

Report on the international and interdisciplinary conference:

**Experience, Memory and Media: Transmitting the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars in 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century Europe**

11-13 October 2007, University of Mannheim

Convener: AHRC-DFG Research Group 'Nations, Borders, Identities: The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars in European Experiences and Memories' and University of Mannheim.

*By Leighton James, Catriona Kennedy and Kirstin Schäfer*

“In the beginning was Napoleon” – this famous sentence from Thomas Nipperdey's *History of Germany* applies also to large parts of Europe. Notwithstanding Nipperdey's strong focus on the person of Napoleon it seems unquestionable that the Napoleonic Empire and the French Revolution which preceded it constituted a crucial turning point in European history. The military expansion of France ensured that hardly any part of Europe remained untouched by these revolutionary transformations. Both the wider population and the soldiers directly involved in the fighting were drawn into the vortex of the wars, which raged across Europe between 1792 and 1815. Influenced by the experiences and memories of these wars, self-perceptions and perceptions of others changed fundamentally. Unlike any other era, the period of 1792–1815 created ideas of ethnic, religious and national identity.

The experience and memory of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars had an enduring influence on the collective memory of all European nations and regions and have given them an international dimension. Since summer 2005 the Anglo-German project *Nations, Borders and Identities*, the main convener of the conference, has been analysing the experience and memory of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars across Europe, while paying particular attention to issues of national transfer. The project concentrates on France, England and Ireland, Austria and Prussia, Poland, and Russia. The aim of the conference, which the NBI project group organized in cooperation with the University of Mannheim, was to discuss this research in a broader European context. The main focus was on the transmission of experience and memory through the various media which constitute their material dimension. Along with the University of Mannheim, the German Research Foundation, the Centre for French Studies at the Free University of Berlin, the Foundation of

the Landesbank Baden-Württemberg, and the Heinrich-Vetter-Stiftung in Mannheim sponsored the event.

The conference began with introductory addresses from the two principal organisers, Erich Pelzer (Mannheim) and Karen Hagemann (UNC, Chapel Hill). Pelzer observed that Napoleon was now understood as a European phenomenon, rather than a purely French one. As one of the cities visited by Napoleon during his 1804 Rhine journey, Mannheim could make a particular claim to participate in this shared European experience. Hagemann also stressed the European dimension of the conference and its aim of crossing borders between nations, disciplines, and the experience, communicative and cultural memory of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. She presented the battle of Leipzig in October 1813, the largest single battle before the First World War, as a particular fruitful case study not only for the 'modern', or as David Bell had termed it recently 'total', character of the wars between 1792 and 1815, but also for the diversity of war experiences, the importance of remembrance and the influence of media and history politics on the formation of memory. Significantly dubbed the 'battle of nations', the battle involved nearly 500,000 soldiers from across Europe and beyond, who shared related but often very different experiences and memories. In German history the national myth of 'renewal' from 1813-1815 played a particular important role and was represented again and again in a broad range of media, especially in times of national crisis and war when patriotic sacrifice was needed.

Alan Forrest (York) and Etienne François (Berlin, FU) reflected in the first session on theoretical and methodological approaches to the experience and memory of the wars. For combatants, Forrest emphasized, the wars invariably comprised a tangle of shared and highly individualistic experiences and he underlined the difficulty of identifying a common 'soldier's experience'. Each soldier's war followed its own timetable dependent on the campaigns he was involved in and marked by personal peaks and troughs. Though wars were increasingly written about in national terms, it remains difficult to conceive of a national history of experience. Defining experience also raises difficult questions. As Forrest noted, the work of Joan W. Scott and others has drawn attention to the discursive systems that underpin experience, implying that we need to focus on the representational and generic forms that structure the media of experience. We must therefore remain alert to the audience expectations that may have shaped war narratives, whether letters or memoirs. For memoirs, the date of publication and prevailing political mood must also be taken into account. Yet this does not mean that they should be discounted as sources of experience, especially if we

consider experience not as a static but as an evolving concept. Forrest concluded by suggesting how the transition from experience to memory might be thought of as a process in which variegated individual experiences become flattened into one collective image often serving a propagandistic purpose.

Explaining why the wars might be understood as an exemplary *lieu de mémoire*, Etienne François pointed to the strong emotional resonance of these wars, the potent range of images that they generated, their imbrications in the construction of modern national identities and also the persistent conflict and debate surrounding their memory. These factors, he suggested, ensured that the shift from ‘communicative’ memory to ‘cultural memory’ did not weaken the evocative power of the wars, but rather strengthened and amplified its range and impact. He proceeded to explain their position as a site of shared and entangled European memory, highlighting the paradoxical process through which national memorialisations of the war drew on a strikingly similar set of symbols. A further reason for the existence of a specific European memory of the wars, he argued, derived from the persistent presence of ‘the enemy’ at the core of national memories, giving rise to what could be described as a European ‘conflictual community’. In an illuminating comparison of London, Paris and Berlin, François showed how not only national victories but also adversaries’ defeats became enshrined in each capital’s commemorative topography. The European dimension of the wars was clearly evident in soldiers’ memoirs and historical novels and was sustained by the numerous translations of such texts that circulated across the continent. Referring to Marie-Claire Lavabre’s founding opposition between the *choix d’histoire* and the *poids d’histoire*, François concluded by reflecting that in the case of the Revolutionary the ‘choice of history’ appears to have prevailed over the ‘weight of history’ and that ultimately the memory of the wars was less obsessive and harmful than might be expected. Rather than the nineteenth century being dominated by a flow of conflicts aroused by the need for revenge for the humiliations and sufferings endured between 1792 and 1815, it stands as one of the least warlike and bloody in European history.

‘Experiences and Memories in Personal Writings’ during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars were the subject of the second panel. Marie-Cecile Thoral (York) began with an examination of French soldiers’ diaries and  *carnets de route*. As she observed, soldiers’ desire to keep a daily record of their war experiences was often motivated by an awareness that they were living through a historically momentous period. While the daily writing of such accounts meant that the content was often rather dull they can convey the

immediacy of war experience with soldiers' reporting events as they happened. These diaries and journals also constituted important raw material for the elaboration of individual and collective memories of the war as soldiers drew upon such contemporaneous sources to bolster the veracity and authenticity of their memoirs. Catriona Kennedy (York) also discussed soldiers' personal writings – letters, journals and diaries - produced during the wars. Her paper explored the range of literary genres and texts that soldiers drew upon in their narratives, from the picaresque and the Gothic novel to the bible and the battle dispatch. Such texts, Kennedy argued, comprised a crucial frame for representing and interpreting war experiences. She further suggested how certain genres might have shaped the very texture of war experience and the ways in which soldiers imagined themselves as actors in the theatre of war.

The final two papers considered retrospective accounts of soldiers' war experiences. Leighton James (York) questioned the distinction between experience and memory, and proposed instead that letters, diaries and memoirs should be understood 'as points on a continuum of narrated experience'. Focusing on three aspects of Austrian patriotic war rhetoric - the demonization of the French, an appeal to German patriotism and the propagation of a 'valorous manliness' - James considered how far such discourses shaped Austrian officers' narratives of their war experience. While he identified some congruity between the public discourse and the individual experience, he also highlighted the dissonances. These included accounts of positive interactions with the French and the privileging of the 'barbaric East' as the enemy 'other' in soldiers' narratives. He further pointed to the limits of patriotic rhetoric and the pragmatic motivations that underpinned many officers' war service. Idealised images of martial heroism, James suggested, were often subsumed by more immediate concerns about the integrity of the male body in wartime. In the final paper Philip Dwyer (Newcastle, Australia) focused on French military memoirs, locating these texts within the evolving market for published personal narratives in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Memoirs, Dwyer argued, were an influential medium through which veterans helped shape the past and were, in turn, influenced by contemporary views of the wars. The majority of memoirs, he observed, were not published in the author's lifetime. This may have been because the memory of the wars remained too raw and painful, or from fear of government censorship. It was in the aftermath of the nation's defeat in the Franco-Prussian war (1870-71) that Napoleonic memoirs flooded the market, as they encouraged a militaristic nostalgia for the past in order to forget the humiliations of the present. In his comments on the

panel, Horst Carl (Giessen) noted the importance of the relationship between time and narration that emerged in each of the four papers, which all questioned the sharp distinction between experience and memory, and emphasised instead how both operate within a shared social framework.

The third panel on ‘Collective Memory in Historical Novels’ began with a paper by Lars Peters (Berlin, FU) on narrative imaginings of masculinities in the nautical novels of the nineteenth-century British author Frederick Marryat. Historical novels, Peters proposed, constituted not only one of the most important media for the British memory of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, but were also a vital means of propagating emerging models of masculinity in the nineteenth century. Peters stressed the importance of two novels by Marryat, *Frank Mildmay* (1830) and *Midshipman Easy* (1836), in the construction of Victorian models of the manly sailor hero. Situating these early war novels within the realm of ‘communicative memory’, Peters showed how they were characterised by the use of a ‘euphemistic realism’. In the move towards ‘cultural’ or ‘collective’ memory evident in later historical novels, this realism would be replaced by a more idealised image of the navy, and the image of the Christian warrior defending the British Empire would join the bourgeois manly hero portrayed in Marryat’s novels.

Kirstin Schäfer (Berlin, FU) considered the relationship between image and text in French memory of the wars. Visual culture, she argued, played a critical role in French memory, continuing the privileged position that visual propaganda had obtained under the Napoleonic regime. Images such as David’s *Napoleon Crossing the St Bernard* were thus transferred from the visual to the literary realm, and reappeared in French novels and memoirs of the wars. Maria Schultz (Berlin, FU) examined gender images in Napoleonic war novels published in Germany and Austria. She indicated how representations of national masculinity and femininity in these novels clustered around a select group of male and female figures and archetypes. While representations of women remained relatively static across the *longue duree*, Schultz pointed to a shift in constructions of masculinity at the turn of the century. Whereas earlier historical novels tended to emphasise the valorous citizen soldier, later representations focused on professional soldiers and the imperial national war hero. In her remarks, the commentator Astrid Erll (Bergische Universität, Wuppertal) noted the different approaches in the papers. Peters and Schulz focused on literature both as a social system, considering the number and popularity of historical novels, and as a symbolic system exploring how they present themselves as media of collective memory. Schäfer, on the other

hand, adopted an 'intermedial' approach to the generation of collective memory. Suggesting how we might test the importance of particular media of memory, Erll proposed that we should consider the processes of 'remediation', through which meanings, narratives and images of the past are recycled and reproduced across different media.

The theme of 'Collective Memory in Literature' was continued in the fourth panel. Bernhard Struck (St Andrews) began by considering images of France and Poland in German travel reports written during the wars in order to explore perceptions of the occupied territories and of national borders, as well as the prevalence of nationalist consciousness in such accounts. The travelogues, he argued, tended to downplay French/German conflict and did not describe a sharp national border between the nations but rather a long, overlapping Franco-German zone. For most of this period, it was not the French who were perceived as the enemy, but the war itself. Ruth Leiserowitz (Berlin, FU) explored the memory of Russian heroines of the 1812 campaign as presented in historical novels which reached a wide audience. In the two decades after the end of the wars heroines could still be remembered as playing a proactive role. This could take the form of the patriotic suicide or political involvement. However, these constructions of femininity overstepped traditional gender boundaries. Over time the images were therefore played down in favour of a more traditional representation of feminine roles. In his study of nineteenth-century memoirs by British soldiers and sailors, David Hopkin (Oxford) emphasised the importance of folktale motifs to these narratives. Storytelling, he noted, was an important part of soldiers' and sailors' everyday life, providing not only entertainment but also practical lessons for dealing with dangerous authorities and situations. Folktales thus provided a shared language through which they could communicate difficult experiences. In his concluding remarks George S. Williamson (Alabama) underlined the very different types of media discussed by the panel and the need to remain alert to how various generic conventions shaped both the experience and memory of the wars.

On the second day of the conference attention turned from the literary to the visual. Rolf Reichardt (Gießen) opened the fifth session on 'Experience, Memory and Visual Representation' with his examination of British caricatures dealing with the threat of invasion by the French. Both French and British artists engaged in a propaganda war. While the former presented invasion as a response to English aggression, English caricaturists conflated the Revolution and the Terror. However, James Gillray's caricatures did not only engage in mordant mockery of the French; they were also a commentary on the political struggle

between Whigs and Tories in England. Those Whigs who advocated peace with Revolutionary France were castigated as potential traitors. He commented that the purpose of text included in the caricatures was to relay information. The text was often taken from Parliamentary speeches and therefore served to place the image with a particular political context. He argued that such caricatures were not a direct contribution to the construction of the nation. Instead they played an indirect role through the constant repetition of stereotypes, such as John Bull, during the time of crisis.

Marina Peltzer's paper (Gießen) examined little-known Russian caricatures. These images were meant to represent the triumph of the Russian people over the rapacious French, who were equated with hungry beasts. In contrast the Russians were symbolized by the complementary figures of the male and female peasant, who represented canons of physical and moral beauty. The Cossack also played a key figure in these caricatures and contributed to an aura of invincibility surrounding these soldiers. By contrast the figure of Napoleon was demystified by placing him in sordid and humiliating situations. Illustrating the transnational nature of caricatures, Peltzer showed that images were copied and repeated across Europe. David O'Brien (Illinois) sought to test the applicability to Napoleonic painting of Pierre Nora's thesis that self-conscious history disciplines and disrupts collective memory. Art historians have analyzed the propagandistic messages of such painting, but their impact on collective memory has not been widely discussed. These paintings did become important *lieux de mémoire* in France. From the outset they drew upon collective memory to legitimize the regime by equating Napoleon's achievements with those of classical and national figures. Painting also sought to shape collective memory in the present and into the future. Later Louis Phillipe would attempt to co-opt the Napoleonic legacy and stabilize his regime by including these paintings at Versailles. The Gallery of Battles might divide public opinion, but O'Brien argued that this debate seems to have reinforced the notion that there was a collective memory to be drawn upon.

In response to questions about reception both Reichardt and O'Brien stressed that visual images had a much wider impact than might be supposed. Reichardt indicated that some caricatures were reprinted several times. Moreover, cheaper, non-coloured prints were available, while public viewings of caricatures were also held. Meanwhile, O'Brien argued that historians should not think of the Salon as the preserve of the educated elite. The available evidence suggests that it had a mixed audience. The manner in which exhibitions were received can also be gauged through the large number of reviews published in journals

and newspapers. In her comments on the panel, Mary Sheriff (Chapel Hill) recapped the importance of visual media for analysing the memory of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars and sought to relate this to acts of consumption. The viewing of caricatures, which were affordable to a wider range of people, appeared to represent a more intimate act than seeing large-scale history paintings in galleries.

The sixth session focused on 'Memories and Cultural Practices'. It started with a presentation by Colin White, director of the Royal Naval Museum, who talked about the conception and planning of the British celebration of the 200<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the battle of Trafalgar in 2005. White suggested that high attendances at many of the celebratory events demonstrated that the figure of Nelson was a cultural phenomenon and noted that, unlike Napoleon, Nelson appears to be a relatively unproblematic. He advocated 'performance history' and made a plea that academic historians should be more involved in the popular presentation of history and less dismissive of re-enactments. Guido Hausmann (Trinity College) returned the focus to Europe through his examination of material memory in Russia. Taking as his examples the Church of Christ the Saviour in Moscow and the Icon of the Smolensk Virgin, he illustrated the continuing importance of the Patriotic War of 1812 in Russian collective memory. In contrast to earlier conflicts, the material memory of the 1812 war was much more widespread. Low literacy rates meant that there was increased emphasis on the architecture as a means of expressing collective memory. The Church was first conceived in 1816, but was only finished and consecrated in 1881. It represented the three pillars of Tsarist Russia: orthodoxy, autocracy and *narodnost* (nationality). The Church, however, remained more of a monument to the dignitaries of Russian society than to the people. The latter found a greater connection to the memory of 1812 through the Smolensk Virgin. The icon had been the focal point for prayers during 1812 and was carried into battle. Thereafter praying to the icon created a commemorative community and its central importance to popular collective memory was illustrated by the centenary celebrations organized in Smolensk in 1912. This celebration represented a fusion of popular and official memories of the war.

Jakob Vogel (Centre Marc Bloch, Berlin) continued the theme of celebration. Through the description of the different forms of commemoration in France and Germany Vogel highlighted the general evolution of the memory after the generation that had experienced the wars at first hand passed away. He described the commemorations of the fiftieth and hundredth anniversaries of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars in Germany and France.



In doing so, he stressed the different political settings caused by the outcome of the Franco-German war of 1870-71. The collapse of the Second Empire and the rise of the Third Republic, together with the creation of the *Kaiserreich*, created in both countries a new context for the remembrance of the Napoleonic period and the “wars of liberation”. But notwithstanding all these fundamental differences, Vogel concluded that both societies faced the same problem: the transformation of a more or less lively memory of the wars still present in the ceremonies of the 1850s and 1860s (notably in the figure of the “veteran”) into a historic commemoration that was connected to the events around 1800 only through a more or less mythical history. Margarete Lincoln (National Maritime Museum) returned to the issue of material culture. However, unlike Hausmann’s focus on the monumental and religious, Lincoln drew attention to the everyday. She posed the question of how popular, decorative objects represented everyday British life during the Napoleonic wars. Kitsch, she argued, encouraged a sense of Britain as a maritime nation. Maritime art also portrayed a gendered image as it showed almost exclusively men. Where women were depicted it was usually in a passive role. On the other hand, women were extremely significant as consumers. The acquisition of material possessions enabled many women to demonstrate their national identity in the everyday and the domestic. The purchase of such items served the dual purpose of cementing a family’s place in a certain social milieu and demonstrating its wealth and status.

The discussion that followed explored the issue of entangled memory. Questions were raised about the relationship between different, but inextricably linked, national memories. The example of Russian and Polish memories of 1812 provided a relevant example. Questions were also raised about how governments seek to instrumentalize material culture. Jörn Leonhard sought to provide in his comment a framework for discussion by proposing a four-part typology through which to examine the structures of collective memory. The first part focused on agency. What role did institutions such as the state or church play? The second part asked what mechanisms and strategies can be identified behind popular culture and to what extent was memory embedded? The third questioned the function of collective memory. For example, what aspects determine the economics of memory? How is legitimacy established? Finally, how can the impact of collective memory be measured?

The evening lecture was provided by Steven Englund (American University, Paris). His lecture centred on the ambiguity of the Napoleonic legacy and was a plea for historians to accept the role of ambivalence in historical enquiry. Englund took Napoleon’s relationship

with the Jews to exemplify his case. A long-standing historiographical tradition regards Napoleon as the liberator of the Jews. Yet Napoleon also passed decrees in 1808 which discriminated against Jews in Alsace and Lorraine. In attempt to resolve this ambiguity, Pierre Birnbaum, in his *L'Aigle et la Synagogue*, has placed a heavier emphasis on the decrees of 1808 which discriminated against Jews in Alsace and Lorraine and reassessed the historiographical tradition. He has argued that Napoleon's use of the word *race* to describe the Jews indicates that he was part of a biologically racist tradition. Linking the 1808 decrees with the re-establishment of slavery in the Caribbean, Birnbaum claims that the Napoleonic regime was not only tyrannical, but anti-semitic and racist. Englund critiqued Birnbaum's case, suggesting that in his attempt to force a resolution to the ambiguity of Napoleon's relationship with the Jews he had adopted anachronistic concepts. Englund not only pointed out that the term *race* was widely used, but also that the relationship between personal beliefs and the politics of rule is unclear. Indeed, in other parts of Europe Napoleon was regarded as the liberator of the Jews. If contemporaries could not agree then surely the legacy is also ambiguous and ambivalent. Historians may resolve ambiguity, but ambivalence remains and might even be deepened by historical enquiry.

The third day started with the final panel on 'Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars in Feature Films'. Wolfgang Koller (Berlin, FU) showed how the turbulent social and political situation in the Weimar Republic was addressed through films on the Napoleonic era. The crisis of defeat and the myth of a national 'renewal' provided a suitable vehicle through which to present ways of dealing with the current troubles facing Weimar. The right dominated movie production and used films, such as *The Higher Command*, to project an image of martial masculinity that fitted with their political outlook. The hero represented a 'nationalistic-radical' ideal in his decisiveness and rejection of the bourgeois and democratic values of compromise and debate. He was placed in juxtaposition with inferior forms of manliness represented by both internal (the traitor) and external (the French) enemies. Films thereby sought to project a patriotic-patriarchal gender order. The link between the social and political context in which a film is produced and filmic representation was reinforced by James Chapman (Leicester). He argued that films are more about the present than the past and indicated that film history has generally identified two separate strands. The first focuses on the filmic representation of historical events, while the second examines the history of the film itself, its production and representation. He suggested that both approaches needed to be combined and that criticisms of films founded on historical inaccuracy were often misplaced

since they do not account for the limitations imposed by production. Chapman used two films, the *Iron Duke* (1934) and *Lady Hamilton* (1941), to illustrate how contemporary political and social concerns influenced story-lines and representations. He concluded by arguing that historians need to be aware of the multiple influences on films represented by production demands, censors, social factors and public taste.

In the final roundtable discussion the contributors sought to bring together the rich store of ideas raised during the course of the conference. Karen Hagemann (Chapel Hill) opened the debate by summarizing the aims of the conference. She emphasised that memories often say more about the period of their production than about the remembered past; that memories were everywhere sites of contestation; and finally, that gender seems to have played a continuous role in the construction of memory. It created order and hierarchies and formed – in the interplay with other categories of difference – the often fractured and changing identities of individuals and groups. She also referred back to Leonhard's four-part typology as a potentially fruitful framework through which to approach the study of collective memory. Taking up her points, Richard Bessel (York) asked important questions about the subject of the conference. If, as many of the contributors suggested, memory is about the present then what was the actual object of enquiry? Was it the Napoleonic Wars or the cultural history of various European nation-states in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries? This naturally led to questions about the link between experience and the media and the extent to which historians should analyse the history of the media rather than the message. He also asked why people reached for Napoleonic images over and above others to comment on contemporary issues. Finally, he pondered the role of religion. He wondered how important religious world views had been for contemporary and near-contemporary perceptions of the conflict. If early memories had been refracted through the lens of religious belief, then how had memory changed in an increasingly secular world?

Jane Rendall (York) pointed out that although the conference had covered a great many media, several still had been neglected. Theatre, poetry and ballads, newspapers, rituals and sermons could all be included as media of memory. She also raised the question of remediation and the fluidity of the various media. She emphasised that many contributors dealt with the interplay of text and media. Moving on to national identities she perceived a note of caution in many papers. Many contributions had suggested that national identity might not be the only framework through which to view differences. We should consider the shared identity of the bourgeois, urban gentleman, be he French, German or British, when observing

the rural poor. Meanwhile, gender regimes were continually being re-negotiated and reevaluated. Through the example of the Irish rising of 1798, Rendall also illustrated entangled and often paradoxical nature of European memories. The centenary commemoration of the uprising in Ireland had taken a nationalist view which stressed the role of local, rural Catholic communities. Yet the leadership was from the urban rational milieu of Dublin.

Mary Sheriff (Chapel Hill) underlined in her comment the question of remediation and the fluidity of the various media. She stressed again that visual images had a much wider impact than many printed texts. She also pointed to the importance of other visual media such as the theatre and opera. Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink (Saarbrücken) summarized four major points that for him had come out of the conference. First, he stressed the ‘mediatic revolution’ that had taken place since the Napoleonic Wars. The spread of literacy and the development of new technologies had multiplied and reshaped the basis of cultural and collective memory. Second, he advocated the practice of intermediality. Historians tend to investigate a national context and compare later. The challenge, however, is to examine the various media and pursue the connections between them, rather than regard them as self-contained. Third, he pointed to the profound influence of classical rhetoric, which reached a highpoint in the Napoleonic era. Napoleon’s own self-memorialization was a mixture of classical rhetoric and the new language of the Revolution. This mix had an enduring influence on the later representations of the period. Finally, he stressed the need to examine the inter-cultural dimension of the wars. Citing David Bell’s recent work on the notion of total war, Lüsebrink asked whether there was a productive element to the conflict. He suggested that national grand narratives could be submerged into an inter-cultural dimension, and pointed to the seeming paradox that, despite the conflict, the period from 1792 to 1815 was also characterised by increasing interest in foreign lands.

The NBI conference in Mannheim highlighted the role of different media in constructing collective memory. It also demonstrated the importance of an ‘intermedial’ and transnational approach across different disciplines. The event was a stimulating start for necessary further transnational and –disciplinary research. The results will be published in a volume of the new Palgrave series “War, Culture and Society, 1750 - 1850”. Alan Forrest, Etienne Francois and Karen Hagemann will edit this volume.

For more information on the NBI project, the conference and the series see: <http://www.nbi.tu-berlin.de/>