the author to write a sustained introduction giving his views about the historiographical developments of the last dozen years. Moreover, at times, the book has a mildly parochial quality. Presumably because he was usually writing for a broader public, Winock rarely cites the work of non-French scholars. To be sure, he does make reference to Roger L. Williams’s *Henri Rochefort: Prince of the Gutter Press* (1966), only to dwell at length on its many egregious errors of fact. He is not wrong about the book, but it all seems a bit much for a work of popular history manifestly not intended for a scholarly audience. One would be far more interested in his thoughts about a book he never mentions, namely Steven Wilson’s very substantial *Ideology and Experience: Anti-Semitism in France at the Time of the Dreyfus Affair* (1982).

Scoring points on Williams for mistakenly believing that Maurice Barrès belonged to the *Action Française* is good sport, but there are serious North American scholars — one thinks of Robert Soucy (*Fascism in France: The Case of Maurice Barrès*, 1972) or Stewart Doty (*From Cultural Rebellion to Counterrevolution: The Politics of Maurice Barrès*, 1976) — who have provided us with far more scholarly interpretations of Barrès. These books had been published long before Winock wrote his articles, and his thoughts about their (very different) interpretations would have been welcome. In spite of these defects, however, there is a great deal to be learned from this book.

William D. Irvine

York University


As Nancy Wood reminds us in the opening sentence of her book, “Memory is decidedly in fashion.” Indeed, there has been considerable recent discussion of collective memory, especially in European societies, where the memory of painful episodes has been hotly contested in the 1980s and 1990s. In France and Germany, for example, debates over memory have become central to political culture and have involved politicians, jurists, artists, journalists, Holocaust survivors, museum curators, and historians. To be sure, historians have often played prominent roles in discussions of memory. They have theorized about the construction, function, and meaning of historical memory, and they have examined both the varying ways in which particular episodes have been remembered and commemorated and the political considerations involved in the construction of memory — and in the determination to forget. Some historians have served as expert witnesses during war crimes trials, while others have analysed historical interventions and highlighted the often conflicting demands of law, memory, and historical scholarship. From an historical standpoint, then, the issue of memory in contemporary Europe is certainly not unexplored terrain.

Wood brings a somewhat different perspective to the study of European memory. A professor of media studies in Britain, she approaches the study of memory from an interdisciplinary perspective, and she is determined to bring a conceptual rigour
to the enterprise. The book focuses on Germany and France, where debates over memory have been most intense, and it ranges more widely temporally, methodologically, and geographically than many historical works on the subject. Wood’s starting point is what she considers the “conceptual haziness” of approaches to collective memory. To clarify matters, she proposes to treat collective memory as “performatif”, that is “as only coming into existence at a given time and place through specific kinds of memorial activity” (p. 2). To analyse this characteristic, she examines key “vectors of memory” (a term she acknowledges borrowing from Henry Rousso’s now classic study, The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France since 1944): historiography, survivor testimonialisations, trials, novels, and films. For Wood, these “vectors of memory” function as conduits of performativity and their analysis allows a study of memory in all its complexity.

The book collects eight varied, self-contained essays, many of which were published elsewhere in one form or another. A brief tour of the contents is perhaps the best way to suggest its approach and scope. The first chapter provides a critical summary of the highly influential, seven-volume Les lieux de mémoire, published between 1984 and 1992 under the direction of the French historian Pierre Nora. The second analyses the eminent German philosopher Jürgen Habermas’s media interventions into debates on German history and memory between 1985 and 1990. In this chapter, Wood elaborates the ways in which Habermas links his notion of the necessity of a public working through of painful memories to the formation of a new “postconventional” German identity. Chapter 3 examines the relationship between memory and resentment in the writings of the two Holocaust survivors, Jean Améry and Primo Levi. The following two chapters, the longest in the book, focus more particularly on the intersection of history, historical scholarship, and memory. Chapter 4 examines the controversy surrounding the 1995 publication of Daniel J. Goldhagen’s Hitler’s Willing Executioners, while chapter 5 analyses the complicated relationship between law, memory, and history through the lens of the 1997–1998 trial of Vichy functionary Maurice Papon.

Chapters 6 to 8 interrogate memory through an analysis of fiction and film. Chapter 6, for example, provides a reading of Albert Camus’s novel Le premier homme (published posthumously in France in 1994) that argues for the novel’s multifaceted character. For Wood, in fact, it is Camus’s forays into historical memory — especially the attempt to restore to the pied-noir community of which Camus was a part the ambivalences of historical memory — that account for this complexity. A subsequent chapter uses the 1959 French film Hiroshima, mon amour to “reflect on how analogy illuminates and limits our encounter with history-as-trauma” (p. 185). The remaining chapter examines the relationship between history, memory, and identity formation through the example of Algerian Jews. The book ends with a brief conclusion which does not bring together the issues raised in the diverse chapters, but instead raises questions about what the 1998 commemorations of the Great War and arrest of General Augusto Pinochet can tell us about a contemporary public’s relationship to both the near and more distant past.

The book’s temporal, geographical, and methodological range distinguish it from many works on memory produced by historians. I suspect that historians will find
some essays more compelling than others, depending on their particular interests, familiarity with the issues, works, and debates under discussion, and, at times, willingness to wade through poststructural language that, to my mind, does not always illuminate the issues. For example, I remain unconvinced that Wood’s description of collective memory as “performative” or her use of the term “conduits of performativity” enhances our understanding of how collective memory operates in contemporary Europe. With that said, however, there is much in this book to interest historians of memory and of contemporary Europe more broadly. The chapters that analyse historiography and interrogate the complicated relationship between history and memory are interesting, clearly written, and grounded in the most recent historical scholarship. At their best, these chapters offer fresh perspectives on historical works and controversies. For example, Wood’s examination of the controversy surrounding Goldhagen’s *Hitler’s Willing Executioners* shifts the focus from a historiographical critique of the book (of which there were many) to an examination of the representational and narrative strategies used. Wood wonders whether Goldhagen’s sin — in historians’ eyes — was not simply his argument but also the fact that the book has a narrative structure that resembles that of a film; the book is, she argues, the historiographical equivalent of *Schindler’s List*.

Whether or not one accepts all of her arguments, Wood provides a stimulating comparative discussion of *Hitler’s Willing Executioners* and Christopher Browning’s highly acclaimed *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*. She highlights how both authors’ interpretative frameworks structure the narratives they produce and influence the different ways in which they analyse the same evidence, including photographs. Her analysis of the vexed relationship between law, memory, and history in the very recent Papon trial (which, she acknowledges, draws heavily on Henry Rousso’s analysis of Paul Touvier’s earlier trial) will also interest historians. In conclusion, this book is a valuable interdisciplinary addition to the ever-expanding literature on European memory, one that should be of particular interest to scholars of contemporary Europe and memory more broadly.

Susan B. Whitney

*Carleton University*