Chapter X

ART, COMMERCE, AND THE PRODUCTION OF MEMORY IN FRANCE AFTER WORLD WAR I

DANIEL J. SHERMAN

RECENT SCHOLARLY INTEREST in collective memory, spurred by such ambitious publishing projects as Pierre Nora's *Les lieux de mémoire*, has brought new attention to those proverbially overlooked artifacts of public art, local war memorials.² Owing perhaps to their proliferation and their striking conjunction of variety and sameness, French monuments to the World War I dead have garnered a considerable share of this attention. Yet in the absence of a coherent theoretical framework, studies of such monuments too often present anecdotes, taxonomies, or metaphorical speculations as ends in themselves rather than as starting points for sustained historical analysis. Such a theoretical framework must, it seems to me, begin with a conception of collective memory not as something inherent to a group or groups, reflected unproblematically in objects like monuments, but as a socially constructed discourse. In this view, as culturally specific beliefs about a historical event merge with individual memories and take on visible and legible form, collective memory emerges as a construct of the political, social, and economic structures that condition it, if they do not determine the production of those forms. Similarly, what we conventionally call "commemoration" I take to be the practice of representation that enacts and gives social substance to the discourse of collective memory.

The construction of both discourse and practice involves either the production or the reconfiguration, in terms specific to their purpose, of certain cultural forms: monuments, of course, but also literature, film, and popular visual imagery in such media as postcards, cartoons, and posters. In most of these productions, formal traditions and received assumptions enjoy considerable autonomy from larger social structures and processes such as capitalism, technology, and ideological formulations like the national local dichotomy. The role of these larger structures might best be understood as a kind of mediation: by mapping the terrain in which commemoration operates, modeling what Raymond Williams calls the "conditions of a practice," they mediate both the experience and the representa-

tion of memory.² For this essay, I seek to illuminate the workings of these mediations both separately and in terms of their interaction. For the construction of monuments takes place at the conjunction of a variety of discourses and practices: local and national, commercial and artistic, high and low, and, ultimately perhaps, history and memory.

Although societies since antiquity have erected monuments to their military exploits, historians trace the origins of a new, democratic style of commemoration to the period of the Napoleonic wars, when large citizen armies began to replace mercenary troops. Whereas Roman monuments took the form of arches of triumph, with bas-reliefs celebrating the achievements of rulers or generals, the modern nation-state has felt the need to pay tribute to the ordinary soldier, whether volunteer or conscript, who sacrificed his life in its defense.³ Although various groups and regimes proposed monuments to citizen soldiers from the late eighteenth century on, Maurice Agulhon and June Hargrove have argued that such monuments emerged in France only after the Franco-Prussian War finally removed the sovereign as a potent locus for commemorating the democratic spirit. Monument to the mobiles, the volunteer armies of 1870, broke with past traditions in two other ways that would prove durable: their location in soldiers' hometowns and their frequent recourse to the reproduction of standard models.⁴

No one would deny, of course, that memorials to the World War I dead have an omnipresence in France that distinguishes them even from monuments with which they have much in common: the number of local monuments must approach the total number of French *communes* or townsships in the 1920s, thirty-six thousand. The sheer extent of French losses in the war provides the most obvious, and the most common, explanation for the unprecedented scale of postwar commemoration.⁵ One estimate puts French military deaths at some 1,327,000, proportionally higher than any other major combatant.⁶ Yet it is not self-evident that even widespread grief should so rapidly—within only a few years of the war's end—find monumental expression. The proliferation of monuments to the dead of the Great War did not simply result from a spontaneous outpouring of emotion, however real this was, but involved the fusion of a collective need to mourn with preexisting practices of commemoration. After all, as both Agulhon and William Cohen remind us, the eighteenth century, not the twentieth, gave birth to the expression *statut omnäme*, literally a mania for putting up statues.⁷

In the Third Republic the objects of monumental commemoration ranged widely, from signal events to great figures of the past, from Joan of
to leave their dead in a battlefield cemetery. Yet neither the transfer of remains nor battlefield visits offered any consolation to the many relatives whose loved ones’ bodies had never been found. A 1922 article on the Verdun theater estimated that, despite continuing efforts to recover and identify remains, no more than a quarter of the four hundred thousand Frenchmen killed there would ever be given individual graves.

The plight of families who lacked the means to bury their fallen meant that a sombering sacrifice, as well as the promise of proximity to physical remains, had much to do with the rapid spread of monuments in the immediate post-war period. Many speeches at monument dedications referred to them as a substitute tombs, and mourned memorial to the community, especially children, to show them the same respect they would a cemetery. This discourse of substitution gives much of its significance to the designation monument aux morts, and helps to explain the one feature common to virtually all monuments, even the rare ones that feature allegories of victory; the prominent inscription of the names of the dead (Fig. 1).

[Fig. 1: Names on the war memorial in Euville (Meuse). (Photo: Author)]
These names were invariably read out at monument dedications and at subsequent Armistice Day ceremonies in some towns they find an echo in faded enamelled plaques with photographs of the dead and, occasionally, a brief encapsulation of their life histories (fig. 2). The purpose of this discourse was largely consolatory, but it was not simply a discourse of mourning. Although the proportions vary, fewer than a third of the commemorations in three very different departments—the conservative Morbihan, in Brittany, the leftist Var, in Provence, and the central Loir-et-Cher—decided to build monuments in the cemeteries, the space most suited to mourning. The rest chose to place them in more or less open spaces: in front of the church or town hall, in a public square or park, or at the entrance to the village. Such a public position served clearly to identify the community with its monuments, and to claim for the locality a privileged place in the hierarchy of postwar commemorations. Commemoration does not simply involve urgings; however, it also requires means, and what made universal commemoration possible in France after the war was the existence of a commercial monument industry. Aguilon's study of Republican imagery from 1880 to 1914 makes clear the prior importance of the mass production of standard monumental forms, but after World War I it was no reach unparalleled heights. For if major towns had the resources to sponsor competitions for their monuments and to hire reasonably well-known architects and sculptors to execute them, the vast majority of France's communes did not. In meet their needs a number of major suppliers, from well-known foundries to commercial quarries, offered for sale both low-cost monuments and standard designs that local stoneworkers could copy or finish. Their sales pitches ranged from brochures and fliers to newspapers and sales catalogs, and they pursued prospective clients aggressively. The state, its local representatives, and art critics disparaged both the producers and the product, calling it dated, unoriginal, pretentious, and quite simply not art. For localities, however, these mass-produced or standardized memorials represented not only all they could afford, but also a way of situating a sense of loss they shared with the whole nation in the particular context of their own community.

As soon as the war ended, the Fine Arts Ministry in Paris found itself flooded with requests from members of Parliament, prefects, and mayors for models of monuments or for competitions to create them. Some local officials also sought the names of artists who specialized in commemorative art. These letters suggested that the state provide inexpensive but aesthetically acceptable designs that could be built by communes of varying resources: "bon marché, sans vulgaire" (cheap, but not vulgar) as the mayor of Châlus, in the Indre-et-Loire, put it. Provincial towns with ties to the capital seem to have had a real fear that purely local initiative would lead to considerable aesthetic embarrassment: a deputy from the Ain wrote, "we must not let our lords become covered with horrors. Between a work of art and an abomination there is room for something suitable [convenable]." But the state consistently refused to provide any such models, saying that to do so would conflict with localities' right to make their own artistic choices and impede artists' exercise of their creative freedom. From July of 1919 the Fine Arts Ministry replied to all such requests with the same formulaic statement: "the ministry has abstained from intervening in the choice of artists in order to leave towns and monument committees the greatest scope for initiative." In addition, the ministry refused to consider subventions for monuments in towns with populations of fewer than five thousand, on the assumption that these could not be considered works of art. This cutoff point referred to a law of October 1919 that offered subsidies for monuments in towns of fewer than five thousand inhabitants. The law...
provided a formula for calculating the subsidy based on two scales, the percentage of the town's 1191 population killed in the war, and the value of local tax revenues. The total ranged from a minimum of 4 to a maximum of 25 percent of the cost of the monument borne by the commune; the production of subscriptions and other private contributions was not taken into account. The preferred grants, administered not by the Fine Arts Ministry but by the Public Commemoration Division of the Ministry of the Interior, amounted to too little to give the state an effective role in the monument's design. In theory all monuments required approval from the state, but in practice only communes wanting a subsidy had to submit documentation to Paris. Since the stakes were so small, many did not bother, or did so only late in the process.22

But the Interior Ministry did want to assure some quality control, to avoid what it considered the worst excesses of mass-produced monuments. In 1920, accordingly, it called on prefects to create review commissions, including as members the departmental architectural advisers and others with competence in design matters, to evaluate local proposals for monuments.23 The commissions paid little attention to the Fine Arts Ministry's rhetoric about local initiative. The Berain town of La Trinité-sur-Mer, in the Morbihan, wanted to erect a monument in the shape of a mermaid, the neoclassic stone formation typical of the region, but the departmental commission considered this "lacking in harmony." Furthermore, it declared, "it does not seem a good idea to put a mermaid on a mausoleum base." (After the monument's designer, a Paris sculptor and longtime resident of La Trinité, vigorously defended the regional particularity of his design, pointing out that the base was to be in native blue granite, the commission reversed itself and approved the project.)24 Commissioners were far more concerned with issues of originality, which they contrasted absolutely with serial or mass production. The rapporteur for the Var commission criticized the proposed monuments in Artigues and Les Salles, two styles of pyramidal tops, saying the designer should have taken inspiration from classical models. Yet the appearance of the monuments concerned him less than the fact that the same workshop had produced both of the monuments, and that, at least in basic form, they were identical.25

Commissioners were also concerned with maladroit designs by amateurs, and they continually urged communes to have recourse to trained architects and sculptors like themselves. Commission members did in fact design monuments, generally for larger towns, and naturally they responded to their colleagues' designs with great enthusiasm.26 When the project of the departmental architects Barla for a relatively simple monument in Callas came before the Var panel, the curator of the Draguignan museum wrote in his report, "of all the commemorative projects sent to us up to now, this is certainly the one that, through the simplicity of its lines, the sobriety of its ornamentation, and the harmony of the whole responds the best and the most sincerely to the desired end."27 The commissioners did, however, realize that most smaller communities could not afford their services. Discussing the proposed monument in Bargemon, in the Var (fig. 5), which he called "a post-war horror," Barla declared that "certain towns seem unaware of the prefect's considered warning . . . to avoid the pretension of statues that can only be beautiful if their execution is entrusted to artists worthy of the name, whose inspiration, drawn from the faith of their art, realizes moving works, which are generally too costly to be within reach of our smaller villages."28

But their reliance on models and sketches, as well as the primacy attached to originality, could blind commissioners to the way monuments work within specific locales. Arguably, the site of the Bargemon monument, in the hills of Haute Provence, lends a dignity and power that go beyond its formal qualities. On the other hand, the Var commission lavished praise on the design for a monument in Cotignac, finding in it "the
are merit of being original, simple, and imposing at the same time. The pollu, the principal element of the work, becomes the soul of the stone, becomes an integral part of it as he became an integral part of the earth of the trenches."

But in the actual monument (fig. 4), the soldier looks as though he is peeping over the top of the stone out of which he is carved, and the effect, particularly from the back, is more comical than imposing.

In contrast to their praise for professionally produced unique memorials, commissions objected with particular vehemence to monuments ordered from catalogs, which they criticized for "a false luxury of details scattered without any ordering principle, and for the pernicious mannerism of statues that pretend to be allegorical." Their comments reproduce a discourse widespread among critics working in the "high art" arena, one that attributed the generally perceived low aesthetic quality of small-town monuments of commerce and enterprise. One critic in the spring of 1922, "the weather has already digested the cheap enamel, the flashy gilding, the patinas of fake bronze that clever manufacturers use to disguise (maquiller) their commercial junk."

Another critic, referring to "factories where commemorative war memorials..."
suggests a file of standard designs with only minor modifications for each client. 14 Other companies, such as the Marbreries Générales in Paris, or a smaller Nice firm, insisted that they were specialists, that they could modify standard designs to suit particular sites and programs, and that their designs had "great artistic cachet." 15

The appropriation of artistic discourse to commercial ends reached something of an apex in a monthly (occasionally semimonthly) newspaper called L'art funéraire et commémoratif. In four tabloid-size pages, each issue of L'art funéraire juxtaposed critical articles such as those quoted above, historical pieces on past masters of French commemorative sculpture like Mercié and Dalou, and articles, photographs, and advertisements promoting the monuments of the sculptor Charles-Henri Pouquet, a serious artist of modest talent whom the newspaper vaunted as the master of Great War commemoration. 16 Praise in these terms reinforced L'art funéraire's constant insistence, in editorials and in brief slogans interspersed throughout the text, that only trained artists and architects could produce monuments of a suitable aesthetic character. 17 But the newspaper did not limit itself to urgings of a purely artistic kind. Another of its slogans ran, "There is a truth that those who undertake commemorative monuments too often do not know: in art, the beautiful is no more costly than the ugly." 18 On the last page of almost every issue, L'art funéraire advertised its availability to towns "proposing to build commemorative monuments of the Great War that will leave behind the current banality," and offered, at no charge, "artistic designs, models, sketches, reasonable estimates, even cost prices." These were undoubtedly the works of Pourquet; under the photograph of perhaps his best-known, La Résistance, the newspaper wrote that it could provide information "on the reproduction of this beautiful work in any material at all." 19

In the absence of entrepreneurial archives, it is difficult to know how successful this rhetorical strategy proved in attracting clients. A price list issued by Rombaux-Roland a few months after the one discussed earlier offered new variations on certain models and price reductions of up to 15 percent on some of the more expensive ones. But this may simply indicate a routine market adjustment, as most prices, and all of the cheapest ones, remained the same. 20 More significantly, the monument business could tap a set of local attitudes that lent itself to precisely the kind of product, both
discursive and physical, it was offering. The responses of local officials to the criticisms of prefectural review boards show a surprising confidence in their own ability to determine the type of monument appropriate to their community. The mayor of Les Saies, in the Var, considered the similarity of its monuments to others, which the commission criticized as a sign it lacked originality, proof of the contractor's ability. "The entrepreneur is not very good at drawing," the mayor noted, as though this explained the commissioner's reservations, "but he handles a chisel very skilfully; that's well known."

Recognizing the photography on the Poucext plan as a commercial product, the rapporteur on the Var commission wrote that the phrase "cannot be considered an original work. It will doubtless be seen in several communes and will create more of a commerical than an artistic impression."42 The "original" realistic paint job applied by the town, in fact a fairly common practice, would hardly have changed his mind, but like most of his colleagues in similar cases he acquiesced, reasoning that small towns could hardly be expected either to produce or to appreciate original works of art.43 In some cases review boards were able to secure minor changes in the dimensions of a monument, in order to say "magnificent" to a statue with a pedestal, but when presented with what the prefect called a fait accompli, a monument completed prior to their examination, they could not even do that.44

Yet though the dichotomy between art and commerce, or between high and popular art, clearly constituted one of the basic divisions between the state and localities, it was not the only one. The town of Nans-les-Pins, also in the Var, prompted criticism from the commission because of its plan to use an old fountain as the base for its monument; the commissioner also suggested, not very helpfully, that the monument should be "more artistic."45 In a polirhe very deeply felt reply, the mayor observed that the "value of an object does not depend on its cost, but on the memory attached to it; our modest monument will perpetuate the memory of our dear departed just as well as one costing ten times as much." The town, the mayor wrote later, already had a monument in the cemetery, but the "popular insists on having its polirs in a public square."46 This apparently simple assertion actually contains two references that need to be considered separately: to the polirs and to the public square with its fountain. For its polir Nans chose a variation on the hugely popular product of the Jacotet company in the Vaucluse. Jacotet boasted in its literature, usually accompanied by a photograph (figs. 7 and 8), that "Le Poilu" is the only subject that fully represents the idea that has been developed [par J. Figar] of a Monument to the Dead of the Great War.47 Of course, many sculptors and companies produced versions of the polir, and although the Jacotet monument (fig. 9) can be found all over the country, other types were popular as well. In addition, statistical surveys in a number of departments make clear that the most common type of polir, and undoubtedly because it was the cheapest, had no figurative representation at all: the simple soldi (fig. 10).48 Yet Jacotet's carefully worded advertisement makes a conceptual claim, not a statistical one, about the polir itself, who could be represented in basre, plaques, or full-length figures in a variety of poses; constitutes one of the most common motifs of a national order on French World War I memorials. In the Morbihan, out of 154 memorials surveyed, 79, or just over half, lack any figural motif; in the Loir-et-Cher the percentage is greater, 74 out of 113.49 But in both cases, the memorials with figures, the overwhelming majority—25 out of 30 in the Loir-et-Cher, 54 out of 62 in the Morbihan—include the polir, either alone or grouped with other figures.

That the common soldier should emerge as the most pervasive image of the war memorial in France may not seem surprising, but its significance...
Fig. 8. Photograph of the Jacquotte polux model. Archives Départementales de la Manche, depositaire Archives Communeales de Neuville. (Photo: author)

Fig. 9. War memorial, Beigné (Manche). The classic Jacquotte polux. (Photo: author)

deserves closer examination. The polux, as be sure, comes out of a stylistic tradition particular to war memorials, one extant in France since the Franco-Prussian War and with examples from the United States (in Civil War memorials of both the Union and the Confederacy) to New Zealand. But this form itself represents a radical break with the prevailing tradition of monumental representation, the female allegory. This tradition had hardly seemed moribund in France, for in the three decades prior to the war it had found an embodiment in Marianne, the personification of the newly reestablished Republic. Nor can this new preference for the male body be attributed simply to commercial availability; the letter from the mayor of Nantes-Portau, Roland did not show female allegories in their publicity materials, and probably did not sell them. But suppliers aiming for the middle and upper ranges of the market like the Marchés Générales and the well-known Val d'Oise foundry did offer such designs, usually winged victories, and a few towns did select them, either with or without a polux (figs. 11 and 12 show two Marianne monuments purchased from the Marchés Générales, in Plonelin and St. Dolay). Why, then, did so few towns choose female allegories; why did so many, like Nantes-Portau, want an undeviating polux in the public square? Simple explanations largely unrelated to the nature of monuments are not lacking: the higher cost of elaborate sculptures, the pressure of veterans’ groups for realistic representations of their dead comrades, or more generally the inappropriateness of a heroic idiom to the mood of postwar France. All of these explanations have some merit, but we also need to consider factors proper to the order of representation itself. Martha Warter has observed that monuments in the form of the female body have historically represented abstractions, signified by particular devices: Marianne’s cap, Victory’s wings, Justice’s blindfold and scales. Logically then, “female figures
representing an ideal or an abstraction hardly ever intersect with real individual women. Though a specially commissioned monument could transcend this abstraction, for example by clothing women in regional costume or widow's weeds, a mass-produced standard figure could do so only with great difficulty.

The soldier in uniform, in contrast, was, even in the exaggeratedly heroic pose favored by Pourquet and others, immediately recognizable as a realistic type, an important attribute for grieving relatives. This is true in a general as well as a particular sense: Warner notes that male representations of the nation, such as John Bull or Uncle Sam, have particular characters in ways that Britannia or the Statue of Liberty does not. France before the war lacked such a common male representation; the polis supplied one. Yet the special appeal of the polis lay in his ability to conjure national with local resonances. Not only a standard figure, he was also a local one; given local roots by the names at his feet, he stood not only for

the nation but for the individuals a particular community had given up in its name.

Returning to Nans-les-Pins, we remember that the community did not only want a polis, it wanted a polis on an existing fountain base (fig. 15). Such a combination did not lack precedents: Aguilhon has found a number of Third Republic Marianne with what he calls “hydraulic supports.” A Marianne so placed clearly associated social progress—the easy availability of water in the center of the village, rather than in some distance well—with a particular political commitment. In one of his letters to the prefect the mayor gave a capsule history of the fountain, built in 1887 “for a great deal of money” and clearly the pride of the town. The fonsion of the fountain, a symbol of the community’s civic identity, with the polis, which
embodied the link between the community and the nation that the monument itself sought to enact, thus signified not a solution of convenience but a profoundly meaningful commemorative act.

Town-wanted polis, or stele with standard decorations, or defaced shells to form balustrades, because these forms signified commemoration. Their resemblance to other forms, far from disqualifying them as art, provided a link to an order of signification that town-lacking experience with high cultural discourse constructed as artistic, and thus the worchest signifier of their own highest emotions. Nor could the repetition of forms compromise the distinctiveness of individual monuments. Having inscribed monuments with the names of their own dead, having placed them in churchyards or in town squares newly renamed Place du Maréchal Foch, or Place Verdun, or, as in St. Maurice-sous-les Côtes, Place du Poilu, towns saw in them more than mass-produced compendiums of artistic clichés. 16

For these monuments, recognizable as such by their association with standard types, yet distinctive in their locations and in the names they inscribed, presented towns with an image of their community in terms both of what they shared with others and of what remained distinctly their own. This is not to say that the meaning monuments conveyed was either clear or fixed. As objects, monuments from the moments of their conception offered themselves up to a variety of interpretations. Indeed, even at their dedication or on subsequent Armistice Days, ceremonial occasions when monuments most ostentatiously signified unity, practiced rhetoricians could appropriate them to their own political purposes. Where a leftist deputy might find in a monument, whatever its form, an exhortation to avoid senseless slaughter in the future, one of his conservative colleagues could, at the same ceremony, extract from it an endorsement of a strong defense and an uncompromising foreign policy. 17 Whatever the views of
the commentator, the monument could be interpreted to suit them. As Werner has written, "it is in the intrinsic nature of public art that it tends to blend, to coalesce. It could be said that it has no coat to turn."54

It seems clear, however, on the basis of some suggestive empirical evidence, that for most communities their monument embodied, more than anything else, a sense of loss. The stela or funerary architecture, accounts for at least half the monuments in most départements, and often adjoins the figure of the poilu. Another 5 or 10 percent of monuments in surveyed regions take the form of tombs, either cast or made for without mourning figures, altars, or in Brittany even calvaries. Among figural monuments, few convey an attitude of triumph, either allegorically or in the pose or expression of the poilu. One finds as many soldiers as stelae in most regions, and very frequently the soldier stands at rest, sometimes with a rifle. A poilu in Normandy, not from a standard model, even seems to be mourning a German helmet at his feet, a sign of the international reconciliation that many veterans' groups advocated in the postwar period.55

But meaning is not a matter of proportions, frequencies, statistics, like memory it is profoundly untalatable. The monument, in its tendency to blend into the landscape, embodies this instability in a particularly ironic way. Werner cites Robert Musil on this phenomenon: "The most striking feature of monuments is that you do not notice them. There is nothing in the world as invisible as monuments. Doubtless they have been erected to be seen—even to attract attention; yet at the same time something has impregnated them against attention. Like a drop of water on an oilskin, attention runs down them without stopping for a moment."56 The builders of World War I monuments in France were conscious of the tendency of memory to fade, and their inaugural speeches often testify to a certain pessimism about the efficacy of the means, monuments, they had chosen to combat it: "In these parts," the mayor of a small Breton town declared bluntly, "forgetting comes quickly."57

This inevitable dialectic between memory and forgetting affords a context at once poignant and revealing for the most recent and consistent feature of these monuments, their inscription of names. However odd or simply ugly we may find the ensemble of which they form a vital part, even today those long, heartbreaking lists, strangely echoed by the silence that usually surrounds them, cannot fail to move us. The names more than anything else constitute the monument as a place of mourning, inscribing it with the particularity of a place that the denaturation of its inhabitants embodies. More than this, by virtue of their inscription the names constitute themselves as part of a signifying process that seeks to transcend memory and its limitations by assigning to it, its constructed "collective" form, a historical role. In a manner both poignant and troubling, names are the irredensible

syndecophel monuments make a community's claim to a place in history, representing its loss as its most essential link to the nation.
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