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Making Sense of the Muddle
War Memoirs and the Culture of Remembering

Philip Dwyer

WRITING TO REMEMBER, WRITING TO FORGET

The early modern autobiography coincided with the rise of the centralising state.¹ It was written by the military and political elite in the service of one European monarchy or another, and was modelled on the wars of the ancients and in particular Caesar’s Gallic Wars. This began to shift in the seventeenth century when memoir writing was given a significant impetus by the Thirty Years War (1618–48) and the English Civil War (1642–51). Although most memoirs from those protracted and bloody conflicts were written by the gentry or the aristocracy, we see for the first time a surge in ‘popular’ autobiography, that is, accounts written by junior officers and common soldiers.² However, it was not until the war memoir became democratised from the middle of the eighteenth century onwards that the voice of the common soldier, anxious to be part of and a witness to history, was for the first time heard in a meaningful way.³ The American War of Independence (1775–83), and in particular the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars (1792–1815), gave the memoir a tremendous impetus. Thousands of memoirs were published, in all the major European languages, as individuals realised they had taken part in a momentous historical process and felt the need to testify to what they had lived through.⁴ This was especially the case for wars that followed political upheaval,
during which individuals realised not only that they were part of history, but also that they had lived through life-transforming personal experiences. Soldiers of all modern wars share this at least in common.\textsuperscript{5}

The democratisation of a genre that had once been the reserve of an aristocratic elite overlapped with a number of important cultural developments taking place in Western Europe. Those developments were increased literacy rates; the rise of the novel or the \textit{Bildungsroman}; the transformation in thinking about the place of the individual in society and history; the interest in self-representation that came to fruition in the eighteenth century;\textsuperscript{6} the change in status of the common soldier, increasingly socially accepted during the course of the nineteenth century;\textsuperscript{7} the evolution in military strategy from small professional armies to massed conscript armies; and the advent of what has been dubbed a ‘culture of sensibility’ when ‘feeling’ first came into its own in the literary and philosophical world.\textsuperscript{8} With modern armies being made up of citizen soldiers, and with a growing awareness of certain sentiments and sensibilities, the literate, upper classes were far more ready to listen to and read accounts by their social inferiors.\textsuperscript{9} The sentiments expressed by common soldiers – generally scenes of horror and destruction described in pathetic terms, but also as we can see in the following chapters, narratives of pain and suffering – were designed not only to elicit a response in the reader, but also to develop and refine the reader’s own sentiments and sensibilities.

Take the description of the retreat from Moscow in 1812 written by a survivor, Raymond de Montesquiou-Fezensac, who explicitly asks the reader to ‘participate in the sentiments … to share in my admiration of so much courage, and to sympathize with my compassion for so much misfortune’.\textsuperscript{10}

With the end of the First World War the genre reached new heights. The generation that fought in the trenches seems to have been educated, literate and ‘vigorously literary’ in ways that soldiers in other wars were not.\textsuperscript{11} Thousands of memoirs have been published by veterans of the Great War from all sides of the conflict, not to mention the number of diaries and the collections of letters.\textsuperscript{12} One can also include hundreds of novels inspired by the direct experience of trench warfare, from one of the most famous of them all, Erich Maria Remarque’s \textit{All Quiet on the Western Front}, to the lesser known Australian work, Frederic Manning’s \textit{The Middle Parts of Fortune} (once described by Hemingway as the ‘finest and noblest book of men in war that [he had] ever read’). These novels, especially when based on first-hand experience, are often more powerful and more convincing documents than memoirs.

The Second World War differed again from the First to the extent that the men writing their memoirs were often less literary, and more direct.
This was particularly the case of the Pacific theatre of war where conscripts and civilians alike confronted a particularly brutal enemy in the Japanese imperial soldier, who not only gave no quarter, but also treated his enemy appallingly. Robert Leckie’s *Helmet for My Pillow*, published in 1957, and Eugene Bondurant Sledge’s *With the Old Breed: At Peleliu and Okinawa*, first published in 1981, both describe how the Japanese would routinely mutilate dead American soldiers and how retaliations would inevitably follow, so that a vicious racialised war ensued in which both sides were guilty of committing atrocities and systematically murdering prisoners. Here too, as with the First World War, the novelised account of the pacific theatre, including in Japan where there was a rich tradition of autobiographical novels, blurred the lines between fact and fiction. In the United States, Norman Mailer’s *The Naked and the Dead*, which appeared in 1948, and James Jones’s *The Thin Red Line*, published in 1962, have become two of the most recognised novels on the American war in the Pacific. Much like the First World War novel, both play on the incompetence of military high command, as well as questioning the integrity of some of the men they depict.

Vietnam again changed the war memoir mould. Many more memoirs show a tripartite structure of before, during and after as participants testify to the transformative nature of the war. Before Vietnam, there is no life before or after war. With few exceptions, the war narrative usually starts with either recruitment or training, and finishes with the end of the recruit’s war. Colonel Noël, for example, declared at the end of his memoirs on the Napoleonic wars that there was no more to tell. ‘I have almost nothing to say about the period of peace’. The same could be said for most veterans of most wars. Childhood, peace and the mundane do not elicit a reflex to remember. A new life starts and finishes with time in the services and nothing that happens before and nothing that comes after has any importance in defining the experience that was combat.

There are important exceptions to that rule. Robert Graves and Siegfried Sassoon begin their memoirs detailing their family lives. So too does Remarque’s novel *All Quiet on the Western Front*, which can be read as memoir. The opening pages of Ron Kovic’s *Born on the Fourth of July* dwell on his life growing up in Massapequa, New York, before joining the United States Marine Corps straight out of high school. On the other hand, Marian Novak’s *Lonely Girls with Burning Eyes*, about the life of a military wife who stays at home while her husband is in Vietnam, is really about the post-war experience. On the whole, however, war is considered a rupture to one’s ‘normal’ life, and is therefore generally treated as completely separate from the civilian life led both before and after.
The reasons men and women decide to write about their wartime experiences are as varied as the individuals who put pen to paper: to justify individual acts or their participation in a war; to leave something behind for posterity (memoirs are often dedicated to children);\(^1^6\) as an act of remembrance in which the veteran not only speaks for himself, but in the name of others; to set the record straight; to commemorate fallen comrades; to bear witness; and to express dissatisfaction with the ways in which wars are officially portrayed. For Ron Kovic, writing was a way of ‘leaving something of meaning behind, to rise above the darkness and despair’.\(^1^7\)

Writing can, in other words, be a cathartic experience, a means of better coping with the present, of helping the author understand what they have lived through. It may have got them through a particularly difficult period in their lives, one in which the memories of past hardships and lost comrades have come flooding back to haunt them. This is not always the case though. Sometimes, writing about the past can be a traumatic experience as individuals relive what they had hoped to forget. Regardless of the person’s politics or background, regardless of whether they belonged to the oppressors or the oppressed, the reasons people testify in writing are ultimately the same. All put pen to paper in the knowledge that they have lived through, and survived, something extraordinary, that they have been part of a larger historical moment.\(^1^8\) The memoirist does not, however, set out to write history, but to give a privileged point of view, a personal perspective of what has been witnessed, experienced and suffered. In doing so, the author leaves himself open not only to the gaze of contemporaries, some of whom may have shared similar experiences, but also to the critical gaze of generations to come.\(^1^9\)

The chapters in this collection study diverse aspects of what we now know to be an enormous body of literature comprising tens of thousands of works for the modern period, across languages and cultures. Until quite recently, this body of work was not taken seriously, largely dismissed as unimportant because memoirs were considered notoriously inaccurate and unreliable. Historians consequently approached them in much the same manner as a lawyer questioning an aging witness with a history of perjury.\(^2^0\) They were all the more critical because the memoir often falls between two worlds, between truth and fiction, between primary and secondary source, between reality and imagination.\(^2^1\) This scepticism was exacerbated by historians.
traditionally shying away from the individual as subject, from the ‘I’ in history, wary of biography as much as autobiography and the memoir.22

The advent of alternative approaches to history, in particular oral history, cultural history, memory and the experience of war, has enabled scholars to tackle the war memoir from an entirely different perspective. Of interest now is not what people claim to have occurred, but what the author thinks worth remembering, how an event is remembered, how war memoirs shape ‘cultural memory’, and the impact they can have on the ways in which a society prefers to remember and celebrate past wars.23 The individual may recall particular experiences and events in the past, but that past is interpreted through the filter of time and shaped by larger social and political attitudes towards the war. There is, moreover, to paraphrase Jay Winter, a difference between what soldiers write, and what readers do with their words.24 It is the difference between a veteran’s memory of a war and ‘cultural memory’.

The literature has thus grown in recent years but there are still vast lacunae. Apart from the two world wars, there are no studies, for example, on war memoirs and the Mexican War of 1846–48, the Crimean War, the Italian and German wars of unification or the Franco-Prussian War of 1870.25 Nor are there any studies focusing on the wars of colonisation that took place throughout the nineteenth century, not to mention the twentieth-century wars of decolonisation. There is little for the Spanish Civil War – Franco’s death and the introduction of democracy saw an outpouring of war memoirs in Spain26 – nothing for the Korean War and little for Vietnam. Some of the chapters in this book are therefore the first to examine particular wars from the perspective of the memoir. Memoirs by American, British and Australian soldiers who have served in Afghanistan and Iraq have appeared since at least 2001, but we have almost no knowledge of what has been written from the Arab perspective. And, yes, jihadis write their memoirs too. There is, subsequently, a need for studies that further place war memoirs in context, that reflect on how memoirs have been used to transmit particular views of war as well as the experience of war itself, and that reflect on the ways in which veterans shape their reminiscences and the ways in which, in turn, veteran memories are shaped by the social and political environment.27 Scholars are, as is manifest in this collection, increasingly engaging with the ways in which memory and written representations of the past interact, how experiences are transmitted, and how in some instances – think of France, Germany or Yugoslavia in the post-Second World War years, Israel after the 1948 war, or Pakistan and India after Partition – the state, political parties and individuals coalesce to
erase from history those who had persecuted and to restore to prominence those who had been proscribed.28

WAR, HISTORY AND MEMOIR WRITING

There has always been a certain amount of anxiety surrounding the accuracy or ‘authenticity’ of memoirs, not only among historians and readers but also especially among veterans writing about their experiences.29 False memoirs are periodically uncovered, hoaxes written for all sorts of reasons that can discredit the genre.30 When that happens, the distinction between traditional history and memoir is brought to the fore. History is for the most part written by professionals who have never lived through or experienced the subject matter of their studies. Memoirs are written – the reader assumes – by people who have actually experienced the events they are describing.31 Some memoirs are published in the hope of influencing future historians, or at the very least in the hope of influencing the way future generations will look back on the author. In the process, memory becomes history, and is transformed into a document later used by historians. The lived experience then is the basis, the source of those documents.

The war memoir is nevertheless a very different animal from history and even from the traditional military autobiography in which generals wrote self-justificatory accounts of campaigns and battles.32 At its most basic level, the story is told from an entirely different perspective – that of the common soldier or civilian who has little or no control over the events they are caught up in.33 It is more personal, it is about the experience of war, as well as experiences beyond the battlefield, and can sometimes include accounts of people whose lives are peripheral to, but touched by war. That is why a more encompassing approach to the genre is required, one that does not limit the definition of the war memoir to those only written by combat veterans.34 Family members, friends and wives have, for example, also written accounts relating the shared experiences of war that are now considered to be part of the war memoir genre.35 In the modern era, journalists and writers have invariably ‘gone to war’ to report on what they see.36 The study of war writing, in other words, no longer needs to be limited to the experience of men in battle, but can encompass a much broader autobiographical tradition where the myriad voices emerging from war should not be treated in opposition to each other but as component parts of a larger story.

The war memoir was predominantly, but never exclusively, a male preoccupation. In the eighteenth century, there were cases of women disguising
themselves as men to fight alongside them, and who later left accounts of their adventures. From the mid-nineteenth century onwards, nurses related their wartime experiences and then in the twentieth century there was a shift with women fighting in the front lines. Women drove ambulances on the Western Front during the First World War, trucks and trams on the Home Front during the Second World War, as well as worked in factories, fought on the Eastern Front in their hundreds of thousands, and supported the resistance in Nazi occupied Europe. They necessarily tell of a different experience to that of the male combatant, although invariably subordinate to male myths about war. The nurse, for example, does not normally place herself alongside the male soldier, but rather she tends to place the wounded soldier on a pedestal while she is before it, head bowed, in tribute to his sacrifice. Also, in nurses’ descriptions of interacting with non-white populations, women often imitate the predominant, in this case colonial discourses, infantilising colonial troops, revealing the extent to which they had accepted the myths and stereotypes about race they had learnt growing up. As such, nurses’ memoirs are complex records of how white women and non-whites interacted. Only a few from the First World War dared question the myths and the treatment received by African and Indian troops.

In a similar vein, few prisoner-of-war (POW) narratives question the prisoner experience as one based on mateship, courage and survival. This is especially the case within popular Australian memory where the nationalist narrative that conforms to the Anzac legend still survives, despite a number of studies pointing to the tensions between POW memoirs, oral testimonies and the Anzac ethos. Narratives of mateship, courage and survival, however, need to be constructed, and can only occur if former POWs are given a voice during and after war. This was clearly not the case in Soviet Russia, where millions of POWs survived the brutal treatment of the Nazis only to be stigmatised by their own, and treated little better than ‘enemies of the people’. A not dissimilar experience existed for the few who survived internment during the war in Vietnam.

National myths require veterans to leave out certain experiences. Soldiers are generally silent about the darker side of war we know they must have either been witness to or involved in. Few mention the mistreatment of civilians, let alone the rape of women. Few mention homosexual encounters in the ranks. Few mention desertion or the execution of prisoners, or reprisals against civilian populations as punishment for partisan activity. The absence of anything that might tarnish the reputations of veterans or which might lead to national myths being questioned says as much about the men and women writing their memoirs as about the
overpowering obligation to conform to national expectations. It is only in
the modern era that the combat veteran will even admit to killing, and in
rare instances admit to the pleasure of killing. Most portray themselves as
bystanders, victims of war, rather than as perpetrators or actors. A very few
saw beauty in war’s death and destruction. Realism is expected, but only
up to a certain point, and only an accepted kind of realism, usually one that
conforms to the dominant national ideal.

* * *

In the nineteenth, more so than in the twentieth century, memoirs were
often based on diaries and journals, ‘documents’ that helped prod the
memory of the author, traces of the past that were brought into the present.
In the nineteenth century, too, anxious that their memoirs would be ac-
cepted as credible, authors often appended supporting documents (letters,
maps, official proclamations). The veracity of memoirs occupied a central
place among the memoirists themselves. They told the ‘truth’, because they
had been in the thick of it, they had seen what took place, and they had ex-
perienced the pain and suffering. All memoirists want to be taken at their
word; they aspire to revealing reality through their stories, to let people
know what it was like to live through what they have lived through, to tear
the veil from the readers’ eyes. It is part of the time-held claim to authenti-
city – distinct from the debates surrounding ‘veracity’ – that only those who
have experienced battle can talk about war. The authenticity associated
with the claim that veterans have lived through and experienced the events
they describe in their memoirs gives them a moral authority the historian
does not possess. From the very start, then, there is a tension between mem-
ory and history that can be found in all memoirs.

This is why memoirists often distinguished themselves from novelists,
although the distinction with biography and history was far less clear in the
eighteenth century, and the distinction with the novel became far less obvi-
ous after Vietnam when writing styles tended to blur. And yet we know that
by the time veterans return to the past to begin to write about their experi-
ences, the past has already often become mythified, and their own memories
have been deformed by the ways in which the war has since been interpreted.
In the course of that process reality and fiction can merge as memory plays
tricks on the author, something that many memoirists are aware of. Take
the preface to Edmund Blunden’s Undertones of War, published less than ten
years after the end of the First World War, in which he writes that:

memory has her little ways, and by now she has concealed precisely that look,
that word, that coincidence of nature without and nature within that I long to
remember. Within the space of even one year, this divinity seems to me to take a perverse pleasure in playing with her votaries; ‘you’d like to see this, my friend’ (she shows for the second time the veiled but seemingly perfect novocreation of some heart-throbbing scene – she slides it into secrecy) ‘wouldn’t you?’ But I am inclined to think that her playfulness has been growing rather more trying latterly: and perhaps I am gradually becoming colder in my enthusiasm to win a few games.\footnote{49}

And yet Blunden persisted, attempting to describe what he called ‘the image and the horror of it’. When the veteran is mistaken or asserts something that has never happened, it is not that the author deliberately exaggerates or distorts reality, but rather that the process of writing and of ordering a life into a cohesive narrative inevitably deforms that reality.

An interesting example of this occurred with the publication of the memoirs of John Howard, Prime Minister of Australia from 1996 to 2007, who recounted a story of his first weekend in the Prime Minister’s residence in Canberra, The Lodge, to which he claimed he invited the daughter of another former Prime Minister, Robert Menzies, for celebratory drinks. Robert Menzies’ daughter publicly rejected the account as ‘fanciful’ and insisted it be omitted from any future editions. One can assume John Howard wrote the account in good faith, and that it was not a deliberate falsehood. It could have been embellishment or he may simply have convinced himself of the verity of what he was writing.\footnote{50} This type of ‘fictionalisation’ can really only be contradicted or corrected by a third person privy to the scene in question. When the historical record can be corrected, of interest to the historian is why the author has imagined a particular presence or event. Of course, ‘fictionalisation’ is really part of the memoir-writing process, and is inherent in the construction of style and structure.\footnote{51} To that extent, techniques used by memoirists are similar to the devices used by fiction writers to influence the reception of their text, as well as creating the atmosphere necessary to convey thoughts, feelings and atmosphere.

The model for these fictionalisations is not only the novel, however. Other texts, and in the modern period filmic representations – as we see in a number of the chapters here – can influence not only the manner in which the past is recalled and remembered, but the soldier’s conception of war, before he or she actually experiences it. There are, in other words, strong links of memory between wars. The Wehrmacht generals of the Second World War had been young officers during the First, and were immersed in a literature (as well as the experience) of war that was brutal and total. The American boy who went to Vietnam was brought up on the memory of the Second World War – transmitted in part through Hollywood movies – and
often believed, naively, that like the war in Europe in 1939–45, Vietnam too was a ‘good’ war. John Wayne is sometimes evoked in American memoirs of the Vietnam War. As Joanna Bourke points out in her chapter, the professionals who went to Iraq have been brought up on war movies and the memory of Vietnam. Anthony Swofford’s *Jarhead*, about the Iraq war, is an example of how tropes from one war, in this case Vietnam, can cross over into another. Every young generation of soldiers is influenced not by the experience of war itself, but rather by the ‘experience of war’ as schoolboy or schoolgirl. This is not to say that all children glamorise war, but that their imaginings of what the next war will be like are firmly rooted in the past, and are therefore largely out of sync with the reality they are likely to face in the next war.

THE POLITICS OF WAR MEMOIRS

If war museums have often been accused of sanitising or glamorising war by their ‘heroic’ portrayals of death, the same cannot be said for the modern war memoir. It is true that battlefield feats are sometimes glorified, or that scenes of hand-to-hand fighting are embellished, but by the eighteenth century the glory of war was quickly giving way to detailed descriptions of horror that were meant to serve as a judicious lesson for those who followed in the veteran’s wake. This was a tradition that dated back to at least the Thirty Years War, when memoirs were in part meant to serve as a warning to others of the dangers of war. If not yet what Samuel Hynes has dubbed ‘battlefield gothic’, a change in attitude towards war saw a seismic shift with the Romantic movement in Europe at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, and which regarded war, for the first time in history, as ‘evil’.

Soldiers do not, on the whole, portray war as noble and uplifting. This may be the case for particular individuals, but it has not been a general trend since the seventeenth century when self-reflection, the expression of an inner life, and the transformative nature of war and combat all begin to make an appearance in the memoirs. From the end of the eighteenth century onwards, one can find all the tropes belonging to the ‘modern’ war memoir: descriptions of the first time in combat and the feelings associated with the experience, what is commonly referred to as a ‘baptism of fire’, as though it were a religious rite of passage; the first time one comes across the dead, mutilated or wounded; the horror, the trauma, the obsession with anecdotal detail that stayed with the veteran for years after (what Fussell calls ‘irony-assisted recall’); the day-to-day experience of camp or barracks life...
or in the lull of fighting; interactions with civilians and especially women
(sexual conquests are part of the soldier’s narrative); impressions of the
landscape and the peoples encountered; the bonds of camaraderie; and,
inevitably, the disdain for war and its suffering. This latter in particular
makes up what is now referred to as the disillusionment narrative, in which
war is criticised or at least presented at its worst.⁵⁹

The disillusionment narrative sensationalises the gore of war – extreme
violence, detailed descriptions of death, wounding and suffering, mass kill-
ings, massacres and atrocities – and includes detailed portrayals not only
of the wounded and dead, but of men’s bodily movements. *All Quiet on the
Western Front* was by no means the first war novel or war memoir to do so, to
the point where it was dubbed by right-wing critics the ‘lavatory school’ of
war novels, but the gore of war was clearly present for the first time in nov-
els and memoirs during the 1920s and 1930s.⁶⁰ Increasingly, as a shift took
place in the way in which war was represented, descriptions of battlefield
gothic became not only more common, but more emotionally invested. The
twentieth century lifted social taboos that had inhibited earlier forms of
writing so that soldiers were able to articulate their thoughts, fears and
beliefs in ways they had not been able to in previous generations.

There has, however, been a shift in the way in which war is portrayed
in this century. As Joanna Bourke demonstrates in this collection, twenty-
first-century war memoirs, written by professional, elite soldiers, eschew the
disillusionment narrative, and glorify the blood and guts of war in ways that
we have rarely seen in previous generations. This development appears to
represent another defining moment in the history of the war memoir. The
emotional pleas that can be found in twentieth-century accounts were pres-
ent, in muted form, in earlier centuries, but really come into their own in
the twentieth century. As Jay Winter shows in his chapter, what this says
about changing cultural conceptions of the self, about the way soldiers re-
member wars, and about that which they choose to remain silent, makes
for interesting social and cultural insights.⁶¹ There are reasons for the si-
lence. Remembering can be painful, especially when the account touches on
deeply traumatic and personal events. Gabriele Köpp, for example, who was
repeatedly raped by Russian soldiers in 1945 at the age of 15, did not write
of her harrowing experiences, and was only the second German woman to
do so, until the age of 80.⁶² Köpp would have had to endure the traumatic
violence of the rapes, and would have then had to endure the memory of
that violence for decades after. For her at least, the act of writing about that
violence was a liberating experience. For others, however, memories of war
and violence are so traumatic that the only way forward is to forget alto-
gether; they never talk and will never write of their experiences.⁶³
HOW TO READ A WAR MEMOIR

Apart from the obvious necessity to disentangle fact from fiction, and to contextualise, how does one then read a war memoir? The chapters in this collection take into consideration the complex processes whereby war experiences are reinterpreted, and will hopefully serve as examples to others. Two of the most important elements historians should take into consideration have to do with the ways in which memory is transmitted. The first is that the memoirist chooses, consciously or otherwise, what to include and what to omit in the light of hindsight or in response to the degree of importance an event has taken on over time. There can be a certain amount of self-censorship involved in this process when individuals omit details they do not want the public to know about, or which do not accord with the official narrative of the war. An example of this is the Israeli memoirs that appeared after the 1948 war, which deliberately failed to mention the forced expulsion and massacre of Palestinians. Instead, they adopted the official narrative that, afraid of the Israel Defense Forces, Palestinians ‘ran away’. The reasons veterans adopted this Zionist narrative ranged from support for Israel’s international image to a desire to portray Israeli citizens and soldiers positively. By the 1970s and 1980s, however, a number of these memoirs were corrected either in newspaper articles or in new, reprinted editions as a more realistic assessment of the war, largely the result of research conducted by the ‘new historians’ in Israel, began to reveal details of what had taken place. A shift can, therefore, take place over time from an acceptance of the official narrative to a more critical stance.

The second important element historians need to consider when reading war memoirs is that as a consequence of textual, novelistic, filmic and other media influences on the veteran-author, the line between reality and fiction can become blurred. The memoirist, as narrator, especially in his or her old age, may become incapable of distinguishing between imagined memories and the reality of the past. When this happens, the author-veteran necessarily becomes the vector of a social re-memorisation of the war, the fruit of their own personal experiences, and a version of the war that is projected onto them by the media. The individual’s recollections are, moreover, constantly being transformed and reformulated, in the first instance by telling others about his or her experiences, and secondly by absorbing what others have to say about the war. In the telling of the story, the individual then has a tendency to only remember that which has been told or written down. It becomes the reference point for further tellings of the story.

The process of writing a memoir, the transformation of the experiences an individual may have lived through and witnessed, necessarily transforms
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the events described as they are put on paper. The overall narrative, for a narrative is constructed in the process of writing, alters the memory and with it the attitudes, behaviours and actions that are the basis for that memory. The act of writing, therefore, transforms what may very well have only been a subjective impression into a ‘historical reality’ that was not. The act of writing about an anecdote or piece of gossip also transforms it into a fact; it now exists, it is true, because it is on paper. In this manner, memoirists become mythmakers, creating records that not only influence the manner in which readers see the past, but also how historians interpret the past.

For those who have never experienced war or extreme violence at close hand, talking about it is largely an intellectual exercise, a question of imposing structures and themes where none previously existed. Like the authors themselves, we attempt to ‘make sense of the muddle’, to interpret the images and to place everything in a larger context. The war memoir is often a one off, a work by a veteran who has no pretentions of writing literature, who is entirely unaccustomed to writing narratives, and who at most may have written reports or letters. This was especially the case for the period before the twentieth century when wars were mostly fought by the semi-literate, who only later found the means to express their thoughts and feelings, or to simply describe their experiences, on paper. If veterans’ narratives are published at all, the vast majority go largely unnoticed, and then fall into obscurity only to be brought into the light (again) by scholars. The war memoirs that become ‘classics’ and that are read across generations more often than not strike a chord in the national myths they have helped shape and colour. They are the Robert Graves, the Siegfried Sassoons and the Michael Herrs.

In this collection of essays we deal specifically with war memoirs – and not letters, diaries and journals – because they are remembered, restructured and filtered by time. That is their value to historians, not as immediate impressions of what has just taken place or been observed, but as a remembrance that has survived and has been shaped and coloured by the passage of time. It is their interpretation, their impressions and their feelings that, as part of the experience of war, make them valuable sources for historians trying to figure out what it was like to live through those times. Memoirs written during the time period under study suffer from what Bourdieu dubbed the ‘biographical illusion’ (illusion biographique), the belief that we are getting a privileged and direct access to the past. In fact, the best memoirs are those written many years after the event, which does not make them more accurate, but which allows for a certain reflection, and a degree of self-reflection among the authors. This retrospection always assumes a certain discontinuity between youth, the period about which the
veteran memoirist is most often writing, and old age. The assumption is that the veteran telling the story of his or her youth is the same person, in spite of the decades that might separate them. It is memory that provides the continuity between youth and old age.

We are only just beginning to understand the ways in which the war memoir is ultimately a product of the veteran author’s memory. The subjective experience which is often at the centre of the modern war memoir and which constitutes such a large proportion of the ‘experience of war’ is only one layer of what is a multilayered, multidimensional text. Other layers and dimensions include questions over the extent to which war and violence have influenced people’s behaviours and actions, as well as understanding the impact war and violence can have over long periods of time. Why is it, for example, that the victims of war, mass killings and genocide often express feelings of shame and mortification at surviving, while the perpetrators of those crimes generally feel no remorse? If there is a ‘duty to remember’, does the voice of the perpetrator deserve to be heard in the same way as the victim?

Any interpretation of the war memoir, any understanding of personal experience in war, has to take into account changing frameworks of meaning. That is, the text has to be read where possible from the contemporary’s perspective. The scholar has to understand how it was received at the time, and should place it where possible in the continuum of autobiographical texts relevant to the war under study, but also the wars that preceded it. In other words, historians have to take into account not only the social and political context in which the memoir was written, but those cultural influences that may have sculpted and shaped the veteran’s memory leading up to the point in time when pen is put to paper. When all of these factors are taken into account, it may be possible to uncover parallels as well as differences in the experience of war, the emotion of war and violence over longer periods of time, between the early modern and the modern.

It is impossible to guess what forms the war memoir will take in the future, although blogging and online memoirs are now common forms of expression among returned soldiers. Separate work needs to be done on those genres. Increasingly, too, women are seeing front-line combat, at least compared with earlier twentieth-century wars. From the little we know of their memoirs – as can be seen in the chapters by Roger Markwick and Joanna Bourke in this collection – they do not differ terribly from those of the male front-line soldier and appear to continue to perpetuate the male myths of war. Moreover, the nature of the front line and even the act of killing has changed; both can now take place at a distance. Such is the enlisted man or woman who drives to work at a military base in San Diego, spends
the shift guiding a drone to a kill site, and then drives home to spend the evening with the family. No matter how bloody or horrible war might be, we can be certain of two things: veterans will continue to write about their experiences, leaving tantalising traces of what it was like to live through war, recalling the sights, the sounds, the smells. And no account, however graphic or accurate, is going to dissuade future generations of young men and women from fighting and dying in other wars.

NOTES


3. On memoirs and the American War of Independence, see Robert Lawson-Peebles, ‘Style Wars: The Problems of Writing Military Autobiography in the Eighteenth Century’, in Alex Vernon (ed.), *Arms and the Self: War, the Military, and Autobiographical Writing* (Kent, 2005), 75–78. There is as yet no systematic study of war memoirs for this period. Vernon claims that Colonel Robert Rogers’ *Journals*, published in 1765, is the first ‘modern military autobiography’.


5. And where once they may not have had an outlet to express themselves through autobiography, veterans found other means. See, for example, the soldier poets of the Elizabethan era in Adam N. McKeown, *English Mercuries: Soldier Poets in the Age of Shakespeare* (Nashville, 2009).


7. This necessarily varied from country to country. In France, it was not really until the second half of the nineteenth century that soldiers became socially acceptable. See David M. Hopkin, ‘*La Ramée*, the Archetypal Soldier, as an


12. Edward G. Lengel, *World War I Memories: An Annotated Bibliography of Personal Accounts Published in English since 1919* (Lanham, 2004) has estimated that over 1,400 memoirs, diaries and letters by soldiers and civilians from all belligerent nations have been published in English since the end of the war. The term ‘veteran’ is used here in its broadest possible sense to designate a person who has lived through, survived or experienced war, including those not in the military.


16. See, for example, Geoffrey Mortimer, *Eyewitness Accounts of the Thirty Years War, 1618–48* (Houndmills, 2002), 185–88. Writing to leave a record for posterity is one of the most common and conventional reasons given by veterans and is one that can be found across the centuries.


22. There has been far more research into journals and diaries as ego-documents although here too historians have generally neglected to contextualise them. See, for example, Robert A. Fothergill, *Private Chronicles: A Study of English Diaries* (New York, 1974); Ralph-Rainer Wuthenow, *Europäische Tagebücher. Eigenart, Formen, Entwicklung* (Darmstadt, 1990); Gustav René Hocke, *Europäische Tagebücher aus vier Jahrhunderten. Motive und Anthologie* (Frankfurt am Main, 1991); Steven Rendall, ‘On Diaries’, *Diacritics* 16(3) (1986), 56–65.


26. Foreign volunteers wrote many more memoirs, and many of these, like George Orwell’s *Homage to Catalonia*, provide narratives of the war permeated with political viewpoints, often twisting truths to suit a particular political stance and, if the veteran were a revolutionary, writing with dismay and disillusion. Interestingly, the French novelist Claude Simon declared Orwell’s *Homage* was ‘fake from the very first sentence’ (Anthony Cheal Pugh, ‘A Conversation with Claude Simon’, *The Review of Contemporary Fiction* 5(1) (1985), http://www.dalkeyarchive.com/aconversation-with-claude-simon-by-anthony-cheal-pugh/). Simon was inadvertently highlighting the conscious and unconscious pressures writers face when memory confronts the tropes of conventional narrative. See also Franz Borkenau, *The Spanish Cockpit: An Eyewitness Account of the Political and Social Conflicts of the Spanish Civil War* (London, 1937). Valentine Cunningham’s *Spanish Front: Writers on the Civil War* (Oxford, 1986) is a good introduction to the array of writings on the wars.

28. For France, see the work by Olivier Wieviorka, *Divided Memory. French Recollections of World War II from the Liberation to the Present* (Stanford, 2012); for Germany, a good summary of the literature is in Hannes Heer and Ruth Wodak, ‘Collective Memory, National Narratives and the Politics of the Past – The Discursive Construction of History’, in Hannes Heer et al., *The Discursive Construction of History: Remembering the Wehrmacht’s War of Annihilation*, trans. from the German by Steven Fligelstone (Basingstoke, 2008), 1–13. For Yugoslavia, see Vesna Drapac, and for the Partition in 1948, Tarun Saint, both in this collection.


36. On the war in Bosnia, for example, see the memoirs of an American on the margins of but a witness to the war by Anthony Loyd, *My War Gone By, I Miss It So* (London, 1999).


40. See, for example, Alison S. Fell, ‘Colonial Troops in French and British Nursing Memoirs’, in Santanu Das (ed.), *Race, Empire and First World War Writing* (Cambridge, 2011), 158–74. There were over 600,000 non-white colonial troops used by the French and the British in the trenches in 1914–18, and yet few historians have turned to the memoirs they left behind to understand their wartime experiences. Christian Koller, ‘Representing Otherness: African, Indian, and European Soldiers’ Letters and Memoirs’, in Das, *Race, Empire and First World War Writing*, 127–42, only touches on this vastly under-researched topic.


44. Alistair Thomson, *Anzac Memories: Living with the Legend* (Melbourne, 1994).


48. For a discussion on authenticity, see Carrard, *The French Who Fought for Hitler*, 25–52; and Subarno Chattarji in this collection.


50. For a discussion of how memories can be falsified, see Elizabeth Loftus and Katherine Ketcham, *The Myth of Repressed Memory: False Memories and Allegations of Sexual Abuse* (New York, 1994).

51. The ‘fictionalisation’ of memoirs is treated in Geoffrey Mortimer, ‘Style and Fictionalisation in Eyewitness Personal Accounts of the Thirty Years War’, *German Life and Letters* 54(2) (2001), 97–113.


54. Echoing Sebastian Haffner’s contention that the root of Nazism was not in the ‘front experience’ of the First World War, but in the ‘war experience of the German schoolboy’ (Sebastian Haffner, *Defying Hitler: A Memoir*, trans. by Oliver Pretzel [London, 2002]).


56. See, for example, the remark in *Memoirs of a Sergeant late of the 43rd Light Infantry, previously to and during the Peninsular War* (London, 1835), 215; Robert Blakeney, *A Boy in the Peninsular War: The Services, Adventures and Experiences of Robert Blakeney* (London, 1899), xi–xii.


59. See Harari, *The Ultimate Experience*, 9–10, 72–76, 261–64, and esp. for the following, 263–82, on which these pages are based.


62. Gabriele Köpp, *Warum war ich bloß ein Mädchen? Das Trauma einer Flucht 1945* (Munich, 2010). Before Köpp was the anonymous, *A Woman in Berlin*, published in the 1950s. We now know the author of that memoir to be Marta Hillers, whose identity was revealed in 2003, two years after her death.

63. Take, for example, a woman who told a team gathering information for the truth and reconciliation commission in Peru: ‘When I forget, I’m well. Remembering, even now, I just go crazy’. It led Kimberly Theidon, the author of *Intimate Enemies: Violence and Reconciliation in Peru* (Pennsylvania, 2012), to conclude that, ‘Forgetting is not simply a strategy of domination employed by the powerful against the weak. Rather, it may be a state that is fervently desired by those who suffer from the afflictions of memory and seek relief from the heavy weight of a painful past’. See the review essay by Klaus Neumann, http://inside.org.au/when-i-forget-im-well-remembering-even-now-i-just-go-crazy/.

64. For this see the chapter by Ilan Pappe in this collection, and Rafi Nets-Zehngut, ‘Internal and External Collective Memories of Conflicts: Israel and the 1948


70. Motzkin, ‘Memoirs, Memory, and Historical Experience’, 112.
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