

In the following, I shall give examples of arguments and motives that liberal groups held against Svea Trängkår. They can roughly be divided into three categories: economic, ideological and other issues. The latter concerns issues that lay close to the temperance movement, the peace association and the non-conformist churches.

Political boundaries can be seen amongst the various arguments and motives that political actors used in the debate.

\subsubsection*{Economical arguments and motives}

The impending economic development of Örebro became a highly contested issue during the debate. Some members of the city council viewed a military establishment as a generator of prosperity while others feared that Svea Trängkår would hinder what had been up until then a period of steady growth. Nerikes Allehanda ran an editorial along the lines of the latter standpoint. The calculations used to propagate Svea Trängkår are uncertain at best, and Örebro would not gain anything by it. The city was deep in debt, and at such a moment buying a form of artificial progress, ‘that only satisfies the vanity of the city’, would in the long run prove counter-productive according to the paper.

Not even a nationalist turn on the economic arguments could sway the paper – even if the city is the best place for Svea Trängkår, Örebro should not be forced into economic sacrifices for the good of the nation because defence matters is a task best covered by the state.\footnote{Nerikes Allehanda 20.1, 21.1, 23.1, 31.1.1902 (quote from 21.1.1902).} Nerikes Allehandas’ point of view is supported by several liberal and ‘free-spirited’ members of the city council.

\subsubsection*{Ideological arguments and motives}

The policy pursued by the state – to offload considerable costs on cities and towns – was seen by the liberals as a clear intrusion on the integrity of the municipality. The liberal ideology advocates personal freedom and wants to keep state interference to a minimum. Therefore it is only natural that the individual city should not be forced – by any means – by the state into making decisions. This is a point that separates liberalism from a conservative ideology. The latter views the state as a guarantee that decisions always are made with the best interest of the nation in mind.

Nationalism, at its height at the turn of the century in 1900, played an important role in the debate; though not at an explicit level, it was always present beneath the surface. It took the shape of an ‘über-ideology’. Research has shown that different versions of nationalism existed.\footnote{Strahl 1983, p 12 f.}

The liberal version of nationalism hade similarities with the one propagated by the Social Democrats. Both camps had a common view of...
what constituted the role of the nation. Liberals though, did not use the same kind of anti-military rhetoric. Instead they highlighted the huge costs of rearmament. One of two factions within the liberals was close to the peace movement, but for the sake of party unity both factions had to cooperate. 17

Relations at a national level between the left wing of the liberals and the peace movement were evident also in Örebro. The Peace association and Friisinnade Föreningen had close ties.

Points of issues

Many of the arguments used against Svea Trängkår concerning the other issues, contained built-in boundaries that divided the popular movement along the lines of ideology masquerading either as faith or moral conviction.

Temperance groups in Örebro were very critical of the (at least imagined) alcohol-soaked lifestyle of the military. They feared that to have military personal stationed in, or close by, the city could jeopardize all that the temperance movement had worked for. Örebro Workers’ club also shared the same fear. 18

The peace question was important and connected to the temperance movement – peaceful co-existence between nations was seen as a prerequisite for universal temperance. In Örebro, strong bonds between the peace movement and different temperance organisations existed.

The way one views war differed within the nonconformist churches: the different denominations all had their own opinion. EFS (Evangeliska Fosterlands Stiftelsen) had a nationalistic outlook while the Baptists were more internationally minded and liberal. SMF (Svenska Missions Förbundet) was divided: the majority were liberal/‘free-spirited’ but there was a strong faction of conservative nationalists as well. The latter was led by P.P. Waldenström.

In 1900, two lines of thought existed within the peace movement: one that was anti-military but not totally against defence spending, and one that was wholeheartedly pacifist. After 1902, the latter was the dominant. This more or less nihilistic outlook alienated leaders of the Social Democrats as well as liberal leadership, and prevented a sought after cooperation. The peace movement then turned to the temperance movement and varying nonconformist churches for support.

Local elections as boundaries

During the early part of the 20th century, local elections were not yet politicised. Instead of modern parties, different coteries ran for election. This system had distinctive corporative traits.

Three factors were important if one wanted to be elected to the city council: (1) belonging to an elite group, (2) having channels to elite groups, and (3) tactical dispositions.

The first and the second factors were necessary prerequisites in order to be elected – mainly because the way the election system functioned (votes according to income), but support by members of elite groups (for instance those already in the council), and access to their networks, also played an important role when preparing for elections. Those who did not belong to an elite group, or have channels to those who did, and therefore lacked the important network connections, had to rely on tactical dispositions.

Local elections in the beginning of the 20th century followed traditional corporate lines, and most important, were not yet politicised. The norm to adhere to was proportional representation – the council should be made up of individuals/corporations representative of the makeup of society as a whole. In practice, this principle of distribution effectively hindered isolated groups from dominating the city council – no single coterie was allowed to become too powerful. When these unwritten rules were broken, there were protests: when the commerce association in 1904 nominated too many of its own members, Nerikes Allehanda indignantly wrote that ‘much wants more’. 19

To be considered representative was important – for one’s trade, conviction, domination and even one’s class. When the first worker, a typographer, was elected to the city council in 1904, he was frowned upon because he was deemed as unrepresentative of his class: he was not a ‘true’ worker. 20 This particular scepticism was erased only when the workers’ union nominated a man employed at a shoe factory. 21

17 Gustavsson 1987, p 44.
18 Nerikes Allehanda 11.2.1902.
20 Nerikes Allehanda 12.11.1904.
21 Nerikes Allehanda 20.11.1906.
An even distribution within groups was also of importance. When the large group of men in the city council involved in commerce were seen as too dominated by wholesale dealers, retailers posted ads that advocated a more balanced distribution within the group.\textsuperscript{22}

Groups outside the council, especially those on the left who had few votes, had to establish electoral cooperation in order to succeed in getting one of their candidates elected. By putting together a joint list of candidates, plenty of room to manoeuvre could be found. Groups belonging to the temperance movement used such tactics early on. Already in 1897, an organisation was founded that, during elections, had as its purpose to act in the interest of temperance.\textsuperscript{23}

Silent agitation was another way of raising enough votes to put a candidate on the city council. It was done by using proxies and sought to get votes from those who could not (for some reason) vote or those that had no intention of voting at all.

\textit{Conclusions}

In this essay, I have studied boundaries within politics. By focusing on a single question – the defence question – I was able to pinpoint different types of delimitations, all roughly applicable to the grid put forward earlier.

\textbf{(1) Boundaries within an ideological context}

The defence question quite clearly shows differences of mentalities within the liberals/‘free-spirited’ political camps. In the debate, the liberal newspaper \textit{Nerikes Allehanda} often put forward arguments that emanated from the liberals in parliament, while the ‘free-spirited’ relied on standpoints made by the temperance movement and the non-conformist churches. These intra-organisational differences are important because they portend the split of the liberal party in 1923. One should not forget though that already in 1910 there was a breakup along such lines in Örebro.

\textbf{(2) Boundaries between national and local levels}

If local politics are usually perceived as non-political, the defence question shows that in decisions viewed as vital to the nation, ideologically stipulated boundaries are visible also at the local level. Arguments and motives belonging to liberalism, conservatism and socialism can be identified. From such a perspective there was to some extent an emerging modern twist on the local level as well but the political forms were still archaic.

\textbf{(3) Boundaries between an older praxis and a modern discourse}

The defence question is a good example of a period of transition where local politics were still dominated by a corporative outlook, network- and coterie alliances and of political praxis – politics by agency – that meant that politics were being made through basically non-political organisations. This praxis is very apparent when it comes to elections.

In Örebro County a public sphere existed that was predominantly ‘free-spirited’, made up of temperance organisations and nonconformist churches that were being used for political purposes. From such a perspective a political modernisation as discussed above had yet to take shape.
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Tomas Nilson’s contribution to this volume is a survey of the local politics in the Swedish small town of Örebro.

His first aim is to identify and study the liberal movement and its organization. The second is to study changes the liberal organization may have given rise to in political practice. In order to achieve this Nilson follows one controversial issue from beginning to end with a focus on the liberal groupings involved in the process.

Nilson claims that the period between 1880 and 1920 is a transition period in Swedish politics, from older coteries to modern party formations. During this period the national party organizations were founded. More important, however, may well be that politics as a term started to be used at the local level.

The liberal movement in Sweden has undergone a series of important changes. What is today Folkpartiet (the People’s Party, the Swedish Liberal party) has a dynamic history of political evolution:

- In 1809, there was a party in the Swedish parliament which called itself liberal. Albeit this was a short-lived group, it was nevertheless the first.
- In 1895, there was one party in parliament which called itself Folkpartiet. In 1900, Folkpartiet fused with two other parties to form Liberala Samlingspartiet.
- In 1902, Frisinnade Landsföreningen was founded, which was a national organization to support the parliamentary party.
- In 1923, the big split occurred. There had always been two factions within Liberala Samlingspartiet, one radically liberal and one more morally oriented, often rooted in the revivalist or temperance movements. The first faction formed the small Svenska Liberala Partiet (Swedish Liberal Party).
• In 1934, Liberala Samlingspartiet, Svenska Liberala Partiet and some smaller groups forms Folkpartiet.
• In 1990, the party name was changed to Folkpartiet Liberalerna.

I can make a few interesting observations as a linguist. If I were to do a study of the liberal political organization in the early 20th century, I would have focussed on two things, political labels and self-definition. Here I will start off with a discussion of the different labels of political groupings within the broad liberal field. Following that I will briefly comment upon self-definition as a way of analyzing older texts.

The development of liberal organizations in Sweden is decidedly interesting to a linguist. There are two important reasons for this. Firstly, there are plenty of name and term changes in this movement. Secondly, these changes reflect ideological (and other) factionalisations and therefore lead to a sociolinguistically interesting field where people use language and naming to mark their political position.

In the short chronological survey above there are a few words used as political labels. I will very briefly comment on the etymology and interrelated semantics of these terms before I discuss them as political labels.

The Terms

‘Folkpartiet’:
The term Folkpartiet¹ (People’s Party) is of old Germanic origin and was used for the first time in any known text in 1841. Folk (People) should here be seen as opposed to other parties targeting the nobility or the bourgeoisie. There was no conception in the 19th century of a party for all people.

² SAOB: FRI-SINNAD p. adj. 1) (†) till 6. frihetsälskande [...] 2) till 6 a β o. 14; om person: som besitter l. karakteriseras av frisinne, fördomsfri (motsatt: trångbröstad, fördomsfull, bigot), i sht på det politiska området: framstegsvänlighet; som omfattar l. gillar de åsikter l. reformer för vilka de framstegsvänliga politiska partierna kämpa l. som tillhör ngt av dessa partier; liberal (närmast motsatt: konservativ); i pl. i substantivisk anv. de frisinnade, benämning på olika politiska mellanpartier med framstegsvänlig karaktär, i Sv. efter 1923 särsk. på den kvarvarande huvuddelen av den detta år splittrade frisinnade landsföreningen: liberala folkpartiet; om sak: som vittnar om frisinne, som sammanhänger med l. omfattas av l. uppbäres av "de frisinnade"; jfr -SINNING, -SINT. Frisinnade åsikter, reformer, tidsningar. Frisinnad politik [...] (6 a β o 14) FRI-SINNE. sinnesriktning som kännetecknas därav att den som är i besittning av densamma värderar åskådningar o. rörelser (särsk. i fråga om politik samt religion) på ett fördomsfritt sätt utan att vara bunden av egen (tidigare) uppfattning l. av gällande (mer l. mindre konservativ) allmän uppfattning, o. som därför ställer sig sympatisk mot nyare åskådningar l. rörelser vilka åsyfta ett framsteg mot det förutvarande (reformer), fördomsfrihet, framstegsvänlighet; av. om den politiska riktning som anser sig representera frisinet i ovan angivna bet [...].

³ SAOB: LIBERAL. i fråga om politiska förh.: som är anhängare av l. gillar resp. (om sak) som hör till l. omfattas av l. står i samband med den politiska meningsriktning som bl. a. avser att företräda frisinnade, jämförelsevis radikal politiska åsikter, demokrati, reformvänlighet o. strävanden att i gjögigaste mån bevara den enskilde medborgarens handlings frihet, bl. a. på det ekonomiska området (liberalismen); närmast motsatt: konservativ; i pl. i substantivisk anv., de liberala, sammanfattande beteckning för personer med liberal samhällsskäldring l. liberala politiker.

‘Frisinnad’: Frisinnad² (sing., ’De Frisinnade’ is the definite plural form) is a loanword from German and was first used in the 1830’s. The original Swedish meaning was free-minded or free-thinking. The term was used first as a positional marking against conservatism and what was felt as a prejudicial establishment. In the later half of the 19th century ‘frisinnad’ was used as a near synonym with ‘liberal’ and closely tied to the (liberal) political movement.

Liberal:

‘Liberal’³ (noun, sing. ’Liberalerna’ is the definite plural form). This is a nominalization av the adjective ‘liberal’. The roots are, of course, Latin, from ‘liber’ (free) but the modern term is a loanword from English, where the same nominalization process had occurred.

Initially the meaning of the adjective was, as, noted first in 1808, aligned with ‘humane’, ‘understanding’ and ‘unprejudiced’. But, in analogy with...
‘frisinnad’, the adjective ‘liberal’ soon shifted from being a way of describing a person’s point-of-view to a political label.

I have extremely briefly commented on the etymology of three words, ‘folkpartiet’, ‘frisinnad’ and ‘liberal’. It is obvious that all three have undergone a politicization process. ‘Folkpartiet’ was already from the beginning a political term but only had a meaning in relation to the other parties (which could be argued, is always the case with political parties). When a group of parliamentarians formed the ‘Folkparti’ in the late 19th century there was a political, ideological meaning as well. The two terms ‘frisinnad’ and ‘liberal’ have undergone very similar processes. Both were at first terms for a person’s views but they subsequently shifted meaning and became the political, organizational labels they are today.

Sociolinguistic Interest in the Liberal Movement

What I have presented so far is the etymological and semantic aspects of political labels. A closely related method to approach political labels and groupings is to ask the individuals involved in this process. In this case face-to-face interviews obviously are not the way ahead. Such a study would have to look at source texts, i.e. protocols, newspaper articles, letters, literature and any other type of document that could reveal how the politically organized persons defined their own ideological standpoint. This method is of course a common modus operandi for a historian, but nevertheless a good method.

In every categorization the bottom line is ‘Us’ and ‘Them’. Who are ‘we’ and who are ‘they’? In this specific case this is particularly true. It is a question of self-definition in relation to other groups and individuals. Within linguistics, and particularly within dialectology, there is a term that would be useful in this context, naboo-opposition (neighbour-opposition).

The term was coined by Amund Larsen in the 1880’s and refers to the phenomenon which makes villagers create an identity based on what the neighbouring village was not. The logic is: ‘us’ is what ‘they’ are not. And how the identity of a person or a group is manifested through language, especially in relation to other groups and persons, is central to sociolinguistics.

For a sociolinguist it would be interesting to analyze the previously mentioned semantic shifts in relation to the relevant political agendas and political coteries within the Swedish liberal movement. My hypothesis would be that through the movement’s history when a schism arises between different groups within the Swedish liberals, a need to redefine terms like ‘liberal’, ‘frisinnad’ and, indeed, ‘Folkpartiet’ emerges. Sometimes this has led to the party splitting but on other occasions the result has been a new way of defining ‘us’ and ‘them’ within the movement.
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Symbolizing Borders: Swedish Travels into the Soviet Union during the 1930’s

Charlotte Tornbjer

Travelling means meeting new and different cultures, and crossing different kinds of borders, both mental and physical, is part of the travelling experience. In this article I will investigate how Swedish travellers during the inter-war period conceptualized national borders. What did they experience when they crossed the border? Did these borders symbolize something more in the minds of the travellers? And finally, is it obvious that national borders are experienced as borders also in mind?

The inter-war years were a period of travelling. Paul Fussell suggests that this yearning to travel was connected to the experiences of the First World War and the terror and feeling of narrowing horizons it had produced. People wanted to get out and see the world, and Swedish writers and journalists were no exception. They went everywhere; to Europe, to the US, to Africa and to Asia. Improved communications facilitated travelling, and a body of travel books was generated to mediate the experience of the travellers. In this article I will focus on the Swedish journeys in the Soviet Union. The country symbolized a different political and social system, and therefore one can suppose that the Soviet borders were even more distinguished than many other national borders which the travellers crossed during their journeys. The source material for this study is published travelogues written by Swedish travellers during the inter-war period. The focus, however, is on the travelogues written during the 1930s – an especially turbulent decade starting with the crash in 1929.

In 1933, Hitler seized power in Germany, and during the same decade Stalin strengthened his position in the Soviet Union by extreme terror. Dictatorships threatened democracy almost everywhere. The Swedish travellers were fully aware of the critical circumstances, and sometimes the travellers reflected upon these questions when they crossed national borders. Sometimes they did not. However, as readers of the travelogues we have to keep in mind that travel-writing is a special kind of writing. It is somehow a ‘mediation between fact and fiction’. The writers often freely intersperse their actual experiences with fictitious stories, and the travel narratives are also infused with the writers’ subjectivity. A fruitful approach could therefore be to comprehend ‘travel writing as occupying a space of discursive conflict.’

The travellers to Soviet were prepared to meet a different kind of society. The revolution had swept away the old regime, and in its ruins a new socialist society was about to be built. The travellers were politicians, writers and just curious ordinary people, wanting to see the changes with their own eyes. In the years immediately following the revolution there were mostly Swedish socialists who visited the new country. Many of them also had personal relationships with some of the Russian revolutionaries.

In the middle of the 1920s, the flow of tourists and travellers increased. This was not just a Swedish phenomenon; people from all over the world wanted to visit the Soviet Union, and both historians and sociologists have studied these travellers from a number of perspectives, although, the conceptualizing of the national border itself has never been the main focus of interest. In particular the so-called ‘political pilgrims’ and their motives have been analyzed. The term itself is connected to Paul Hollander’s well-known book Political Pilgrims in which he analyzes why otherwise critically thinking intellectuals could visit the Soviet Union and honour Soviet society and government. Why did they not see the terror and oppression? Hollander’s answer is that these intellectuals had feelings of alienation towards their own societies; furthermore, their alienation was combined with a utopian vision, which envisioned social justice and harmony between society and the individual. These travellers held the conviction that intellectuals in the Soviet Union had more influence than intellectuals

1 This study is a part of my research project Travelling into the Future: Swedish Travellers in Search of a Better Society which has been financed by The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation, 2005–2008.
2 Fussell 1982 pp. 3-8.
4 Schweizer 2001 pp. 11.
6 This is especially the case regarding the travellers in the Soviet Union. See e.g. Gerner 2000 pp. 38-40; cf. Goméz 2002 p. 65-83.
7 Holland & Huggan 1998 pp. 8-11.
8 See e.g. Kan 2005 pp. 204-206.
in their own countries, and so they uncritically embraced the Soviet political system.⁹

Some of the Swedish travellers can be categorized as political pilgrims, led either by political ignorance or by conviction, but many were not. Many had different kinds of ideological or cultural connections to the Soviet Union, Russia or the Russian people; others were really sceptical of this new society.

Sweden and the Soviet Union have no common border, and the Swedish travellers had to go via a third country, for example Poland, the Baltic States or Finland, to enter the Soviet Union. The most common route was to go through Finland, but as we will see some travellers took other routes. During the 1920s, travellers sympathizing with the Soviet system often referred in their travelogues to the Soviet customs officers as ‘very nice’, especially in comparison to their German counterparts.¹⁰ On the other hand, travellers could also write about tough interrogations by the customs officers and the dirt in the new country.¹¹ However, even positive travellers during this decade recognized the traces of war on both sides of the border; they told their readers about ruins and bullet holes that were the consequences of the First World War and the following civil war.¹²

Many of the travellers did not write explicitly about the national border, and they did not verbalize their feelings. Does that mean that these travellers did not see the national border as something special? It is hard to say, because the only traces we can analyze are their written accounts, and if there is nothing written about crossing the border, nothing can be concluded. Those who actually wrote about the national border, however, often made it into a symbol of the differences between the Soviet socialist system and the Western capitalist world. The communist Ture Nerman entered the country by train from Poland. This border, he said, was the border between capitalist Europe and the country where the workers ruled. He was happy and sang to himself when he was entering the Soviet Union.¹³

Bengt Idestam-Almquist was another traveller, and he saw the national border not only as a border between two political systems but as a symbol of the differences between the Russian and the Swedish people. He was a well-known writer and above all a film critic during the inter-war period. In his travelogue from 1932 he mixes the past, the present and the future in a very intricate way. He entered the Soviet Union from Finland as so many other tourists and travellers did, and for him the national border was not just a geographical place. It was also a border of memory in his mind. He had had the ambition to travel around by car in the Soviet Union, because he and a friend of his wanted to go camping. They had done so on their way from Stockholm to Finland, and when the rain was pouring down outside the tent, Idestam-Almquist remembered his former visits in old Russia. He had spent his childhood and some years during the war in St Petersburg. In the rain, memories from Imperial Russia and the years of the revolution came to his mind.¹⁴ When they continued their way to the Soviet Union, he and his friend also made a stop in the Finnish village Terijoki. This was the place where the Russian aristocracy had had their summer villas, but now everything was in decay.¹⁵ The changes the Russian revolution had led to had also affected the Finnish landscape, and the expected ruins started already in Finland. In that sense the border was not so distinct; the decay started long before the frontier station. Later on, however, Idestam-Almquist admitted that on the other side of the border the ruins had turned into something positive. When Idestam-Almquist and his friend actually reached the Soviet border, they realized that it was not possible to go by car in the Soviet Union. It would have been too expensive, because they would have been obliged to pay a heavy import duty to bring the car into the country.¹⁶

The Finnish border station was named Rajajoki and the Soviet station was named Beloostrov. Between them runs the little river Systerbäck. When Idestam-Almquist stood there waiting to enter the Soviet Union, he started to remember once more. The last time he was there was in 1922. At that time, when he was looking at the other side of the border, he just felt disgust. The only thing he saw was a field of ruins, and everything was poor and dirty. He compared what he saw with the Russia of his childhood, and he shivered with disgust. At that moment, he was almost the only person to enter the Soviet Union, because almost nobody was allowed in. At the so-called train station, more or less a shed, the train stopped. He was surprised that no-one helped him with his luggage. He concluded that Russians were

---

⁹ Hollander 1981; see also Caute 1988 and Jensen 1984.

¹⁰ See e.g. Nerman 1930 pp. 12-22.

¹¹ See e.g. von Rosen 1926 pp. 8-12.

¹² Nerman 1930 p. 130.

¹³ Nerman 1930 pp. 263-264. The Russians he met in the new country were, according to him, smiling and innocent.

¹⁴ Idestam-Almquist (‘Robin Hood’) 1932 pp. 7-34.


not curious any longer, and he saw hunger in their eyes.\textsuperscript{17} He continued to reminisce about his last visit, and in those days Leningrad had been a dead city. He had just seen ruins, and the people had seemed to be hungry and poor.\textsuperscript{18}

Ten years after he wondered how things had changed. The first impression he had now was how different everything looked. The dirt and the apathy were gone; there was another air, another feeling. Now he felt both energy and happiness in the air. He saw women and men working together, and everywhere he found planted flowers. Idestam-Almquist was relieved; people who cared for flowers were alive. Even the secret police were nice young boys, he stated.\textsuperscript{19}

Even if Idestam-Almquist sympathized with the new Soviet Union, one could not classify him as a genuine political pilgrim. In his travelogue, the border in 1932 pointed to a new time, a new time compared to both the old Russia and the years of the revolution. Somehow the border also symbolized a mixture of old and modern times. Maybe he was not aware of it when he crossed the border, but as one reads further on in his travelogue, it becomes clear to him. He stated that modern times in Russia were completely Russian. He appreciated many of the new reforms in the state, but he was also aware of the oppression. Idestam-Almquist loved the Russian people and saw the new Soviet system as offering hope for a new Russian future. He did not, however, see communism as a Russian force. He maintained that two lines of development went on in Russia; the first was communism, which strived for equality. The second line was the unknown destiny of Russia. Sometimes the two lines had cooperated, but Idestam-Almquist was not sure it would continue this way. Russia was special, and maybe the country needed a period of hard revolutionary government to be able to flourish in all its glory in a near future. Maybe the harsh Soviet system would mean a new kind of mixture of capitalism and communism, something modern and at the same time very Russian?\textsuperscript{20}

Other travellers were more pessimistic. Though the Swedish actress Pauline Brunius crossed the border and the river Systerbäck in 1934, two years after Idestam-Almquist, her experience was similar to Bengt Idestam-

\textsuperscript{17} Idestam-Almquist 1932 pp. 36f.
\textsuperscript{20} Op. cit. pp. 225-230. Even travellers that did not know much about Russian culture were fascinated by the mixture of an old romantic Russia and the country of Lenin, see e.g. Quensel 1926 p. 11.
impression of the border was actually a non-impression, since they travelled in a comfortable train that was as good as an ordinary Western train. He admitted, however, that the speed of the train could have been higher. For him the border itself was not an obvious marker between two cultures, and he did not realize he was in the new Soviet Union until he reached Moscow. In the rest of his reports from the journey, he describes his impressions from the train window.28

In 1937, the writers Gustaf Hellström and Ivar Harrie travelled in the Soviet Union together with some other Swedish journalists. They also entered the Soviet Union from Finland. Gustaf Hellström’s first impression was similar to that of Marika Stiernstedt. He saw depression and melancholy, and he asked himself if this really was the place where modern man could be studied. He was sceptical.29 Later on in his account he was more positive about the reforms, but the people and the life in the Soviet Union were still different from the Swedish way of life, and Soviet development was not desirable from a Swedish point of view.30

Ivar Harrie did not write about entering the Soviet Union; on the contrary, he discussed his exit. The strange feeling of relief, he said, was often described when people were taking the train back to Finland across the river Systerbäck. Harrie felt the same. In Finland he was back in Scandinavia, and he felt safe. In Scandinavia you had freedom of speech, and your thoughts were respected. For him the true community was Nordic, and the Finnish-Russian border conceptualized the differences between the Nordic and Russian cultures. The Russians were different, and that was, for example, the reason why accused politicians in the Moscow Trials in 1937 confessed their guilt instead of protesting against the terror.31

For many Swedish travellers the river Systerbäck really symbolized the border between Them and Us. In the Soviet Union they had a communist system, quite different from the capitalistic Western countries. If you sympathized with the system, you could feel relief on the border, but if you were critical, you noticed decay, hunger, oppression and despair. But in the Soviet Union, the Russians lived, and they were another kind of people. They needed other things than Scandinavians; they were a mystic people with their own priorities. The writer Anna Lenah Elgström made it clear that this difference was both ideological and cultural. She describes in her travelogue two different kinds of women in the Soviet Union, and these women also became symbols of the entire nation.32 As an example she described her two different Soviet guides. The guide in Leningrad was ascetic and worked very hard, even if she had a fever and a cough. She had no youth, no female desire of happiness and no tenderness. It was, Elgström wrote, like all femininity was left behind on the other side of the river Systerbäck. This woman was not a communist, but still she symbolized the new ideological woman who never thought of herself and worked hard for community. On the other hand, the guides in Moscow were like oriental odalisques, both negligent and inconsiderate. They symbolized the Asian and barbaric side of the Soviet Union, and this image was not positive. Obviously, Elgström preferred the first kind of woman, even if this woman was also very different compared to women in Scandinavia; the river Systerbäck was in her account made into a distinct borderline that conceptualized the differences between Scandinavia and the Soviet Union. Her conclusion was that women in the Soviet Union were part of another world; they lived another kind of life.33

Another Swedish woman, writing in the liberal newspaper Tidevarvet, understood the border and the river Systerbäck differently than Elgström. She meant that the border was far too complicated to cross. The Finnish frontier guards were too slow, but when you had crossed the border, soldiers from the Red Army smiled and greeted you. Even for her the border was a distinct line between two worlds, but she was far more enthusiastic than Elgström, seeing a country where people were building a new society, a country full of hope and energy. For example, the women did not care for fashion; instead they were engaged in important things in real society. However, there were still things reminiscent of the old world to be found in the new country.34

The Soviet border was the dividing line between something well-known and the unknown. If the travellers sympathized with the new communist government, they felt joy and saw a new country full of hope and energy. The Western countries symbolized instead an obsolete society. If the travellers were more negative, they could emphasize the Asiatic and barbaric traits in the new country. In some cases they saw both trends on the other side of the border. Anna Lenah Elgström is an excellent example of that. In

28 Stiernstedt 1935.
29 Helström 1937 pp. 25f.
32 She was not the only one who saw the woman as a symbol of another nation, see Tornbjer 2008 pp. 108-112.
33 Elgström 1932 pp. 11-24.
34 Hermelin 1934.
any case, the national border became the distinct borderline between Them and Us. The view of the border itself conceptualized the travellers’ view of everything on the other side. The national border was not just a political borderline; it also became a mental border, and everything strange and unknown on the other side was connected to the fact that it happened there.

The travellers’ conceptualization of the border did not, however, happen in a man’s land. The travellers were teeming with prejudices and images of the Soviet Union, of communism, of Russia and of the Russian people. These images naturally penetrated their own conceptualization of the national border. Earlier research has emphasized that there were two distinct discourses dealing with the conceptions of the Soviet Union in Sweden during the inter-war period. There was one romantic discourse in which the Soviet Union was comprehended as an extension of old Russia. Russia was Asia, and people who lived there were of different than the people of Scandinavia or Europe. The second discourse emphasized the rational trait in the Soviet Union. The country was about to develop into an industrial and rational model state.35 You can see traces of both of these discourses in the travelogues, but no matter which discourse dominates, the national border was seen as a distinct borderline between Them and Us. In some cases the other side is seen as a model and in others as a threat, but the travellers who wrote about the national border did not think that the border could unite the two opposite sides; instead, it still defined us from each other. The border can in this sense be seen as a marker of identification. However, where was the identification? In the above-mentioned examples the travellers identified themselves with a vague Western society or Europe, sometimes Scandinavia and sometimes also Sweden. The Other was always the Soviet Union or Russia, either the country was seen as a rational, progressive and communist society on its way into a better future, or as a backward, Asian and barbaric country. The border itself made this definition visible, and maybe this is the reason why many of the travellers wrote about their feelings and observations when they crossed the line.

Actually, this is not the only way borderlines can be conceptualized. Borders can be negotiated, and regions can be created across them. One example is the Baltic region or the Öresund region. Earlier research indicates that borders can be constructed and reconstructed in different ways, and that this depends on the person who reflects upon the border.36 There is a long tradition of regarding Russia (and Eastern Europe) as the Other of Western Europe. Russia has been seen as barely civilized compared to Western Europe.37 This tradition continued after the Bolshevik assumption of power. The differences in political and ideological systems were too many between the Soviet Union and any of the European countries. Even if the national borders were questioned (and they never were in the analyzed travelogues), it did not matter. The border itself still symbolized the conflict between these different systems, either you liked the other side or not.38

The national border was not always clearly visible for the travellers. All travellers mentioned above crossed the border at a guarded frontier station. There are, however, some examples when people crossed the Finnish-Russian border in a more unorganised way. Alfred Badlund, a Swedish communist, failed the first time he illegally tried to get into the Soviet Union. He and his friend had been going round in circles, when the Finnish police caught them. The next time they succeeded, but even if Badlund did not recognize the border itself, he realized that he was in the Soviet Union when he and his friend met Soviet soldiers.39 They were both very disappointed by the Soviet system; instead of finding a workers’ paradise, they were put into prison, and later on they were moved to a camp in Siberia. The Soviet administration accused them of being spies.40 Badlund managed to flee, and he was relieved when he finally reached the Swedish legation.41 Badlund himself did not experience the border as a distinct line, but notwithstanding he saw Sweden and the Soviet Union as two heterogeneous cultures, and somehow the borderland became the symbol of the differences. Neither the laws nor the political systems were the same in the two countries, and the positive attitude he had when he entered the Soviet Union was gone after a few weeks in the country.

36 See e.g. Nilsson, Sanders & Stubbeggaard 2007 pp. 8f.
37 Wolff 1994. However, Martin E. Malia states that when Russian development was the same as in Europe, the Europeans had a positive view of the nation. It was through the Bolshevik assumption of power, Russia was constituted as the Other of Europe, Malia 1999.
39 Badlund 1935 pp. 48f.
The described border in the travelogues was a political borderline, a distinct line that separated two defined states from each other. However, borders are, as I mentioned above, not given, and national borders have frequently been changed during history. The border between Poland and Russia has for example been disputed for centuries. The border between Finland and Russia has also been changed. After the Finnish Winter War in 1939, Finland lost the frontier station where most of the Swedish travellers entered the Soviet Union, but the travellers did not discuss the border in this sense. Instead they saw it as an obvious demarcation that separated two different cultures from each other. The following events during and after the Second World War show that it was not always that easy. Borders can be changed and so can how they are experienced.
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To examine the conceptualisation of borders in Swedish travelogues from the Soviet Union in the 1930’s, as Charlotte Tornbjer does in her article, is relevant for several reasons. First, analysing the writings of Swedish authors like Marika Stiernstedt, Ture Nerman and Anna Lenah Elgström, among others, contributes to left-wing historiography and adds to the understanding of the international reception of Stalinism. Second, the accounts from the Soviet Union can be said to form a backdrop for the conceptualisation of the ‘new human being’ (’den nya människan’) in the emerging welfare state in Sweden. Furthermore, the subject can be considered in the light of the theoretical debate on travel writing.

Coming from a German context, I would like to view Tornbjer’s sources in the light of Germanophone academic research on the subject. Since my own background lies in literary criticism and film studies, I am going to focus on two aspects: a literary and a historical perspective, and thereby try to show how insights derived from post-structuralist, discourse-analytical and post-colonial theories might contribute to a better understanding of the literary sources employed in the paper. These perspectives are not fundamentally different from Tornbjer’s approach, but my ambition is, rather than merely commenting on Tornbjer’s use of material, to open up further points of departure for historical and literary research. Therefore, I will not confine my remarks to the question of borders, but will broaden the perspective towards a more general discussion about the use of travel writing as a source for historical research while hoping to show the relevance of Tornbjer’s research.
Travelogues as a source for historians: from authenticity to allegory

Tornbjer’s research addresses questions of importance for left-wing historiography, since some of her source material not only deals with the self-fashioning of left-wing intellectuals, as in the case of the Swedish communist Ture Nerman, but also with the reception of Stalinism. Thus, the Swedish travelogues from the 1930s can contribute to an understanding of the international reception of the events in the Soviet Union, which have been described by political writers like Walter Benjamin, André Gide, Lion Feuchtwanger among others – and which have led to well-known controversies.1 Feuchtwanger’s notorious account, ‘Moscow 1937’, is an example of a very positive reception of the Soviet system, often read and criticised as a tribute to Stalinism – or at least a justification of it. However, one could argue – along with Bertolt Brecht, Lion Feuchtwanger and Heinrich Mann – that positive images were strategically important because the Soviet Union was perceived as the only counterforce against fascism.2 Thus, as these writers came to the conclusion that to fight both against Hitler and Stalin was impossible, they opted for strategic conduct. In short, their texts can be said to have not only a representational, but also a performative function. If we adopt this approach, then travel writing is to be perceived not only as a mere document, but rather as an intervention in an ongoing debate and as a way of not merely recording ‘reality’, but of creating it.3 I will get back to this point. Still, it would be interesting to learn if any of the Swedish travelers reflect upon these issues – and if so, how these questions are articulated and conceptualised.4

1 Cf. Benjamin 1980; Feuchtwanger 1993; Gide 1936 as well as Gide 1937.
3 I follow Foucault’s conception of ‘discourse’ and Butler’s appropriation of Austin’s model of performativity. Foucault 1982; Judith Butler 1990.
4 The Swedish magazine Tidsskriftet, for example, displays a rather ambivalent attitude towards the Soviet Union – and offers a dialogical perspective (in a Bakhtinian sense) as opposed to many rather monological travelogues. Cf Kellgren 1971. At times, even a single article can display a dialogical perspective. For example, in an article from 1927 Honorine Hermelin not only notices the perceived positive changes in society like ‘Självestyrning inom fabriker och skolor, ingen husbondediktatur i hemmet, kvinnor och barn fria medarbetare’ (Kellgren 1971 p. 225; note also Hermelin’s intersectionalist perspective!), but she is equally aware of the drawbacks: ‘Men vi hör också roslingarna från allt som därinne håller på att strypas’ (Kellgren 1971 p. 226). Honorine Hermelin interestingly defines her standpoint in a most unusual mode of self-reflexivity. Instead of claiming to state the truth, her stand is a very source critical one – she is clearly aware that the readers generally have to rely on other people’s accounts about the Soviet Union: ‘Låt oss i ett ögonblick, i dessa tioårsdagar, granska vad vi vet – eller kan skymta – från vårt stora grannland i öster, bolsjevismens hemland.’ (Kellgren 1971 p. 225)
5 For a brief overview, cf. Holland & Huggan 1998 pp. 8-13. They suggest to rather see ‘travel writing as occupying a space of discursive conflict’ (p. 10), which Tornbjer adopts.
8 In his seminal work Culture and Imperialism Edward Said analyses the impact of novels ‘in the formation of imperial attitudes, references, and experiences.’ Said 1993 p. xii.
9 James Buzard, for example, sees the tourist as a mythic figure ‘determined by and in turn helps to determine the ways […] nations represent culture and acculturation to themselves.’ Buzard 1993 p. 4. Buzard actually distinguishes between ‘traveller’ and ‘tourist’, as a lot of literary criticism on travel writing does. However, this distinction is not relevant in this context.

Stressing the texts’ performative function might also enable us to leave behind the fairly fruitless debate about ‘fact’ and ‘fiction’.5 Early research on travel writing has focused on the authenticity of the texts and on questions of objectivity and truth.6 In their attempt to depart from this debate, Holland and Huggan, while referring to Percy Adams, state that ‘travel writers are under no obligation to tell their readers the truth’.7 However, more important than debating the authenticity of these texts could be to analyse their function. To illustrate, if we perceive travelogues about expeditions from the 16th century and onwards not only as documents of unknown countries, but also, by acknowledging their performative aspect, acknowledge their function in the rise of colonialism, we can come to the conclusion, as does Edward W. Said, that cultural texts and imperialism become silent allies.8 Thus, travelogues have an important function in the self-fashioning of a nation, a society, a community or a group of intellectuals. To illustrate, the ‘discovery’ of new countries triggered a big number of travelogues which are situated in far away zones, for example Thomas Mores’ Utopia (1516) or Montesquieu’s Lettres persanes (1721), which are hardly travelogues in a geographical, but rather in a philosophical sense – depicting societies as a counter-image to our own. To read travelogues as allegories could be a rewarding point of departure.
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The Soviet Union as Utopia

In the 1920s and 1930s the Soviet Union offered an alternative to the decline of capitalism in the West. Anne Hartmann has pointed out that the Soviet Union initially functioned as a counter-model to ‘Western emptiness, decadence and political stagnation’ – from the end of the 1920s as an alternative to the ‘stumbling capitalism’ and the rising national-socialism. Thus travelling to the Soviet Union has often been conceptualised using the trope of ‘Utopia seeking’. According to Hartmann, the journeys to the Soviet Union reproduce the structural movement of utopian novels. In this context Tornbjer refers to Hollander who explains the search for utopia with a feeling of alienation experienced by the travellers: ‘estrangement from one’s society invariably precedes or accompanies the projection of hope and affirmation upon the others’. Analysing the Swedish texts, however, might enable us to modify the trope of utopia, since Tornbjer shows that the Swedish writers did not necessarily conceptualize the Soviet Union as utopia, but often adopted a critical perspective towards the Soviet system.

Hartmann points out that by 1925 the isolation of the Soviet Union, initially due to civil war and intervention, had become a political option enforced by the government. Not only were the borders enforced, but also more controls were imposed on the traffic to, from and within the country. In the same year, in 1925, the organisation VOKS (Vsesojuznoe obščestvo kul’turnoj svjazi s zagranicej) was founded, offering foreign travellers (guests) ‘cultural services’. From then on travellers usually had a guide who both controlled their movements and served as a filter for how they were to perceive/interpret the situation in the country. Thus, the statement that improved communications led to an increase in travelling, might have to be modified. At least for the German travellers entering the country became increasingly difficult. This leads us to the question of borders and how we define them. Tornbjer shows that borders were conceptualised in various ways, both as national/geographical/territorial ones or as metaphors for ideological differences, as an abyss ‘zwischen Welt und Welt’ (‘between world and world’) as Austrian writer Joseph Roth put it. If we perceive space as a site to construct identities, then we can now take a closer look at how these identities are shaped.

Travelogues as a means of negotiating identity: the colonial perspective

Literature can be perceived as a space where the European self unfolds itself (in defining itself in opposition to the non-European ‘Other’) and from where it has become universalised. As Patrick Holland and Graham Huggan point out, travel writing is never innocent and includes often unreflected, colonialist assumptions: ‘It is worth remembering, though, that travel writing, however entertaining, is hardly harmless, and that behind its apparent innocuousness and charmingly anecdotal observations lies a series of powerfully distorting myths about the other (often, ‘non-Western’) cultures’.

The question of borders is a central issue in post-colonial theories, which focus on modes of exclusion and inclusion, on power structures as well as on the construction of the self and other. The underlying structure of ‘self’ and ‘other’, the Foucauldian analysis of the power structures that determine exclusions, have informed Edward Said’s conceptualisation of Orientalism and its legacy in modern travelogues like the TV program ‘Packat & klart’, for instance. In a post-colonial understanding most of the travelogues are informed by a binary, logocentric structure. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam have pointed out, though, that colonial structures can be detected not only in terms of content, but also on a formal level. Therefore, a detailed study of narrative devices employed in the text, for example the aspect of focalization, can unearth inherent colonial structures.
Post-colonial theories have helped to create an awareness of colonialist tendencies in representing ‘the Other’. Post-colonial criticism at its best can uncover essentialising notions of ‘nation’, ‘people’ or ‘culture’ and can lay bare attempts to naturalise these concepts. Thus, if these concepts are employed in the texts, we can deconstruct them. However, we should not run the risk of merely looking at the binarism of ‘us’ and ‘them’, since this will inevitably lead to an ahistorical perspective which reduces complexities by levelling out regional, intellectual and political differences. I will come back to this.

If we perceive travelogues as formed by contemporary discourse and its power structures, a travel memoir tends to reveal more about the ideologies, the desires and fears, the ongoing debates and negotiations in the public sphere the writer belongs to than about the society he/she seems to depict. Let us now take a look at the Öffentlichkeit\(^20\) the writer belongs to: the literary public sphere in Sweden.

\textit{Travel writing and its impact on Swedish nation building in the 1930s}

From a discourse-analytical perspective Tornbjer’s source material can add to an understanding of how the national discourse in the 1930s in Sweden is shaped, negotiated and contested. What do these texts tell us about the self-image of Swedish society and politics? In what way do they negotiate an understanding of Swedishness? What impact did the books have on Swedish nation building in the 1930s? Perceiving the texts not merely as documents but also as performative acts allows us to analyse them as interventions in an ongoing debate about the formation of the welfare state. In this context, the depiction of Soviet society would form the backdrop against which the Swedish Folkhem (‘home of the people’) was created. During this process one contested discourse dealt with the question of how the social democratic party tried to (re-)define its working-class legacy in opposition to communism. If the social democrats wanted to represent the whole nation, how then do they convince followers of more conservative parties of their legitimacy to do so? Even Swedish mainstream cinema addressed this question, for example in the comedy Karl-Fredrik regerar (‘Karl-Fredrik governs’) by Gustaf Edgren (1934), which depicts the communist past of the film’s protagonist, who has become an MP in the newly elected social democratic government, as an adolescent aberration on his way to maturity. The social democrats are depicted as a non-radical, non-revolutionary party embodying universal humanism and the politics of compromise, thus representing the whole nation, including the middle and upper-classes.\(^{21}\) In this context it would be interesting to analyse in what way the 1930s travelogues on the successes and failures of the communist system in the Soviet Union can be read as interventions in current Swedish debates on welfare state politics. Here, Bourdieu’s theory of the field and its various actors could inform our understanding of the performative aspects of the texts as part of a public debate.\(^{22}\)

\textit{Travelogues and narrativity}

Tornbjer’s source material consists of published travelogues. However, one could also argue that the fact that they are published might result in another perspective: unlike letters, diaries and journals, in most cases the travelogues Tornbjer examines were intended to be published.\(^{23}\) Thus, we could place the 1930s travel writing in a tradition of post-revolutionary reportage and presentations in workers’ clubs for educational purposes during the 1920s. If we therefore do not consider the travelogues to be mere documents, but also interventions into current debates, we could grasp the conflicting intentions and opposing world views expressed in the texts. To illustrate, Charlotte Tornbjer quotes Marika Stiernstedt who claims that she was disappointed about the situation in the Soviet Union. Do we have to take Stiernstedt’s assumption at face value or could this be a rhetorical device? By stressing how high her expectations were, she heightens the impact of her disappointment. In my opinion we can only come to a profound understanding of the texts and their conceptualisation of borders by decoding the aesthetic, rhetorical and literary devices

\(\text{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{20}}} \text{In a Habermasian sense.}\)

\(\text{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{21}}} \text{For a more detailed analysis of fiction films from the 1930s and their ideological function for the self-fashioning of the welfare-state, cf. Qvist 1995.}\)

\(\text{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{22}}} \text{For Bourdieu and his conception of the literary field, cf. Bourdieu 1992; Bourdieu 1993; Bourdieu 2000. Both Toril Moi and Catrine Brödje have appropriated Bourdieu for feminist literary studies, see: Moi 1991; Moi 1994; Brödje 2001.}\)

\(\text{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{23}}} \text{The question is not the least relevant when it comes to the travelogues of what Tornbjer calls ‘just curious ordinary people’. In this context it would be interesting to examine the circumstances that allowed ‘ordinary’ people to publish their texts. In other words, why would publishers be interested in these accounts? What made them realize that there was a market for these books?}\)
employing each text: not in a general overview, but specifically for each text which then, in turn, has to be contextualised.24

In order to do so, we should take a closer look at the narrative means employed. ‘What do the writers depict and how?’ is a question that leads us to an analysis of narratological aspects. What narrative modes are used? Contrasting tradition and modernity has been a widely used device. In doing so, what kind of iconography is employed?25 In what way is the narration structured? To what extent are the texts submitted to genre conventions? Barbare Korte points out that travelogues of the Grand Tour, for instance, were confined to recording what was worth knowing and registering.26 Korte’s example shows how the subjective account of the traveller can be restricted by narrative structures. Even within the genre of travel writing, sub-genres evolve while creating their own generic rules. Thus, the task of the critic would be to lay bare these narrative structures. Pointing at narrative techniques, however, is by no means a way of denying the relevance of historical sources. Instead, it can be a means of reflecting upon the process of interpretation, as Helmers and Mazzeo state: ‘Claiming that the repertoire of narrative techniques available to the travel writer borrow from fiction is not to dismiss their effect as falsehood but to enrich our understanding as scholars of the complex connections between prose readership and writerly choices.’27

In this context one should also consider that the writing self is not congruent with the experiencing self, as literary studies on travel writing have pointed out. For example, Helmers and Mazzeo quote Roland Barthes stating: ‘the one who speaks (in the narrative) is not the one who writes (in real life) and the one who writes is not the one who it’.28 Barthes’ words are echoed in the self-conception of French filmmaker Chris Marker who is known for saying that when he edits a film he has already turned into someone else different from the one who he was when he filmed the footage.29 Why do I mention this? Because we have to realize that autobiographical accounts are always mediated - by genre conventions and narrative structures as well as by the passage of time which might lead writers to view their experiences in a different light.

Production and distribution - a material(istic) perspective

In order to being able to analyse the impact of these writings, one should have a closer look at the modes of publishing and distribution. For it matters if a book is published for the mainstream market (well-distributed books from publishing houses like Bonniers förlag) or rather for a smaller segment (like Ture Nerman’s writings). Distribution determines not only the (material) availability of the books for the potential buyers, but also the critical reception of the texts which in turn can exert an influence on the readers.

---

24 With ‘context’ I do not mean ‘historical background’, but a discursive approach starting out from Ricoeur, cf. Ricoeur 1976. In his study of the film director Oliver Stone in the context of auteur theory, Jan Distelmeyer suggests a departure from classical hermeneutics and their focus on the intention of an author. Instead, Distelmeyer regards texts as (cultural) products, thereby taking into account the industrial context of production and distribution, the social context as well as a result of the process of reception. Cf. Distelmeyer 2005 pp. 40ff. Thus, rather than merely deciphering symbols (as in semiotics), textual analysis should deal with the construction of meaning in the production and reception of texts.

25 Analysing the visual iconography of contrast which is employed in accounts from the Soviet Union enables Anne Hartmann to come to the conclusion that the religious iconography initially employed is more and more overlaid by an increased emphasis on rationalism. A more messianistic approach in which the Soviet Union is phrased as a ‘new Jerusalem’, is superseded by a perspective that involves two conceptions of the ‘rational’. Firstly, the Soviet Union is modelled in opposition to Nazism which is perceived as irrational or in opposition to the failure of capitalism which is also perceived as irrational. Secondly, the writings can take a disillusioned, pragmatic stance. Cf. Hartmann 2006.

26 Korte 2000 pp. 41-53. In this context Buzard points out that the Grand Tour also had a patriotic function when some travellers returned stating they had become ‘better Englishmen’ than when they departed, having seen by contrast with other societies the great qualities of their own’, Buzard 1993 p. 8.


29 Cf. Kämper & Thode 1997. Helmers & Mazzeo quote Andrea Stöckl on the belatedness of the self: ‘The self we write about is turned into ‘an Other’ when we progress in time. Thus, who we think we are when we write a text is already another self. We can thus know and write about our selves from a limited perspective /.../ If we create ourselves as an ego in the text, we should be aware that it is not always our selves we are talking about’ (Helmers & Mazzeo 2007 p. 7) Autobiographical theory has shown that ‘all representation of the self [...] is selective, self-censoring, and constructed’ (ibid.) Thus, travel writing ‘must be treated as the product of a traveling, writing ‘self’, one with a constructed narrative point-of-view.’
Considering the material(istic) aspect of the travel writings can prove useful. Who finances the texts? What is their intended purpose? To illustrate, Carl Linnaeus’ writings not only give an account of the idiosyncrasies of each Swedish landscape (even this a mode of categorisation and defining borders), but his texts also had economic and political consequences, since the Swedish king financed Linnaeus’ journeys in order to support the exploitation of natural resources for e.g., medical and pharmaceutical purposes. Thus, travel writing is never innocent – never exists in an ahistorical context, in a vacuum – but is always informed by ideological, economic and philosophical debates and power structures.

Situating the writer: self-fashioning and preconceptions

Stating that travellers in the Soviet Union ‘were prepared to meet a different kind of society’ triggers questions like: What formed the preconceptions of the writers? How does the author’s political standpoint inform the accounts? Obviously, a discourse-analytical perspective could add to our understanding of the preconceptions of the writers. Why would this be important? Because the preconceptions define the modes of narration of the travelogues, they define what the writers focus on, and what they depict – simply, what they consider worth mentioning. ‘You only see what you know’ (‘Man sieht nur, was man weiß’) was the strapline for an advertising campaign run by a German publisher for travel books a couple of years ago. ‘You only see what you know’ can also be translated as ‘what you expect to see’, what you can make sense of, what corresponds with your preconceptions. That is why we have to ask: What preconceptions about the Soviet Union did the writers have? What images and narratives were shaping their perception? Do the writers adhere to different literary or philosophical traditions? Ideally, this analysis would have to be undertaken for every single writer, since a communist like Ture Nerman would very likely have different preconceptions than middle-class writer Marika Steirnstedt. Furthermore, one could go on asking: What impact did the presence of, for instance, Alexandra Kollontai in Sweden have, or the broad media coverage of Moa and Harry Martinson’s famous visit to the Soviet Union, or the reports about the Soviet Union in widely-read and/or politically influential magazines like Tidevarvet and Morgenbris? This shows that there remains a lot of potential for further research.

I would like to get back to the notion of self-fashioning mentioned earlier. How do the writers define their own standpoint? Do the writers reflect their role as authors/as eye-witnesses? Feuchtwanger does. In the preface to ‘Moscow 1937’ he outlines why he has decided to publish his writings after all. Of course, these reflexions can never be taken at face value, but have to be understood and analysed as a rhetorical device – as a means of justifying and author-ising one’s own position. Therefore, the question of self-inauguration is an essential one. How do the writers reflect on their own situatedness? To what extent do the writers critically refer to the limited mobility that restricted their movement in the Soviet Union due to governmental control exerted by appointed travel guides? To what extent does the narrator reflect upon his/her (political) standpoint or his/her own preconceptions? And what rhetoric strategies do they employ in order to voice themselves and to make their texts appear as truthful, reliable, objective and important? In other words, how do the writers try to maximise their discursive authority? Does the lack of self-reflexion relate to the writer’s effort of enhancing the ‘objectivity’ and ‘authenticity’ of the text? Very often, this is a tactic to disguise the modes of production and to label the text as ‘objective’ and ‘true’.

A critical analysis could reveal the inherent power-structures of the text and dismantle, just to give an example, orientalist stereotypes. Why would these questions be important? Because we have the problem of comparing different texts from different contexts. As James E. Young pointed out, eyewitness accounts are very difficult to compare as they all follow very individual modes of narration – stress certain aspects and tend to forget others, for instance. Charlotte Tornbjer has to deal with an enormous variety of sources. Although she narrows them down to published material and monographs, thus leaving out journals, diaries and letters as well as magazine articles and news reports, the variety of the

30 As Mayte Gómez states: ‘Prefaces, forewords and afterwords were filled with justifications of the travel book itself as a desperately needed exercise in objective and scientific observation.’ Gómez 2002 p. 69.
31 Tornbjer notes Anna Lenah Elgström’s orientalist perspective on Soviet women.
32 James E. Young, after having analysed video-witness-documents by Holocaust survivors, came to the conclusion that their narrations follow such different structures, that it seems almost impossible to compare them. Even if the survivors had been imprisoned in the same concentration camp at the same time, their accounts can differ enormously. However, Young states, referring to Lawrence Langer, only if the survivors have the same ‘Weltanschauung’, does their narrativisation follow the same patterns, thus allowing for a comparison and interpretation. Young 1988.
remaining texts is impressive, encompassing memories of actors, communists, middle-class writers, and blue-collar workers. Considering the diversity of sources, we have to ask ourselves how can we grasp the multiplicity of standpoints and the variety of narrative structures. In short: How can we ever be able to compare all these different texts? In my opinion this will only be possible if we deal with each text specifically and analyse its mode of production and its specific function. To do so, we have to contextualize the text and to re-historicise it. Otherwise we run the risk of neglecting a diachronic perspective and make the Soviet Union appear static and fixed.

Criticising the ’Us and Them’-dichotomy

By contrasting two countries, Sweden and the Soviet Union, there is always a risk of perceiving the two nations as monolithic entities. Is the Soviet Union in fact always ’the Other’? On the one hand Gustaf Hellström and Ivar Harrie seem to be obvious examples of this, clearly employing contrasts of ’us’ and ’them’, celebrating the freedom of speech in Scandinavia and the lack of it in the Soviet Union. On the other hand, defining ’us’ and ’them’ merely in terms of ethnicity sidelines a transnational perspective that would allow us to define identity also in terms of ideological belonging, as in the case of the communist writers who experienced a sense of alienation in their native societies. Therefore, letting the perspective of ’us’ and ’them’ dominate might result in perpetuating the binary thinking and logocentrism this dichotomy contains. Gaps, fissures and a process-like understanding of the perception might be overlooked. Indeed, Charlotte Tornbjer mentions in her paper how the border is perceived by some almost gradually – not as a distinct boundary, but as a slow process – starting during the trip through Finland or Poland. In some of Tornbjer’s sources the dichotomy of ’Us and them’ is marked in the opposition of Nordic versus Finnish-Russian culture. In this context Finland is sometimes perceived as ’not us’ (especially in 1930s Swedish mainstream cinema). In other texts, however, which perceive Finland as a transit zone, a liminal space (Naficy), a passage to the Soviet Union, the distinction is less clear-cut. Further studies could and perhaps should take the questions of centre and periphery within the country into account. Do the writers perceive any differences between Moscow and rural Russia? Leningrad as the former cosmopolitan capital St Petersburg and its Tsarist heritage might have had a different effect on the writers than the contemporary capital.

How, then, can political changes – and I am thinking foremost of the rise of Stalinism – be depicted from a diachronic, rather than a synchronic, perspective? What do the Swedish travelogues tell us about the ongoing changes in the Soviet Union and how are these perceived? What about the boundaries within the communist party and its politics of exclusion, especially during the Stalinist purges? It would also be interesting to learn if Ture Nerman, who in the 1920s was very positive about the Soviet Union, expressed any disillusionment later. These questions and remarks show that Tornbjer has chosen an utterly relevant topic that deserves more research.

To sum up, Tornbjer’s research can add to current theoretical debates not only in literary criticism, but in the arts in general. Analysing travelogues as allegorical, interventionist and performative allows us to leave behind the distinction of fact and fiction. In order to avoid mere postmodern relativism, I would suggest contextualising the texts by employing discourse-analytical theories and focusing on narrative devices as well as on materialistic aspects like the mode of production and reception of the texts.

Bibliography:


33 As opposed to Tornbjer’s observation, Hartmann notes that most German travelogues stress the process of border-crossing, not the least due to practical reasons (having to change onto broader railroad tracks or passing the wooden port at the frontier in Negoreloe). Hartmann 2007 p.109.

34 Cf. Wright 1998.

35 To illustrate, as early as 1926/27 Walter Benjamin mentions the repressions against members of the left, the decline of cultural diversity (avantgarde) as well as antisemitism – all of which can be seen as illustrating the fact that the Soviet experiment has failed according to Benjamin. Cf. Benjamin 1980.
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