



**CHALLENGING MEMORIES IN PUBLIC SPACES:
INTERACTIONS AROUND CONTESTED STATUES
IN FRANCE AND IN SPAIN.**

Challenging memories in public spaces: Interactions around contested statues in France and in Spain.

Sherilyn Bouyer

Master thesis

Master History of society

Erasmus School of History, Culture, and Communication

Erasmus University Rotterdam

Student number: 506798

Contact: sherilyn.bouyer@gmail.com

Supervisor lecturer: prof. dr. H.C. Dibbits

Second reader: dr. Z.N. Dujisin-Muharay

Cover photo: The statue of Colbert, Paris, Author's photography, April 2019; The statue of Francisco Franco, Melilla, https://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/Estatua_del_comandante_de_la_Legi%C3%B3n_Francisco_Franco_Bahamonde, accessed 20.06.2019

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	5
1.1 Research question	6
1.2 Theoretical Framework	7
1.3 Literature review	12
1.4 Sources and Methods	22
1.3Structure of the thesis	24
Chapter 2: Why does it matter now? Understanding conflicts over memories in public spaces in Spain and in France.	26
2.1 Historical background:	
State sponsored memories in France and in Spain	27
2.2 The statue of Colbert in Paris and the statue of Franco in Melilla:	
Introducing the debates	34
2.3 Contested statues:	
Challenging the construction of the national collective memory	41
Chapter 3: “How do you feel about this statue?”	
Emotional engagement in Memory Politics.	46
3.1 Expressing explicit emotions.	47
3.2 Memories and emotions:	
Producing affective engagement in representations of the past.	59
3.3 Multiple feelings, one place.	64
Chapter 4: “How are our neighbours dealing with it?”	
Highlighting the European context in ongoing discussions around contested statues in France and in Spain	69
4.1. Measuring up to your neighbour: Comparison to other states.	70
4.2. The European collective memory: Shaping European norms and values.	77
4.3. Conflicts of memories in public spaces: Seeking a European response?	84
Chapter 5: Conclusion	89
Bibliography	103

Acknowledgments

The research carried out in this thesis is the result of my participation in the Master History of Society: Global History and International Relations program at the Erasmus Rotterdam University and of my internship at EUROCLIO and the Institute of Historical Justice and Reconciliation. Taking part in their collaborative project “Contested Histories in public spaces” influenced the present study. I would like to acknowledge and thank both of my internship supervisors, Marie Louise Ryback and Steven Stegers, for their guidance during my internship and their contribution for my research.

My gratitude goes to my supervisor, Prof. dr. H.C Dibbits for her constant advices, feedbacks and, most of all, for her pertinent ideas, which helped me frame my research. I also thank the professors of the Master History of Society which, through different classes, inspired and encouraged me to develop my ideas for this study.

Last, I am grateful for the help and support of Camille Gautier in the editing process of this thesis.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Following the 2015 Rhodes Must Fall movement in South Africa and the 2017 removing process of confederate monuments in the United States of America, statues honouring historical figures became a focal point in a broader discussion about memories and the legacy of the past in the public sphere. The research realised by this thesis fits within a global phenomenon observed around the world. My interest for the research originates from the internship I carried out with EUROCLIO and the Institute of Historical Justice and Reconciliation working on their collaborative project of “Contested Histories in public spaces”.¹ The project strives to identify past or ongoing cases of contested memories in the public sphere and to assess the variety of policies applied in these cases to, eventually, draft advices and recommendations for future decision makers facing the issue of contested legacies in public spaces. While this initiative targets the insufficiency of responsible or informed policies tackling the issue, my research intends to add further empirical research and theoretical analysis to a growing interest in academic research regarding challenged manifestations of the past in Europe.

Although the topic of contested statues has been discussed by several scholars, I noticed the lack of existing empirical researches solely based on Western Europe. Moreover, I found it interesting to carry out a comparative analysis. I narrowed down my interest for two cases, one in France and one in Spain. My choice was motivated by my aspiration to draw attention to two distinct cases, distinct in the types of challenged memories but also distinct in the political context in which memories evolved, and yet, be able to assess similarities in the way contestations of statues unfolded.

This thesis positions itself within this context and evaluates contemporary discourses surrounding statues in Spain and in France. My research will focus on the ongoing process of addressing contested but still standing monuments. France is comparable to other former colonial European states dealing with numerous monuments celebrating figures involved in the slavery institution. I will analyse discourses around a statue of Jean Baptiste Colbert located in front of the French National Assembly in Paris. Jean Baptise Colbert was minister under Louis XIV and

¹ “Contested histories in public spaces” is an ongoing project. Further information can be found on the website of the Institute of Historical Justice and Reconciliation. <https://www.ihjr.org/ethics-and-legacy/>

one of the redactors of the Black Code, thereby formalizing slavery practices in French colonies, as well as the organiser of French East India Company, which participated in the slave trade.

Regarding Spain's case, I will inquire into the last public statue of Francisco Franco, founder and leader of Spanish authoritarian regime (1936-1975). The statue is located in Melilla, a Spanish territory in North Africa. I chose to solely focus on these cases as they both attracted the most attention in their respective country. Additionally, although both statues are referring to different periods and memories, several parallels can be drawn. One of these parallels are the types of arguments that are brought in the discussions. I identified the main arguments conveyed in discussions and my research will focus on analysing the role of these arguments facilitating thereafter the understanding of interactions about conflicts of memories in public spaces.

In this introductory chapter, I will address my research question and the objectives of my study, outline the main concepts that guided my analysis, review some of the academic works I drew upon to come up with my research and finally introduce the sources and methods I used to investigate the debates around the statues of Colbert in Paris and of Franco in Melilla.

1.1 Research question

In this research, I examine two sites of contestations, two statues located in the public sphere in France and in Spain. I analyse interactions around both statues and, particularly, the arguments conveyed by actors of the debates. In both case studies, I identified three dominant types of arguments driving the discussions. My research is based on this identification and analyses the role of each argument in the discussions addressing the issue of contested statues in public spaces. Therefore, my research question is the following: *What is the role of the different types of arguments produced in discussions around contested statues in France and in Spain?*

My research is threefold, and each part is supported by a sub-question. The first sub-question guiding my research is the following: *In which national political and social context did contestations around the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco unfold and what do these conflicts of memories challenge?* The political and social context will be studied in which conflicting memories developed to explore how contestations

arose. I will introduce the protagonists involved in the debates and examine the arguments they produced in relation to the national context. Even though both national contexts and both types of memories are distinct, similarities can be observed in both Spain and France, notably the arguments produced and what they implied and challenged.

These concerns settled, I will focus on one dominant argument brought in both discussions, namely the emotional argument suggesting an answer to the following question: *To what extent are emotions instrumentalized by opposing sides of the debates?* Analysing discourses around the statues reveal how emotions were explicitly expressed by different groups. This second question will support my enquiries about affective processes in politics of memory. I explore how emotions were used by various actors of memory when addressing controversial legacies of the past. Was their use meant to blame, to justify or to understand one another?

The third type of argument I have identified is the European context. I intend to explore how the European community came to influence local conflicts of memories. Thus, my last sub-question is the following: *To what extent does the European community produce a new frame of memory politics in discussions around contested statues?* I seek to evaluate why the European context is brought in the discussions as an argument and the role it played in the debates.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

I analysed the role of different types of arguments brought during interactions around the statues in France and in Spain. Based on the arguments I have already identified, examining contested statues implies that I research about conflicting memories within a national community, but also, about conflicting emotions associated with the statue as a manifestation of the past, and, about conflicting attitudes towards the European community and its ability to shape memories. The articulations of memory within the national community, embedded with politics of memory at local, national or European scale, are one core aspect of my research. The other aspect explores affective engagement as observed in memory politics or expressed during the construction of the national collective memory. The concepts of collective memory, memory politics and emotions guided my research.

I drew upon Maurice Halbwachs' concept of collective memory to conduct my research of how representations of the past were constructed within a nation and how these representations and, their construction, were challenged by the contestations around the statue of Colbert in Paris and the statue of Franco in Melilla. In his 1925 work *Les cadres sociaux de la memoire* and his 1950 work *La Memoire collective*, Halbwachs explored how individual memory is shaped, believing it is not only a matter of the mind.² He considered social structures and social interaction to understand how individual memory is shaped. This assessment led Halbwachs to develop the concept of collective memory, on which individual memory depends. He defined collective memory as a memory that is constructed, shared and passed on by a large or a small social group. The construction depends on the social structure in which the social group evolve. Eventually, representations of the past depend on the identity and values of the social group at a given time (allowing therefore changes as generations passed). Furthermore, collective memory, according to Halbwachs, allows only the past to be represented by a single perspective, namely of the homogenous social group.³ Since Halbwachs' original work, the concept of collective memory has been widely researched and developed. It has been generally assumed that the present is the motor constructing the past according to its needs. Furthermore, it was also agreed upon that cultural symbols matter. Scholars including Paul Connerton, in *How societies remember* or Pierre Nora in *Les lieux de memoires*, followed these assumptions in their works.⁴ These theories eventually outlined how collective memory is shaped and passed on. Social groups are influenced by the type of politics of memory implemented in their time. Politics of memory is the second concept I will be using throughout my research.

Politics of memory is a wide concept that has attracted substantial attention in the past few decades in various fields. Memory politics not only involve what is remembered in a given society but how it is articulated and why these decisions are made. It aims to analyse how entrepreneurs of memory select which memories to pass on to future generations and from which perspective to do so. Therefore, drawing upon

² Maurice Halbwachs, *Les cadres sociaux de la memoire* (Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France, 1952); Maurice Halbwachs, *La memoire collective* (Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France, 1967)

³ Halbwachs, *La memoire collective*

⁴ Paul Connerton, *How societies remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Pierre Nora, *Les Lieux de memoire*, 3 tomes (Paris: Gallimard, 1997)

Confino's definition, "memory is viewed here as a subjective experience of a social group that essentially sustains a relationship of power".⁵ His conception of power and the political oriented view of memory are what is at stake in wars of monuments. Indeed, conflicts around symbols erected under past local or national institutions challenge their ability to shape memories. Official removal, contextualisation of the statue or leaving it standing are decisions that are, generally, made by institutionalized political agents. However, the concept of memory politics should not be reduced to its political orientation. Inherently cultural, Confino feared for politics of memory to forget about the "category of the social".⁶ He argued that by focusing solely on the political aspects of memory, academics are inclined to take into account mainly political transformations and interests while disregarding socially constructed memories. Aware of these limits, I intend to using the concept of memory politics in a broader sense. I will do so supported by Peter J. Verovsek's 2016 article which pointed to the limits of politics of memory suggested by Confino twenty years earlier.⁷ Verovsek exposed a lack of unity but also of definition regarding the concept and suggested another approach to societal disputes over memories. Drawing upon Jurgen Habermas's discourse theory, Verovsek focused his research of politics of memory on "the communicative pathways" connecting an "informal sphere of opinion-formation" and a formal sphere of state institutions.⁸ He believed both spheres influence each other in the issue of coming to terms with the past. Disputes over memories can arise from the informal sphere and be elevated to state institutions whose actions would in return affect the public sphere. Therefore, Verovsek seemed to take into account the social category Confino mentioned. Furthermore, Verovsek considered these disputes to, not only be about the past, but to challenge the present and the future and consequently influence current discourses. His theory placed him directly in the legacy of Halbwachs who viewed collective memories as attached to the requirements of the present. Verovsek's dialogical approach focused on the production of memories and ponders how they are in conflict with other narratives. Additionally, his approach highlights the way they are managed by all entrepreneurs of memories, especially institutional ones,

⁵ Alon Confino, "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method," *The American Historical Review* 102, no. 5 (December 1997):1393

⁶ *Ibid*, 1393

⁷ Peter J. Verovsek, "Collective memory, politics, and the influence of the past: the politics of memory as a research paradigm," *Politics, Groups and Identities*, 4:3 (April 2016): 529-543.

⁸ Verovsek, "Collective memory, politics, and the influence of the past," 530

eventually responsible for making decisions. Verovsek's article on memory studies and argument on informal and formal discourses provides me with a guideline for my thesis. Indeed, looking at contestations at sites of memory implies examining both social and political categories in order to analyse how both interacted with each other.

I used the concepts of politics of memory and collective memory together in my analysis. Indeed, the growing dispute over memories and their articulation in the twentieth century challenge the construction of collective memory. How did these contested discourses over historical figures influence the construction of the collective memory? Additionally, how did state institutions supervise these memories in the public sphere in response to citizens' contestations? These questions guided my research throughout this thesis.

The last analytical concept framing my research joins both the concept of collective memory and of memory politics adding to the idea of connection and interaction within social groups, thereby the concept of emotions. The concept of emotions has been explored in various fields, particularly in anthropology. In recent years, a shift towards linking emotions, heritage studies and memories studies can be observed. Scholars such as Crang, Tolia Kelly, Gregory and Witcomb developed affective processes embedded with the notion of heritage.⁹ My interest lies in exploring affective engagement as observed in memory politics, expressed during the construction of the collective memory and its central role as an argumentative tool in discussions around contested statues. I support my analysis with the more recent approach of emotion networking as developed by Dibbits, Willemsen and Rana.¹⁰ Although originally meant as a "methodology to approach present-day heritage productions" and the divergent emotions attached to them, the concept can be extended.¹¹ Emotion networking is a tool providing citizens with an awareness of the different feelings and interests involved in heritage making. Within a set-up social setting, participants are inclined to take in different feelings displayed and, potentially, influenced by the presence of others, to shift their own emotions. As a result, affective

⁹ M. Crang and D. Tolia-Kelly, "Nation, Race and Affect: Senses and Sensibilities at National Heritage Sites," *Environment and Planning A* 42, 10 (2017): 2315–2331; K. Gregory and A. Witcomb. "Beyond Nostalgia: The Role of Affect in Generating Historical Understanding at Heritage Sites," in *Museum Revolutions: How Museums Change and Are Changed*, ed. S. J. Knell, S. Macleod and S. Watson (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007): 263–275.

¹⁰ H.C Dibbits, M. Willemsen, Jasmijn Rana, "Moved by the tears of others: Emotion networking in the heritage sphere," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 23, n.10 (August 2010): 977-988

¹¹ *Ibid*, 977

engagement can foster new sorts of connections between divergent actors and their opposite interests. Networking provides an opportunity to, once more, shape the changing collective memory. The statues I selected illustrate this notion of divergent emotions. Indeed, in both cases, those who unveiled the statue and those who defend its durability feel pride while those supporting its removal feel hurt by it. While emotion networking encourages awareness of other's feelings, the question of the functions of emotions in conflicts of memories needs to be further developed. Doing so, Sara Ahmed in *The cultural politics of emotions* analysed the power of emotions.¹² She argued that "emotions can lead to collective politics and social alliances".¹³ A cultural practice in itself, using emotions encourages citizens' initiatives and political actions. In discussions surrounded the statues studied in my research, arguments from both sides instrumentalize emotions. Protagonists do so to provoke specific social and political attitudes. In regards of memories, Geoffrey's M. White work on emotional remembering will reinforce my understanding, as well as my analysis of opposite arguments in those debates.¹⁴ Combining these authors' works on emotions, I consider the notion of emotions as feelings constructed through social interaction and depending on social structures. I will analyse how participants of the discussions around the statues of both my case studies are moved by symbols and manifestations of the past, but also affected by the contestation of these symbols. These feelings might be influenced by long-established social structures or developed during the discussion through social interaction as they are confronted with different types of arguments.

Coming back to my research, each argument I have identified as driving the discussions around the statues of Colbert in Paris and the statue of Franco in Melilla, combined each of the concepts I have mentioned. Therefore, politics of memory, collective memory and emotions are core concepts guiding my research and the evaluation of the functions of each argument. Brought together, they facilitated my understanding on how the contestations unfolded and triggered further discussions on conflicting memories in the public sphere.

¹² Sara Ahmed, *The cultural politics of emotions* (London: Routledge, 2004)

¹³ Ibid,9

¹⁴ Geoffrey M. White, "Emotional Remembering: The Pragmatics of National Memory," *Ethos* 27, no.4 (December 1999): 505-529

1.3 Literature review

The statues I analysed are honouring a figure, a memory from the past. Statues are part of the cultural symbols that support the construction of the collective memory. They were built because they embodied a memory or a virtue important for the municipality, or the state, at the time of construction. In both of my case studies, the initial and persisting meanings of the statues of Colbert and Franco were contested or protected by different groups interacting in the discussions I analysed. Furthermore, the statue of Franco and the statue of Colbert carried divergent emotions with them varying from one group to the other because of the conflicting memories the statues are associated with. Analysing discussions around contested statues in France and Spain required to be aware and drew upon past academic work on the construction of memories, the issue of contested memories and the circumstances that led to such contestations. In this section, I intend to understand how memory works and how it came to be an object of conflicts. As memory studies is a large field of academic research which attracted a plethora of scholars, I selected studies from which my own research derives. They are analyses that triggered my curiosity to research further, or my intention to contribute by adding empirical data to constructed concepts. This section will be divided in three segments, linked with three areas of studies, which combined, allow me to explore key notions to start my inquiries about the contested statues of Colbert and of Franco. First, I will introduce essential works on memories as crystalized and passed on from one generation to another, emphasizing on manifestations of the past in public spaces. Second, I will address influences and challenges in constructing and transmitting memories. Last, I will focus on the development of specific memory cultures within the political constellations my case studies evolved, namely France, Spain and the European Union.

1.3.1 Memories as manifested in public spaces:

My research in the field of memory studies

Since my research is framed by the concept of collective memory as developed by Halbwachs in 1925, additional research on the subject needs to be addressed. The concept of collective memory has attracted several scholars who studied it through different perspectives, emphasizing sometimes on one aspect or research on its limits and eventually adding further elements worth considering. A couple of decades after Halbwachs’s last publication, Pierre Nora wrote an article entitled “La mémoire collective” in which he came back to the original concept defining it as:

Le souvenir ou l’ensemble de souvenirs, conscients ou non, d’une expérience vécue et/ou mythifiée par une collectivité vivante de l’identité dans laquelle le sentiment du passé fait partie intégrante.¹⁵

In this article, Pierre Nora mentioned his project of drawing up an inventory of every places or objects embodying French collective memory. He developed this project for the next decade in three books: *Les lieux de memoire*.¹⁶ Nora intended on conveying a historical significance in the popular collective memory defined by Halbwachs. *Lieux de memoires* facilitate the crystallization of memories in light of what Nora called “the acceleration of time”.¹⁷ Under the pressure of keeping a certain historical continuity, there is an urgent need to save memories from oblivion for future generations. Collective memory can’t be shaped naturally anymore and needs to be artificially embodied by these sites of memories. In other words, Nora conceived the phenomenon of collective memory as a victim of an accelerated time leading to an era where contemporary memory cultures encountered ‘globalization, democratization, and the advent of mass culture’.¹⁸

James Wertsch also addressed the concept of collective memory with his work on collective remembering.¹⁹ His emphasis on the action of remembering, qualified as an active process anchored in socially constructed and common set of cultural tools,

¹⁵ «The memory or the collection of memories, conscious or not, of a lived and/or mystic experience by an alive community of the identity in which the feeling of the past is fully integrated” in Pierre Nora, “La mémoire collective,” in *La nouvelle histoire*, ed. Jacques Le Goff (Paris :Retz-CEPL,1978), 398 (translation mine)

¹⁶ Pierre Nora, *Les Lieux de mémoire*

¹⁷ Nora, *Les lieux de memoires*, 7

¹⁸ Ibid, 1

¹⁹ James V. Wertsch, *Voices of Collective Remembering* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

extended further some elements of Halbwach’s collective memory. Noteworthy for my research, is the construction and the transmission of representations of the past, along with remembrance instruments. The different types of cultural tools, the exploitation of such tools as a coordinated practice among members of a given society and entities controlling them are elements I considered in order to understand the remembrance process of memories of slavery and memories of Franco, which turned into an object of conflicts in France and Spain around statues crystallizing these memories.

Astrid Erll’s historiography of memory studies enabled me to get familiar with Jan and Aleida Assmann’s work on cultural memory and on Ann Rigney’s research on the dynamism of remembrance.²⁰ Jan and Aleida Assmann contributed to the academic discussion about the concept of collective memory by distinguishing two types of collective memory. They argued over the existence of differences between a communicative memory, a collective memory which depends on forms of everyday interaction and communication and a cultural memory, a collective memory which is more institutionalized relaying on media.²¹ Through the concept of cultural memory, Jan and Aleida Assmann explored the construction of “connective structures” that connects past and present, as well as members of the society, through acts of remembrance.²² Erll also brought up Ann Rigney’s work on the concept of *lieu de mémoire*. Rethinking the idea of static sites of memories, as suggested by Nora, Rigney argued about the dynamism of the concept of collective memory, “constantly in work”.²³ Rigney suggested that studies should focus on cultural artefacts and associated memories, and the way they circulate and influence the environment.

Within this wide academic discussion about the processes involved in the construction and transmission of collective memory, my research intends to demonstrate how contestations around the statues of Colbert and Franco came to challenge this construction, these processes and the social structures involved. By contesting a statue and confronting the hegemonic narrative and single perspective of

²⁰ Astrid Erll, *Memory in Culture*, trans. Sara B. Young (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Aleida Assmann “Four Formats of Memory: From Individual to Collective Constructions of the Past,” in *Cultural Memory and Historical Consciousness in the German-Speaking World Since 1500*, ed. Christian Emden and David Midgley (Bern: Peter Lang, 2004), 19–37; Ann Rigney, ‘The Dynamics of Remembrance: Texts between Monumentality and Morphing,’ in *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, ed. Astrid Erll, Ansgar Nünning and Sara B. Young (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2008), 345–53.

²¹ Erll, *Memory in culture*, 28

²² *Ibid*, 109

²³ Rigney, “The dynamics of remembrance,” 346

representations of the past, social interactions are reconfigured. Moreover, Nora stated that memory is safeguarded by sites of memories. The statues I analysed are meant to crystallize the memory of one moment in history in order to prevent it from oblivion. They carried emotions of nostalgia for supporters of the statues because it honours a specific moment, they were proud of. For instance, the statue of Jean Baptiste Colbert was selected to be located in front of the French national assembly because Colbert embodied a specific virtue of political action. On the contrary, supporters of removing the statues, challenged the lack of multiperspectivity of *lieux de memoires* and sought to reshape them to foster an updated national imagination.

Narrowing down my interest of memories crystallized in *lieux de memoires*, I will now address a couple of works specific to statues and their embodiment of specific memories. French Scholar, Catherine Brice pondered if monuments, especially statues, were pacifying or agitating memories.²⁴ Brice focused exclusively on the movement of statues-building in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries analysing them in light of contemporary conflicts of memories. Brice referred to Maurice Agulhon, who expanded the study of statues, hitherto belonging to the sphere of art history, to the field of history.²⁵ He was one of the first to suggest a method to investigate statues in a political and historical context, enabling therefore to reflect upon their influence in terms of memories and identities. Coming back to Brice, she went further and analysed deeply what a statue meant. Statues are meant to embody an ideal and pass this ideal on to future generations, allowing memories to live on. The main challenge is whether this ideal belongs to the past or can be reinterpreted in the present.

Outside of France and Spain, valuable works addressing the issue of contested statues have been carried out. A recent article from Suhi Choi on the statue of MacArthur in South Korea explored the rhetoric of statues.²⁶ Choi analysed how statues created meanings, allowed historical figures or events to live on through generations but eventually were assigned new meanings, notably contested meanings. Likewise, through the case study of the Bronze Soldier in Tallinn, Karsten

²⁴ Catherine Brice, “Monuments: pacificateurs ou agitateurs de mémoire,” in *Les guerres de mémoires* (Paris : Editions La Decouverte, 2008): 199- 208

²⁵ Maurice Agulhon, “Imagerie civique et décor urbain,” *Ethnologues française* V, no.1 (1975): 33-56

²⁶ Suhi Choi, “Standing between intransient history and transient memories: The statue of MacArthur in South Korea,” *Memory Studies* 7, no. 2 (2014): 191 –206

Brüggemann and Andres Kasekamp addressed the issue of contested statues.²⁷ Brüggemann and Kasekamp emphasized on the interaction between official institutions and Estonian citizens in the process of statue making and the process of negotiating its meaning and potential contested character.

With my research, I intend to explore, identify and contribute to these concerns about the meanings of a statue and the contestations they are the object of. Through both of my case studies, I analysed how participants debates defended the initial meanings of the statue, but also contested them in light of contemporary implications.

1.3.2: Shaping and transmitting memories: Influences and challenges

In the process of constructing collective memories, social interaction and social structures play a significant role. I joined the concept of collective memory with the concept of memory politics, exploring how memories are articulated and by whom. The conditions in which memory politics evolved are important to understand. What influences memory politics? Who manipulates memory politics? This section will introduce a couple of works dealing with the challenges and influences in shaping memories.

Verovsek’s article, which I discussed in my theoretical framework, was a good starting point as he reviewed the extensive research carried out by multiple scholars who analysed who are the entrepreneurs of memory and which power do they have in writing the memories of a given social group.²⁸ As for the settings in which entrepreneurs of memory cultivate this power, P. J Brendese’s 2014 work in *The Power of Memory in Democratic Politics* brought to light interesting considerations. Brendese analysed what can be expected from a democracy when it comes to establishing politics of memory.²⁹ He conceived democracy as this “open ended struggle with contestations but with collective efforts to establish conditions of inclusivity and deliberate interaction”.³⁰ He did not argue that democracy should set up a politic of

²⁷ Karsten Brüggemann and Andres Kasekamp, “The politics of history and the War of Monuments in Estonia,” *Nationalities Papers*, 36:3 (June 2008): 425 - 448

²⁸ Verovsek, “Collective memory, politics, and the influence of the past,” 530

²⁹ P.J. Brendese, *The power of memory in democratic politics* (New York: University of Rochester Press, 2014)

³⁰ *Ibid*, 23

remembrance, but rather than democracy should provide the settings in which everyone can speak out and collectively work towards a more inclusive future. Moreover, Brendese interpreted the role of politics of memory as acknowledging “the presence of others, their suffering and their stories”.³¹ His suggestion on what is expected from a democratic society was a significant element I am taking into account in order to analyse one of my case study set in Spain. Indeed, Spain’s disputes over memories in 2018 are embedded with the legacy of Franco’s Regime and the government’s decisions during the transition to democracy.

French historians Henry Rousso and Sébastien Ledoux in 2016 explored in their respective research the contemporary memory, what it means, how it came to be, and its challenges.³² Ledoux conceived politics of memory as safeguarding historical events and the stories of those who lived through them and prevent their oblivion. Rousso added that politics of memory were influenced by groups, which formed themselves in regards of a specific memory of events they share. Rousso and Ledoux both exposed contemporary concerns towards the past and its manifestation in every sphere of the society. The discussions around the statues of Colbert and Franco are more than contesting or defending statues, they congregate diverse contemporary concerns regarding history, memories and present-day society.

Last aspect of shaping memories through social interaction I considered is what Geoffrey M. White called “emotional remembering” in his eponym article.³³ White analysed not only, the meanings given to a cultural artefact, but also their emotional significance. In the process of collective remembering, emotions are also “interactively formed as people variously learn, argue over, celebrate, and resist representations of the past”.³⁴ Again, White emphasized on social interaction and social structures through the rhetoric of emotions, associated with memories and remembering process. As I frame my research through the concept of emotions and analyse how emotions are instrumentalized in discourses around contested statues, White’s research provided me with key notions combining the construction of collective memory and the role of emotionality.

³¹ Ibid, 20

³² Henry Rousso, *Face au passé: essais sur la mémoire contemporaine* (Paris:éditions Belin, 2016); Sébastien Ledoux, *Le devoir de mémoire: une formule et son histoire* (Paris :CNRS éditions, 2016)

³³ Geoffrey M. White, “Emotional Remembering: The Pragmatics of National Memory”

³⁴ Ibid, 507

These different positions investigated memory politics, social interactions and social structures from different angles highlighting elements which I believe to be useful for my own research. I intend to apply and develop some of these elements for both of my case studies, exploring notions of interactivity, connectivity and sociability in discourses regarding the issue of contested memories in public spaces.

1.3.3: Development of specific memory culture

In this last section, I will explore some academic works on the development of memory culture within the political constellations in which my case studies are located.

In France, the subject of conflicts of memory, or *guerres de mémoires*, has attracted in the past decade several popular and academic works, becoming an area of study in itself. Mnemonic groups cultivating memories of the slavery period or of the colonial period started to speak out against the hegemonic narrative of these historical phases as developed by state institutions through school curriculums, cultural exhibitions and monuments in public spaces. Therefore, the issue of conflicting representations of the past required to be addressed by academic research. Several scholars explored the origins, the development and the current situation of conflicts of memory. Among them, *Les guerres de mémoire* edited by Pascal Blanchard and Isabelle Veyrat Masson gathered French scholars sharing their views on this so-called “break-up of memories”.³⁵ Blanchard and Veyrat Masson contextualised these memory conflicts within the official politics of memory set up in recent years. While their analysis focused on France, they also mentioned the global challenges faced by several states, coming back to the era of decolonization, as well as the rapidly emerging dictatorships during the Interwar period, eventually influencing victims of these historical periods or their families to speak out against a society that did not represent them. Benjamin Stora and Johann Michel can also be quoted as having participated in this research of growing conflicts within French society regarding specific memories.³⁶ The latter conceived the notion of *regime mémoriel* which will guide the analysis of my second chapter.

³⁵ Pascal Blanchard and Isabelle Veyrat Masson, *Guerres de mémoire: La France et son histoire* (Paris: Editions La Decouverte, 2008)

³⁶ Benjamin Stora and Thierry Leclere, *La guerre des mémoires face à son passé colonial* (La Tour d’Aigues: Éditions de l’Aube, 2007); Johann Michel, *Gouverner les mémoires: Les politiques mémorielles en France* (Paris : Presses universitaires de France, 2010)

As the statue of Colbert is contested because of Colbert’s role in legalising slavery, I explored conflicts surrounding memories of slavery. Historian Françoise Vergès in a 2005 article came back on what she called “blurring memories” towards slavery.³⁷ Vergès assessed the development in remembering the European institution slavery in France beginning with remembering exclusively the European abolition movement, erasing from the national collective memory what happened before and disregarding slaves and their descendants memories. She explored the decades long absence of their memories, explaining it, and how they finally emerged because of the pressure from overseas or ex-colonies populations who emigrated to continental France. Protesting against statues symbolising figures connected with slavery are part of the process of countering the official representation of slavery.

In the case of Spain, the most important element to understand is the impact of the legacy of Franco in the public sphere and in discourses surrounding any forms of contestations. Indeed, one of the current issues faced by Spain is related to the body of Franco and where it should be buried. This recent concern shows how its legacy in the public space is still a subject of disagreement. Therefore, several authors have directed their research towards investigating the various legacies of Franco in Spain’s current memory politics. Among them, Dacia Viejo-Rose, Paloma Aguilar Fernandez, Jo Labanyi, Carolyn P. Boyd, explored in each of their works this post-Franco context.³⁸ Viejo-Rose analysed how Franco clearly imposed his narrative of the Civil war in every sphere of the society. Paloma Aguilar offered an approach of memory specific to Spain, focusing on the current cultural heritage displayed in the country. She took an interest in analysing the first years following the death of Franco and the state’s decision to progressively modify commemorations, monuments or any other legacies inherited from his rule. Boyd detailed the institutional politics of remembrance of the Spanish state and its evolution, insisting on the democratic character of Spain. Labanyi investigated how memories of the victims came to modify institutional politics of memory, stressing upon the 2007 Historical Memory Law. Each author focused on

³⁷ Françoise Vergès, “Les troubles de la mémoire,” *Cahiers d’études africaines* 3-4, 179 (2005): 1143-1177

³⁸ Dacia Viejo-Rose, *Reconstructing Spain: Cultural Heritage and Memory after Civil War* (Brighton, UK: Sussex Academic Press, 2011); Paloma Aguilar Fernandez and Carsten Humlebaek, “Collective Memory and National Identity in the Spanish Democracy: The Legacies of Francoism and the Civil War,” *History and Memory* 14, no. 1,2 (2002): 121 – 164; Jo Labanyi, “The politics of memory in contemporary Spain,” *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 9:2(2008): 119-125; Carolyn P. Boyd, “The Politics of History and Memory in Democratic Spain,” *AAPSS* 617 (May 2018): 133 – 148

specific elements of Franco's legacy and how Spanish society has articulated his memory. All are relevant knowledge enabling a clear image of what is at stake in current discourses. Indeed, nowadays Franco's legacy seems to be more than ever challenged in every aspect of the Spanish society. My contribution is even more relevant taking into account the month-long debates regarding the body of Franco.

Regarding the issue of symbols or statues honouring Franco in public spaces, Jonah S. Rubin's article "How Francisco Franco governs from beyond the grave: An infrastructural approach to memory politics in contemporary Spain" explored the imposed legacy of Franco on the public sphere, emphasizing on more recent events.³⁹ Based on the following statement: "citizens still experience the coercive effects of the dictatorship's policies in their daily interactions with the built environment, state institutions, and even their fellow citizens", Jonah S. Rubin argued that memory politics in Spain is not only about contesting narratives of the past, but also about deconstructing the physical traces, the institutional and social system shaped by Franco's legacy.⁴⁰ In his analysis, he detailed the issue of monuments and how they affect the livings and he reported suggestions made in order to solve these conflicting sites, for instance social networking. Therefore, his analysis is extremely relevant for my own research on my case study related to Spain as this would give me key notions to analyse emotional engagement in discourses.

As both Spain and France are part of the European community, I pondered the extent to which the development of a European memory culture affected Spanish and French memory cultures. For the past decade, several academic works discussed politics of memory on a European level. On several occasions, it was suggested that the European Union is an actor managing clashing memories through a variety of initiatives. Aleida Assmann explored this idea in her article "Europe: A community of memory?".⁴¹ Earlier, I discussed her concept of cultural memory which she defined as a collective memory that is institutionalized and is supported by societal norms and relies on media. In her article on European memory, she developed this concept of cultural memory from a European perspective with European norms framing the

³⁹ Jonah S. Rubin, "How Francisco Franco governs from beyond the grave: An infrastructural approach to memory politics in contemporary Spain", *American Ethnologist – Journal of the American ethnological society* 45, no. 2 (2018): 214-227

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 214

⁴¹ Aleida Assmann, "Europe: A community of memory?" in *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 40 (Spring 2017): 11-26

collective memory. For my research, I explored the development of a common memory culture across Europe in order to deal with conflicting memories and conflicting emotions in public spaces. I also assessed the conflicting attitudes towards the European memory community as observed in the discussions of both my case studies.

Assmann's 2006 article matches with the spirit of several works of scholars including Willfried Spohn, Sebastian M. Büttner & Anna Delius or the essays compiled in 2015 by Malgorzata Pakier and Bo Stråth in *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*.⁴² They mentioned not only the idea of a European memory but also the impact of the European context to shape common narratives, attitudes, norms and values to address the past between member States. The European memory can be addressed from two perspectives, either exploring the formation of a common European narrative about the past or the construction of common European attitude towards conflicting memories. The former is largely more exploited in light of the formation of a European identity. However, my research is influenced by the latter, exposed by Jan-Werner Muller's in his contribution to Pakier and Stråth's compilation of essays.⁴³ Muller argued over a potential "Europeanisation of moral political attitudes and practices in dealing with profoundly different pasts".⁴⁴ Muller argued that the standardization of attitudes and values has the power to influence the guidelines of national politics of memory and its application. Muller's analysis enables me to analyse the extent to which European structures became another frame of memory politics, which I will discuss in my fourth chapter.

Supported by the academic research on memory culture in particular contexts, my research on contested statues in France and Spain adds up to the concerns exposed by each scholar I discussed in this section. The development of memories of slavery and of Franco's in their respective countries, but also the development of the European memory and European memory practices, enabled me to contextualise the contestations and understand their origin.

⁴² Willfried Spohn, "National Identities and Collective Memory in an Enlarged Europe," in *Collective Memory and European Identity: The Effects of Integration and Enlargement*, ed. Klaus Eder (Aldershot: Taylor and Francis, 2005); Sebastian M. Büttner & Anna Delius, "World Culture in European Memory Politics? New European Memory Agents Between Epistemic Framing and Political Agenda Setting," *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 23:3, (2015); Malgorzata Pakier and Bo Stråth, *A European Memory? Contested histories and Politics of Remembrance* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010)

⁴³ Jan-Werner Muller, "On European Memory: Some conceptual and normative remarks," in *A European Memory? Contested histories and Politics of Remembrance*, ed. Malgorzata Pakier and Bo Stråth (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 25-37

⁴⁴ Ibid,31

1.4 Sources and Methods

In France, the statue of Colbert in Paris attracted attention in 2017 and became a topic largely discussed in the media. Likewise, the statue of Francisco Franco in Melilla, while it has been a contested object for the past fifteen years, gained further media attention in 2016 and 2017 when the city was sued for not removing Francoist symbols off their streets. In both of my cases, my sources are of similar nature. I made use of visual sources, with television debates or radio debates, and textual sources, mainly written press. The latter was important as it offered information on the debates, their protagonists and their arguments as well as their opinions on the overall issue of public manifestations of the past. Visual and textual sources were easily accessible online. Their date of publication, dating from the past ten years, were not an obstacle to my research. Additionally, several groups representing specific interests and memories were involved in these debates; their websites also contained significant information. The context of the contestations, the demands and the evolving situation have been reported in blog posts. Furthermore, both France and Spain have laws regulating politics of memories on a national level by political and cultural institutions. These resources were accessible from their respective online portal provided by the ministry of justice or the parliament.

Concerning the case of Jean Baptiste Colbert and his statue, discussions were initiated on the summer of 2017 and continued in the following six months. During that period, several medias got involved and invited numerous scholars and relevant public figures to contextualise and to state their position in this debate. The conversation was initiated by the president of the CRAN (Conseil représentatif des associations noires) through a column in the daily newspaper, *Liberation*. Reactions arose subsequently and were discussed in popular TV and radio programs. To name only a few (see exhaustive list in the list of sources), *Europe 1*, *Franceinter*, *Public Senat* but also the newspapers *Le Monde* and *Marianne* and specific TV programmes such as *Ca se dispute* participated in this debate.

In the case of the last statue honouring Francisco Franco located in Melilla, a number of national and local newspapers such as *El Pais*, *El Diaro*, *Melilla Hoy* and *Cadena Ser* relayed the different arguments. Particular to this case, local but also national politicians shared their attitudes towards the statue. While it attracted more attention in 2016, I also had access to ten years of news articles dealing with this

issue. Furthermore, social groups protecting the memories of the victims of Franco's rule have been prominent participants of the debates; their websites are resourceful.

As I focus on the different arguments that are conveyed and their contexts, my research required for me to gather a large number of sources in order to be representative. One of my fear was is the pre-eminence of one discourse and therefore the lack of multiperspectivity. To avoid that, I also collected data from social media as they allowed citizens to share their opinions. These data reflected the specific culture of memories in both states and its influence on citizens' opinions in regard to the ongoing debates.

Additional sources included observations, recorded conversations or interviews I collected. Particularly, I was in contact with two protagonists involved in my case studies: Louis Georges Tin (president of the CRAN) and Eduardo Ranz (Lawyer who sued Melilla for not removing Francoist symbols).

As I mentioned, many protagonists were involved in the contestation or defence of statues located in symbolic public places. My first task was to select relevant data from the diversity of sources at hand. Using reports from newspapers or TV and radio programmes enabled me to be confronted with the formal debate and its participants. While data from social media reflected unofficial contestation, they attested of the scale of the debate. Arguments were expressed both in writing and orally. Therefore, in order to examine discourses regarding statues, qualitative methods were the most useful research methods. Indeed, qualitative methods explained and confronted my sources. Observing opinions, arguments and the way they were presented allowed me to highlight motivations and reasons. The various nature of discourses required careful attention. Indeed, political discourses differ from media and popular discourses. It was also a strength as I could observe interactions between these discourses. Drawing directly upon discourse analysis, this method enabled to thoroughly explore how protagonists built their arguments and how they intended on imposing their views. The role of context in discourse analysis was also considered as the manner in which positions were told may differ. Indeed, the meanings could differ when the participant was being asked a specific question or expressed his mind without being interrupted.

Qualitative methods continued being relevant as I assessed the role of emotions in my third chapter. The kind of vocabularies used and how they reflected certain emotions was explored using discourse analysis. Explicit use of emotions is central to my research. To assess emotional engagement, I needed the support of secondary

literature on emotions and their ability to alter discourses and arguments. The 2015 *Affective Methodologies Developing Cultural Research Strategies for the Study of Affect* anthology suggested new methodologies to use in order to understand, approach and trace affect.⁴⁵ Offering techniques for “generating ‘embodied data’ for qualitative affect research, and identifying “affective traces of processes in empirical material”, affective methodologies provided me with the appropriate tools to add and analysed further relevant empirical sources.⁴⁶ In this anthology, a number of strategical tools were listed which enabled me to approach my sources investigating how emotions are being transmitted through the use of different types of discourses.

1.3 Structure of the thesis

Within the debate of memories in public spaces, I intend to focus on interactions around specific statues. My input is to compare two different locations with their own cultures of memories facing one similar issue: contestation of one symbolic statue.

For each of my chapters, I focus on one argument to explore it and analyse what is its function in the discussions of both of my case studies. The first chapter contextualizes the recent contestations around the statue of Colbert, Paris and the statue of Franco, Melilla. Historical, political and social context will be explored through evolving memory politics during the course of the past century in each state. In light of the concepts of collective memory and memory politics, I will attempt to demonstrate how contestations came to be, why are they happening now and what do they exactly challenge?

The second chapter studies affective engagement in memory politics. Within the plethora of works on politics of memories and conflicting memories, affective processes were, for a long time, largely disregarded in favour of cognitive knowledge. As a recent shift in research can be observed towards more attention for emotions and their ability to shape cognitive aspects of politics of memories, I, thereby, planned on conducting additional research to this trend. I intended to contribute to this drift by emphasizing affective strategies and their consequences on established politics of

⁴⁵ Britta Timm Knudsen and Carsten Stage, *Affective Methodologies: Developing Cultural Research Strategies for the Study of Affect* (Basingtoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015)

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 3

memories. In each case different groups demonstrated conflicting opinions and attitudes. Each used a different vocabulary in order to convey their positions. My observation focused in these vocabularies and more specifically the explicit references to emotions. In both cases, similar strategies of engagement, namely directly referring to emotions, were used by debates participants. Additionally, I emphasized on specific vocabularies and their impact to trigger emotions. How were emotions explicitly expressed? When can we say that it was explicit? These were relevant questions to guide my evaluation of emotional engagement in discourses.

The last chapter intends to analyse my research taking into account the European structure. My interest for the European community is twofold. First, contestations around statues is a phenomenon observed across Europe with each case influencing neighbouring ones. As part of the European Community, I was interested in seeing how the French case and the Spanish case were influenced by the development of the European memory. Second, the European community, as a supranational structure, has the power to empower memory policies. This ability deserves to be analysed further in light of contestations around statues. Furthermore, within the European memory building context, there is a clear emphasis on memories of the Holocaust and of communist regimes. Memories regarding colonialism and fascist regimes in general, therefore, adding southern regimes, have been, hitherto, marginalized. New initiatives are contributing to bend this tendency and I intended to take part to this contribution.

Chapter 2: Why does it matter now?

Understanding conflicts over memories in public spaces in Spain and in France.

This chapter offers a first analysis of the recent debates in France and in Spain regarding the presence of emblematic statues located in the public landscape. The objective of this research is to analyse the role of main arguments produced in the discussions and to understand the positions of protagonists involved in the debates. In this chapter, I will explore one of the main arguments, namely contesting or defending the initial meaning of the statues and, simultaneously, the construction of the nation's collective memory. I will argue that this argument is embedded in the national political and social context. Drawing upon Halbwach's concept of collective memory, I will analyse the social group of the nation and the construction and transmission of shared representations of the past within the nation. I will explore how conflicting memories were articulated in the interactions around the contested statues of Colbert and Franco. This chapter intends to reflect on how the discussions around the statues originated, why they matter now and what they challenge. Contextualizing the debates is essential as the question of memories in public spaces is the most recent addition to a larger discussion on national representations of the past which emerged in the late twentieth century in both Spain and France. Therefore, the first section of this chapter will provide some historical background focusing on how representations of the past within the nations of both my case studies have been constructed, shared and passed on by national institutions. The second section will introduce the debates, emphasizing on the participants and their positions. The last part will explain why contestations arose now and what they challenged. Each of these parts will lead to answers to the sub question of this chapter: *In which national political and social context did contestations around the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco unfold and what do these conflicts of memories challenge?*

2.1 Historical background:

State sponsored memories in France and in Spain

“PSOE asks for removal of the statue of Franco” or “Should we removed statues of all the historical figures which disturb?” are examples of headlines in national newspapers encountered in Spain and in France in 2017.⁴⁷ In both cases, throughout 2017, medias reported on current debates about two historical figures, or more generally two periods of time in history. Media, participants of the debates, and social media users expressed their positions underlining that the current issue of public manifestations of the past is part of the issue of conflicting memories among society. Before analysing the recent contestations, I need to understand how they came to be. Not only will it will allow me to contextualise better the debate, but it will also demonstrate that memory politics, enforced by states, are a prevalent factor of the discussions. For instance, the local newspaper of *El Faro de Melilla* emphasized on the 2007 Historical Memory Law, one of the most important measure taken by the Spanish state in establishing memory politics regarding Franco’s regime, and its consequences.⁴⁸ Likewise, French participants in the debate often mentioned the unity of the nation and that divisions over the statue of Colbert shattered this unity. In both cases, I intend to demonstrate the way past measures, and more generally, dominant memory policies influence current discussions. I will explore the evolution of national memory cultures which led to the current contestations of memories in public spaces. This process needs to be explained for each case with its own development. While they deal with different types of memories and different measures, similarities can be found.

French professor Johann Michel’s research on the identification of different types of memory politics guided my analysis of the context from which the contestations of the statue of Colbert in Paris derived.⁴⁹ Michel suggested to talk about “grammars of memory” articulated in what he calls a “*regime mémoriel*” or memory regime.⁵⁰ A *regime mémoriel* is a template of dominant representations of the past

⁴⁷ Francisco Vizcaino “PSOE pide quitar la estatua de Franco para que Melilla no sea el ultimo vestigio del facismo en Europa,” *El diario.es*, November 11, 2017, https://www.eldiario.es/politica/PSOE-Franco-Melilla-vestigio-Europa_0_710430212.html

⁴⁸ Redacción El Faro, “Cumplir la ley de Memoria Histórica en Melilla depende de que la gente lo quiera,” *El faro de Melilla*, February 24, 2017, <https://elfarodemelilla.es/cumplir-la-ley-memoria-historica-melilla-depende-la-gente-lo-quiera/>

⁴⁹ Johann Michel, *Gouverner les mémoires: Les politiques mémorielles en France* (Paris : PUF, 2010)

⁵⁰ Johann Michel, “L’évolution des politiques mémorielles: l’état et les nouveaux acteurs,” *Migrations Société* 6, no. 138 (2011): 63

and of prevalent values or norms that are shaping memory policies. This template is formulated by a specific grammar at a specific time⁵¹ In other words, Michel defined *regimes mémoriels* as memorial frameworks constructed by the state. Michel also allowed for possible changes with potential new grammars emerging as new figures, or “entrepreneurs of memories”, influenced the official memory program.⁵² New political, social or cultural groups, unsatisfied with the representations of the past in a given society, claimed for updated representations and eventually came to affect the *regime mémoriel*.

The historical background of current debates presented below follows Michel and others' exploration of France's evolving memory culture. In the case of France, Michel distinguished two distinct *regime mémoriel* and studied their development since the French Third Republic (1870-1940). The first regime Michel explored is the the *regime mémoriel* of national unity which appeared during the Third Republic and matured throughout time.⁵³ After the republican regime was stabilised in France, policies of memory, enforced by successive governments, emphasised on national memories in order to supplement local memories and unify the French nation around common memories. The government organised commemorative events of the French Republic, selected the 14th of July to be the national day, officialised France's devise to be “*Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité*” and entered an era of intensive building of statues dedicated to specific individuals who personified republican values. In doing so, the state aimed to unify a diverse population under similar memories and similar values. These republican values are often mentioned in discourses surrounding the statue of Jean Baptiste Colbert, mainly because the statue is located in front of the French National Assembly in Paris.

Jean Baptiste Colbert (1619-1683) was a minister under Louis XIV, King of the Kingdom of France (1643-1715). Colbert is renowned for his economic policies (known as *Colbertism*) which transformed the kingdom in a significant economic power. He is also one of the redactors of the Black Code, which formalised slavery in French colonies and he established the French East India Company which participated in the slave trade. Louis Georges Tin, president of the CRAN (Representative Council of France's Black Associations), is the most prominent figure in the debate and will be

⁵¹ Ibid, 63

⁵² Ibid, 62

⁵³ Ibid, 64

mentioned on several occasions throughout my thesis. He initiated the demand to remove Colbert’s name and his statue from French streets and defended his position in multiple televised debates arguing that Colbert’s figure misrepresented republican values.⁵⁴ Interestingly, the figure of Colbert was selected by Napoleon’s First Empire to be represented in front of the National Assembly alongside three other figures from the Monarchy’s period. Each figure, honoured as leading statemen of French history, were meant to dignify one of the “virtues of political action”⁵⁵. Colbert represented the organiser of economy and was joined by Maximilien de Sully (Reformer), Michel de l’Hospital (mediator) and Henri Francois d’Aguesseau (unified French law).⁵⁶ Later on, the Third Republic inherited these figures and allowed for Colbert and his colleagues to remain the welcoming statues of the political institution, believing that Colbert was a figure the Republic could associate political values with. The Third Republic carried on these tributes to “France’s great men” throughout the late nineteenth century as one of the grammar of memories in the state’s public program.

According to Michel, but also to historian Sophie Hasquenoph, the first shift in France’s *regime mémoriel* occurred in the aftermath of the first war.⁵⁷ Indeed, the mourning nation united to pay their respect to the fallen soldiers. This time, state institutions were not the only one deciding on which grammars of memory to adopt in order to represented memories of the war. Entrepreneurs of memories rapidly emerged from the civil society, including associations of former soldiers, demanding commemorations or claiming the right for Armistice Day to be a public holiday. While the central government was initially reticent to these demands, it eventually conceded, confirming the growing influence of civic movements.

On the opposite, the three decades following World War II proved the importance of political institutions, from national to local governments, in establishing a common framework of memories of the war, namely “the Resistance myth”. Memories of the Resistance were the only memories accounted for, setting aside

⁵⁴ Louis Gorges Tin, “Bourdin Direct,” *RMC*, September 20, 2017; François D’Oroy Vall and Louis Georges Tin, “On va plus loin, “ *Public Senat*, September 20, 2017

⁵⁵ “Histoire du Palais Bourbon et de l’hôtel de Lassay”, *Assemblée nationale*, accessed February 16, 2019, <http://www2.assemblee-nationale.fr/decouvrir-l-assemblee/patrimoine/palais-bourbon-et-hotel-de-lassay>

⁵⁶ Ibid

⁵⁷ Michel, “L’évolution des politiques mémorielles,“; Sophie Hasquenoph and Serge Barcelinni, *Le devoir de mémoire. Histoire des politiques mémorielles* (Paris: Soteca, 2017) <http://le-souvenir-francais.fr/la-lettre/le-devoir-de-memoire-histoire-des-politiques-memorielles/>

memories of collaboration and of Nazi’s camp victims. Up until then, Michel argued that France’s memory policies were framed exclusively by the *regime mémoriel* of national unity. Michel explored the state’s emphasis on glorifying France’s great men, on significant events of national history and on honouring those who died for the motherland. The nation was conceived as one united group encouraging a transmission of memory based on events or figures relevant to the unity of the nation.

By the 1980s, memories of the Shoah affected France’s memory culture and, alongside the national unity *regime*, a second regime, which Michel named “*regime victimo-mémoriel*”, developed.⁵⁸ The latter focused progressively on a plural vision of the nation but also to events less glorious of the nation’s history. The biggest shift was that the emphasis was not on those who died for the nation but on those who died because of it. This shift was made possible by the Holocaust survivors who spoke out and made their stories publicly known. Memories of the Holocaust triggered other mnemonic groups with neglected memories to request for an acknowledgement of their own stories. Among them, active groups in overseas department maintaining memories of slavery called for a more inclusive account of remembering the European slavery institution. Until then, as French Historian Françoise Vergès argued, the national history focused exclusively on remembering the European abolitionist movement when referring to slavery⁵⁹, purposefully avoiding discussing the trade, the slave revolts and the slaves’ heroes. Vergès called this attitude “the selective memory” of one event.⁶⁰ The attitude could also be qualified as “structural amnesia” drawing upon Paul Connerton’s research on “Seven types of forgetting”.⁶¹ Connerton defined structural amnesia as “remembering what is only socially important”.⁶²

However, the 1980s growing migration of people from both overseas department and former colonies to continental France, influenced politicians to progressively include other accounts of a same event to the official politics of memory. Illustrating this change, a series of laws followed. The 1990 Gayssot Law aimed at repressing racist and xenophobic attitudes.⁶³ The 2001 Taubira Law recognised slave

⁵⁸ Michel, “L’évolution des politiques mémorielles,” 66

⁵⁹ Françoise Vergès, “Les troubles de la mémoire,” *Cahiers d’études africaines* 179, no.3.4(2005): 1143-1177

⁶⁰ *Ibid*, 1160

⁶¹ Paul Connerton, “Seven types of forgetting,” *Memory studies* 1, n.1 (2008): 59-71

⁶² *Ibid*, 64

⁶³ “Loi n° 90-615 du 13 juillet 1990,” *Legifrance*, last modified February 24, 2004, <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=LEGITEXT000006076185&dateTexte=vig>

trade and slavery to be crimes against humanity. This law fostered commemorations of slavery in the public space with an annual celebration for the abolition of slavery on the tenth of May. Drawing upon Michel’s analysis once more, these legal actions can be considered as proving the importance of the legislative institution in manipulating the national memorial narrative.⁶⁴ Coming back to the *regime of victimo-mémoriel*, it illustrates the emergence of new grammars of memories with a focus on the victims rather than the heroes and the importance of recognizing pain rather than what the nation should be proud of. Several cultural and political initiatives acknowledged this change of grammars of memories and exposed other narratives of the slavery period than the abolitionist one. However, the *regime* of national unity did not disappear and is perpetuated within the official framework but also by civic movements. For instance, while Louis George Tin challenged France’s memory politics through the figure of Colbert, he also referred to the concept of national unity and stated “at a time where national unity is essential, we need consensual memories” proving, thereby, how both *regime mémoriels* can exist at the same time.⁶⁵

I drew upon Michel’s concept of *regime mémoriel* as it allowed me to explore the evolution in France’s memory culture and the historical background in which each policy unfolded. I believe the notion of *regime mémoriel* explains best the evolution throughout time of the construction and the transmission of the collective memory within the nation.

Although Michel developed the notion of *regime mémoriel* regarding France, I have decided to follow his concept to guide me through the development of Spain’s memory culture. The memories involved with the statue of Francisco Franco in Melilla derive from the Spanish Civil War, the victory and successive rule of Franco. The Spanish Civil War was initiated by the Nationalists faction in 1936 and lasted until their victory in 1939. Victorious, Franco took the title of *Caudillo* and established a totalitarian regime which evolved in an authoritarian regime by the 1950s. Prior to his death in 1975, he decided to restore the monarchy, which evolved into a democratic parliamentary monarchy following the transition period to democracy in the late 1970s.

Spain’s case is interesting as it raises the following question: After an authoritarian rule, how can a democratic regime deal with its memories? Historian

⁶⁴ Michel, “L’évolution des politiques mémorielles,” 67

⁶⁵ Louis Georges Tin, “Vos héros sont parfois nos bourreaux,” *Libération*, Aout 28, 2017, https://www.liberation.fr/debats/2017/08/28/vos-heros-sont-parfois-nos-bourreaux_1592510

Paloma Aguilar explored this question in the years following Franco’s death in 1975 but also later on when Franco’s Regime still had an obvious influence in official policies of memories.⁶⁶ Under Franco, memories of the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) were clearly instrumentalized by Franco and his supporters. Repressed Republicans’ accounts of the war were, not only forgotten, but also forbidden by the national state. When Franco died and Spain transitioned to democracy, politicians had trouble finding the appropriate policy to remember the civil war. Aguilar analysed the first initiatives taken to progressively modify commemorations established under Franco and to pay respect to Republicans who died during the war. As Aguilar and Professor Carolyn P. Boyd explained, this slow process is due to a consensus by every political party on a representation of the civil war as a “fratricidal tragedy” in which both sides of the war shared equal responsibility.⁶⁷ During the transition period, the priority was to stabilise democracy and prevent the right wing, as well as the army, to rise against the democratic regime. The attempted military Coup of 1981 proved democracy was still fragile and, therefore, politicians needed to be cautious when deciding to continue or shatter the national narrative of the Civil War. As a result, the transitional state decided to not condemn Franco’s supporters for their actions and to not remove monuments related to his leadership, but they progressively, and quietly, modified commemorative holidays. Once more, legal actions were taken to regulate the national narrative. The 1977 Amnesty Law guaranteed that those who committed crimes since the Civil War would not be prosecuted. This subsequently fostered a new dynamic in official politics of memories, namely the notion of “everything is forgotten”.⁶⁸ Within these grammars of memories, the *regime mémoriel* of national unity argued by Michel can be highlighted.⁶⁹ Indeed, the predominant discourse of states’ institutions focused on transmitting a memory of “never again” with a single shared memory of the Civil War.

By the 1990s, however, the second *regime mémoriel* labelled by Michel as “*victimo-mémoriels*” appeared among political and cultural institutions. Boyd explored how the opening of war archives enabled academics to reveal how repressive Franco’s

⁶⁶ Paloma Aguilar Fernandez and Carsten Humlebaek, “Collective Memory and National Identity in the Spanish Democracy: The Legacies of Francoism and the Civil War,” *History and Memory* 14, no. 1.2 (2002): 121 – 164

⁶⁷ Ibid; Carolyn P. Boyd, “The Politics of History and Memory in Democratic Spain,” *AAPSS* 617 (May 2018): 135

⁶⁸ “Ley 46/1977 de 15 de octubre de Amnistia,” *Jefatura del Estado «BOE»* núm. 248, Octubre, 17, 1977 Referencia: BOE-A-1977-24937

⁶⁹ Michel, L’*évolution des politiques mémorielles*”

government had been, thereby shattering the “myth of equal responsibility”.⁷⁰ In the 2000s, the public discourse was oriented towards condemning the regime and enabling victims to speak out. Boyd investigated groups gathering victims of Franco, notably *la Asociación para la Recuperación de la Memoria Histórica*, which claimed for republicans and victims' memories to be remembered. They also requested reparation for their ancestors who died because of Franco's repression. The expression “Recuperation of the Historical Memory” quite significantly illustrates this shift in grammars of memories. Influenced by these civic movements, the central government had to re-evaluate their own grammars of memories.⁷¹ The conservative party did so in 2002 when it condemned Franco's Regime. In 2007, the socialist government took the most significant initiative to acknowledge victims' memories and need for reparation when they adopted the Historical Memory Law. In addition to condemning the Regime, forbidding demonstration commemorating Franco and demanding for the removal of every Francoist symbols, the law recognised the victims of the dictatorship and allowed for assistance in exhuming bodies from mass graves. When the debate around the statue of Franco was reactivated, the media and protagonists involved relied on the law of historical memory, notably the article 15 regarding the removal of Francoist symbols from the streets.⁷²

Despite involving different types of memories, both France and Spain witnessed changes in their memory politics, going from a dominant and homogenous representation of past events to progressively developing more inclusive policies of memory due to civic movements' persuasion and of their own influence in the public space. In both cases, entrepreneurs of memories and state officials took similar measures, from taking legal actions to improving education programs. Civic movements articulated their demands and were influenced by a shift towards honouring victims rather than war heroes. Drawing upon Michel's definition of politics of memory as “all the interventions from public actors who impose, build and pass on common memories to a given collective”, it can be noted that Spain and France are singular cases but, that they share similarities worth outlining. The context presented in this first section provides me with adequate knowledge to understand the recent

⁷⁰ Boyd, “The Politics of History and Memory in Democratic Spain,” 133

⁷¹ Boyd, “The Politics of History and Memory in Democratic Spain,” 143

⁷² Jose Pablo Garcia, “Melilla burla reiteradamente la ley de Memoria Histórica,” *Publico*, October 1st, 2009; Alfonso Ojea, “Melilla, condenada por no aplicar la ley de la Memoria Histórica,” *Cadena Ser*, October 21, 2016

contestations around the statues of Colbert and Franco. It appears that the debates about public manifestations of the past is one step further to shift the dominant and imposed memory politics.

2.2 The statue of Colbert in Paris and the statue of Franco in Melilla: Introducing the debates

The last section presented the general context in each of my case studies’ states from which the recent debates I analyse for my research derived. This section will provide a first introduction to my sources, the debates, the participants and their positions on the matter of statues and the memories they recall. Each of my cases will be presented separately before I analyse a couple of comparable elements.

In August 2017, Louis George Tin, president of the Representative Council of France's Black Associations, wrote a column in the daily newspaper *Liberation* in which he demanded for the statue of Colbert to be removed from the streets.⁷³ He connected his demand to the events occurring on the other side of the Atlantic. In the United States, Confederates statues honouring figures involved in the slavery institution were being removed until violent protests arose in Charlottesville, Virginia, in August 2017 as the Unite the Right rally gathered far-right activists to protest the decision of the City Council of removing the statue of Robert E. Lee (Commander of the Confederates States army). The protest and its violence were reported on globally, including by French media. Reports condemned the use of violence and qualified the statues as “troublesome historical figures”.⁷⁴ In his column, Louis Georges Tin pointed that French media were quick to condemn Confederate statues but were not willing to look at France’s equivalent statues. This column started a debate that took place in the second half of 2017 in France. Following his initial column, Tin intervened in the media to

⁷³ Louis Georges Tin, “Vos héros sont parfois nos bourreaux”

⁷⁴ Chloé Rochereuil, “Les statues des soldats confédérés tombent après les violences de Charlottesville,” *France 24*, August, 15, 2017, <https://www.france24.com/fr/20170815-statues-soldats-confederes-tombent-apres-violences-charlottesville> ; Rédaction JDD, “Charlottesville : pourquoi la statue du général Lee fait polémique,” *Le journal de Dimanche*, August 16, 2017, <https://www.lejdd.fr/International/charlottesville-pourquoi-la-statue-du-general-lee-fait-polemique-3412646> ; Th.B, “ Etats-Unis: pourquoi Charlottesville cristallise la haine de la droite extrême,” *Le parisien*, August 13, 2017, <http://www.leparisien.fr/faits-divers/etats-unis-pourquoi-charlottesville-cristallise-la-haine-de-la-droite-extreme-13-08-2017-7190445.php>

further expose his argument. In September 2017, he signed, along with several personalities, a column in *Le Monde*, the most read daily newspaper in France, demanding for Colbert's name to be removed from educational institutions in France.⁷⁵ The topic quickly attracted attention. For instance, it was discussed in the weekly national magazine *Marianne* and the website *HuffingtonPost*, both popular in raising society-based issues. Yet, the topic was mostly addressed on radio or televised programs in which experts and public figures were invited to join the conversation. Popular daily radio programs relayed the different arguments made in the debate. The discussions I will analyse are extracted from debates hosted by the *Radio Notre Dame*, a private and catholic radio station in Paris; RFI, a public radio station broadcasting around the world and reaching up to 40 million people every week; RMC and Europe 1, among the most listened to radio stations. RMC's political and societal programs *Bourdin Direct* and *Les Grandes Gueules* will particularly be considered. Likewise, televised programs discussing society-based issues and hosting debates on the matter will be analysed. For instance, the political program "On va plus loin" hosted on *Public Senat*, a channel financed by the senate; C Politique, weekly program on the public channel *France 5*; news program "La 1ere" for *France TV* will be also taken into consideration.

Social media were another platform for the debate to take place on. For instance, the Facebook collective #DeboulonnonsBugeaud became a popular space for citizens to denounce contested symbols in France's public landscape. The conversation on statues broadened to include the issue of streets named after figures involved in the slave trade and slavery, notably in harbour cities of Nantes and Bordeaux. Using social media as resources will allow for a better understanding of the scale of the discussion in the media but also in the civic society. However, no strong civic movement emerged from these discussions. Although no action was taken regarding the statue of Colbert as neither the municipality of Paris, in charge of monuments in public spaces, nor the government addressed the issue, the discussions cast light on several society-based issues to light, as I will demonstrate later on.

The statue of Francisco Franco in Melilla, a Spanish enclave in Northern Africa, had already been a controversial effigy for a decade when it made the headlines in

⁷⁵ Louis Georges Tin and Louis Sala Molins, "Mémoire de l'esclavage: Débaptisons les collèges et les lycées Colbert !" *Le Monde*, September 19, 2017

2016 and in 2017. When Franco died in 1975, Spanish streets were filled with statues, monuments or other symbols celebrating his victory during the Civil War and his successive rule. In Melilla, the statue was unveiled in 1978, three years after Franco's death. Initially, the statue was meant to celebrate Franco's rule, but the city council eventually decided to dedicate the statue to Franco's alleged leadership during the 1921 Riff war when Melilla was occupied by Berbers.⁷⁶ Across Spain, the change of regime did not result in an immediate removal of monuments celebrating the authoritarian regime. Although some mayors chose to remove symbols associated with Franco soon after democracy was restored, removal was not made mandatory by the state until 2007 with the enactment of the Historical Memory Law. Civic associations gathering victims of Franco or political parties in Melilla had been demanding the municipality, responsible for the decision of removing or not the statue, to relocate the statue prior to the enactment of the law.⁷⁷ For instance, in 2003 the *Colectivo para la Supresión de Símbolos Franquistas* painted Melilla's monuments celebrating Franco purple to protest them.⁷⁸ It should be noted that Melilla has been governed by the conservative party since 1995. The 2007 law, that compelled towns, first, to write down a catalogue listing all the vestiges of Franco's repressive regime, and, second, to progressively remove them for the public space, started a removal process of symbols across Spain. However, several towns, including Melilla, avoided to do so. When the conservative party was elected to the national government in 2011, the budget allocated to the enforcement of the Historical Law was drastically cut, allowing Melilla to avoid tackling the issue of Franco's vestiges.

The status quo changed in 2016 as lawyer Eduardo Ranz filed a lawsuit against several Spanish towns pointing at insufficiencies regarding the enforcement of the Historical Memory Law.⁷⁹ The case was followed by local newspapers such as *Melilla Hoy* or *El Faro de Melilla*, and national ones, *Cadena Ser*, *el Diaro*, *el Pais*, *el public*, *La Vanguardia*, *El confidencial*. Following that lawsuit, Melilla finally abided by the law

⁷⁶ Equo Melilla, <http://melilla.partidoequo.es/?p=952> , accessed 02.04.2019

⁷⁷ Jose Pablo Garcia, "Melilla burla reiteradamente la ley de Memoria Historica, "; Europa Press – Melilla, "Melilla mantendrá una estatua de Franco," *La Vanguardia*, October 10, 2017, <https://www.lavanguardia.com/vida/20071014/53401994850/melilla-mantendra-una-estatua-de-franco.html>

⁷⁸ Foro por la memoria, https://www.foroporlamemoria.info/noticias/2005/melilla_09112005.htm, accessed 02.04.2019

⁷⁹ E.F Gordon, "Ranz amplía a 167 municipios de Castilla y León su demanda contra la simbología franquista," *La Nueva Cronica*, October 16, 2016, <https://www.lanuevacronica.com/ranz-amplia-a-167-municipios-de-castilla-y-leon-su-demanda-contra-la-simbologia-franquista>

and wrote the aforementioned catalogue, but kept on defending the statue of Franco.⁸⁰ Headlines highlighted the legal actions taken against Melilla and the legal arguments of the municipality to defend Franco’s effigy.⁸¹ Civic associations, as *El foro por la memoria or la asociacion pro derecho humano de Melilla*, actively demanded the removal of the statue. They turned to newspapers and online forums to make their demands public. Political opposition within the municipality’s council did the same, either writing articles on their official websites or discussing the matter in press conference. Political parties EQUO Melilla (Green party), Podemos (left wing party) and PSOE (socialist party) spoke out. The municipality’s argument against those demands was that the statue commemorates Franco’s actions during a war which resulted in the liberation of the town and not the ruler he later was. Spaniards voiced their position, using social media as their platform. These elements, which will be further discussed later, show how the discussion reached several spheres of the society and has been spoken about on several occasions. As of now, Melilla is the last Spanish town with a statue bearing the features of Franco. Although the municipality has been condemned for not respecting the law, it seems the law is not coercive enough to compel Melilla to remove the statue of Franco.

Now that I have introduced both debates, I will discuss some of the similarities and differences I have noticed regarding the contested symbols, the participants involved in the debates and their positions.

First of all, in each state, the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco drew more attention than others because of the symbolic figure they commemorate and of the symbolic location where they can be found. The statue of Colbert stands at the bottom of the steps leading to the French Parliament building in Paris. Louis George Tin paid particular attention to this location, inviting to express shock when he said: “Which State raises more issue? The one with a conflict around the statue of a confederate general or the one where in front of the National Assembly stands the statue of Colbert [...] without arousing any reaction?”.⁸² Journalist Rokhaya Diallo also insisted on this location reminding the words of Deputy Christiane Taubira who, as she

⁸⁰ Javier Guzman and Luis Manuel Rivas, “Melilla defiende por vía judicial la última estatua de Franco,” *El País*, November 20, 2017 ; Redacción El Faro, “Cumplir la ley de Memoria Histórica en Melilla depende de que la gente lo quiera”

⁸¹ Javier Guzman and Luis Manuel Rivas, “Melilla defiende por vía judicial la última estatua de Franco,” Alfonso Ojea, “Melilla, condenada por no aplicar la ley de la Memoria Histórica”

⁸² Tin, “Vos héros sont parfois nos bourreaux”

entered the Parliament, felt offended by the statue.⁸³ Furthermore, when asked why Colbert is being targeted rather than any other historical figure, Tin and his supporters responded that Colbert was a minister of Economy of Louis XIV and drafted the infamous Black Code. The Black Code expressly codified the status of a slave as an item of personal property. Therefore, Tin argued, on the radio channel RMC, that Colbert is a symbol of French's slavery history who wrote in law what would be considered in the twenty first century a crime against humanity.⁸⁴

In Melilla, the statue of Franco is located in the harbour. A reporter for *El País*, investigating the contested case in Melilla, observed that the statue was greeting newcomers in the town.⁸⁵ As most visitors arrive by boat, he considered the location to be a peculiar symbol. The city defended the location asserting that when Franco and the Legion came to relieve Melilla from the war in 1921, they entered through the harbour. Furthermore, dressed in the military attire, the statue is the identical image of Franco. For his victims, this sculpture is a brutal portrait of a painful past.

Regarding the protagonists involved in each discussion, differences between Spain and France are quite significant. While French politicians did not take a stand on the debate nor addressed the demands of the CRAN and his supporters, Spanish politicians are central participants in the debate in Melilla. As mentioned previously, the conservative party, with Juan Jose Imbroda leading the municipality since 2000, refused on several occasions to remove the statue of Franco and defended it with the same argument. The local opposition, notably the socialist party, condemned this attitude and continuously asked for the city council to erase what Francisco Vizcaino, Secretary of the socialist party, called "the last traces of fascism in Europe".⁸⁶ Vizcaino declared that he did not understand the decision of the local government to endorse a dictator who repressed the Spanish people for forty years. Opposition was shared by political parties EQUO Melilla and PODEMOS Melilla and the Spanish central government, who spoke through its local representative in Melilla. Associations and

⁸³ Rokhaya Diallo, "Débat de la semaine: Faut-il déboulonner les statues," *C Politique*, November, 26, 2017

⁸⁴ Louis Georges Tin, "Bourdin Direct," *RMC*, September 20, 2017

⁸⁵ Javier Guzman and Luis Manuel Rivas, "Melilla defiende por vía judicial la última estatua de Franco," *El País*, November 20, 2017, https://elpais.com/elpais/2017/08/23/videos/1503498176_527481.html

⁸⁶ Francisco Vizcaino "PSOE pide quitar la estatua de Franco para que Melilla no sea el último vestigio del fascismo en Europa," *El diario.es*

collectives, notably the *Colectivo Ciudadno para la Supresion de Simbolos Franquistas* or the *Asociacion para la recuperacion de la memoria historica*, joined the debate.

The French debate was initiated by an anti-racist association, namely the CRAN. Historians and other personalities joined the CRAN in their contestation. Journalist Rokhaya Diallo, historians Philippe Darriulat and Françoise Vergès are notable figures of the discussion. Defending the statue, well-known figures often involved in similar arguments spoke out. For instance, philosopher, Alain Finkielkraut, and writer Robert Menard participated in several televised debates. Listing the actors involved enables for an analysis of what aspects of politics of memory are articulated. In the case of Spain, the ratio of power displayed is more political and official. The question of a removal is not only debated, it is demanded through legal and political discourses. France brings the debate to a societal dimension with a diversity of individuals sharing their opinions.

While distinct protagonists can be observed, the type of arguments made are comparable. Those who asked for the removal of these statues claimed that these figures should not be honoured in the public space. Tin and Diallo expressed on multiple occasions that France, through symbolic statues, commemorate historical figures who were involved in establishing and promoting slavery.⁸⁷ The argument does not focus on these figures' actions in the past but on the fact that twenty-first century French society chooses to keep celebrating them, unaware of imposing unwanted memories to a part of the population. Tin's famous phrase "Your heroes might be our persecutors", highlighting that in the public space, heroic figures rather than infamous persecutors are customarily honoured, made headlines.⁸⁸ This expression could easily apply to Melilla's statue. Indeed, Franco is responsible for a large number of victims who either fell during the Civil War or during his forty-year long repressive regime. Descendants of these victims are still, to this day, trying to come to terms with their own past. Therefore, as the socialist party expressed it "Franco was a dictator and should not be in the street".⁸⁹ Insisting upon the fact that these statues are offensive to the memories of a part of the population, both debates mention that a removal would lead to another crucial step in providing moral reparation to the victims. When Eduardo

⁸⁷ Tin, "Vos héros sont parfois nos bourreaux," *Liberation* ; Diallo, "Débat de la semaine: Faut-il déboulonner les statues", *C politique*

⁸⁸ Tin, "Vos heros sont parfois nos bourreaux"

⁸⁹ Europa Press, "PSOE pide quitar la estatua de Franco"

Renz presented his lawsuit to the media, he explained that he wished to recover the dignity of Franco’s victims.⁹⁰ In his column, Tin believed the removal of Colbert from the public space to be a fundamental measure for reaching rehabilitation.

Opposite arguments are also significantly alike in essence. They defended the statues on the ground that they celebrate something different and unrelated to their involvement in “dark times” of each countries, quoting newspapers *Marianne* and *Melilla Hoy* in their coverage of the debate.⁹¹ Supporters of Franco’s statue maintained their argument that the statue honours his position as the chief of Army of the Legion during the Riff war liberating Melilla in 1921 and is unrelated to the dictatorship.⁹² Likewise, French supporters of Colbert’s statue argue over his “good actions”, often drawing a list of the measures taken by Colbert to improve the French economy at the time.⁹³

In 2017, the questions of what and how memories are transmitted to future generations were discussed in both French and Spanish media. These questions were embedded in the decade-long development of each states’ memory culture I explained in the first section. Although both debates have distinct features and evolved differently, several similarities can be observed, as previously explained. In both cases, debate participants argued about the meanings of the statues. These meanings were produced by political institutions. What is at stake in these conflicts over monuments is precisely this concept of power and the politically oriented view of memory. The public space is designed by political institutions, deciding which narrative of memory should be articulated. Supporters of the statues sought to protect this long-established narrative while their opponents were civic groups aiming for their memories to be recognised in the political sphere. Next part will explore further what these conflicts over memories challenge.

⁹⁰ Ingrid Bazinet, “Reportaje: Caza a los símbolos del franquismo todavía presentes en España,” *Milenio*, March 11, 2015, <https://www.milenio.com/internacional/reportaje-caza-simbolos-franquismo-presentes-espana>

⁹¹ Paqui Sanchez T., “Sabrina Moh insta a la ciudad a cumplir la ley de Memoria Historica,” *Melilla Hoy*, July 02, 2018; Hadrien Mathoux, “De Charlottesville à Colbert: Faut-il déboulonner tous les personnages historiques qui dérangent?” *Marianne*, September 04, 2017

⁹² Rebeca Alcántara, “Imbroda: “No soy franquista, pero la estatua es por quienes salvaron a Melilla en 1921,” *El Faro de Melilla*, October 25, 2016, <https://elfarodemelilla.es/imbroda-no-franquista-la-estatua-quienes-salvaron-melilla-1921/>

⁹³ Marine Rosset and Charlotte d’Ornellas, “Faut-il déboulonner les statues de Colbert?” *Radio Notre Dame*, September 19, 2017; François d’Orcival, “On va plus loin,” *Public Senat*, September 20, 2017; Olivier Truchot, “Le monde de Macron,” *Les Grandes Gueules*, September 19, 2017

2.3 Contested statues:

Challenging the construction of the national collective memory

What did the contestations of statues challenge? For the past decades, memories of slavery and memories of Franco were progressively included in the memory culture of both the French and the Spanish societies, notably through political recognition, cultural initiatives or education. Nonetheless, monuments celebrating figures involved in contentious periods of each state’s history remain in the public space. Statues contestation seem to be part of the process of challenging the dominant and homogenous representation of the past (or in that case, the slavery period and Franco’s rule) as set up by the state. In this section, I will analyse my sources in light of Halbwachs’ concept of collective memory and argue that the contestations challenge the construction of the national collective memory.

First, why contesting a statue? How can a statue become a source of conflicts within society? As previously mentioned, the symbolism of the statues was pointed at by participants of the debates. Both illustrate what French Historian Catherine Brice discussed in her contribution for *Les guerres de memoires*.⁹⁴ Indeed, Brice considered that symbols tend to divide society and lead members of the society to ponder what specific statues embody. Brice’s analysis questioned the origin of the statue: Why is a statue built? The statue of Colbert intended to represent the power of the French Republic and the statue of Franco aimed to embody the feeling of hope and confidence Francisco Franco, leader of the legion, brought to an occupied Melilla in 1921. Yet, still drawing upon Brice’s argument, the meaning of a monument can change throughout time if citizens and official institutions chose to reinterpret the past and its memories.⁹⁵ The recent discussions in France and Spain illustrate this process.

Furthermore, as Brice argued, statues are considered as artefacts allowing the construction of a collective memory.⁹⁶ Monuments, built by political institutions are part of the social structure on which the collective memory depends. Following Halbwachs’ theory, collective memory is the constructed and shared representation of the past by a social group.⁹⁷ By contesting the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco, members of the national social group rejected the collective memory as it is depicted in public

⁹⁴ Brice, “Monuments: pacificateurs ou agitateurs de mémoire,” 199-208

⁹⁵ Ibid, 202,

⁹⁶ Ibid, 204

⁹⁷ Halbwachs, *La mémoire collective*

spaces. The notion of collective memory is not rejected but the values and social framework of which it derives are. My case studies illustrate the extent to which participants of the debates engaged with the national collective memory. On the radio station *Paris Notre Dame*, Journalist Charlotte d’Ornellas invited to discuss the issue of the figure of Colbert, asked the following question: “Aren’t we all looking at the past with critical eyes?”.⁹⁸ In other words, D’Ornellas deemed that all French people shared representations, and perceptions, of the past, which illustrates perfectly Halbwachs’ concept. However, how can it be true when the social framework of French society has favoured one dominant memory as Johann Michel argued with his concept of *regime mémoriel*?⁹⁹ It seems that D’Ornellas, who opposed the removal of the statue of Colbert, was defending the traditional conception of the collective memory. On the opposite side, Louis Georges Tin considered that all French people did not have the same representations of slavery as the statue of Colbert celebrates a historical figure who prosecuted the ancestors of many French citizens. He asked the following “How can we live together?”.¹⁰⁰ By objecting to the statue of Colbert, Tin raised the issue of whose past is represented and contested the hegemony of one representation of past events.

Similarly, the contested statue of Franco illustrates this argument. Victims of Franco asked for their stories and memories to be taken into account in a social structure that publicly promoted Franco’s legacies in different spheres of the society, including the public landscape. The decades long struggle for victims of Franco to counter representations of Franco’s rule reveals the will of several members of Spanish society to modify the social structure in which the collective memories of Franco are constructed. In their analysis of the Historical Memory Law, scholars Jo Labanyi and Jose Antonio Moreno addressed this element.¹⁰¹ According to them, in 2007, the Spanish State provided the victims of Franco with a long-awaited law acknowledging their memories and need for reparation. Yet, it failed to modify the social structure on which relies the construction of the collective memory. Moreno argued that the law opted not to “reconstruct the collective memory” but preferred to protect the right of

⁹⁸ Charlotte d’Ornellas, “Faut-il déboulonner les statues de Colbert”

⁹⁹ Michel, “L’évolution des politiques mémorielles,” 63

¹⁰⁰ Tin, “Vos héros sont parfois nos bourreaux”

¹⁰¹ Jo Labanyi, “The politics of memory in contemporary Spain,” *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 9:2(2008): 120; José Antonio Moreno, “La memoria defrauda: Notas sobre el denominado proyecto de ley de memoria,” *Hispania Nova. Revista de Historia Contemporánea*, no. 6 (2006)

having personal memories.¹⁰² Mentioning “reconstructing the collective memory” is interesting as it reveals the Franco’s victims’ intention to do so. While the law granted them recognition of their memories of Franco’s period, it did not modify the shared representations of this period within Spanish society.

As I explained in the first chapter, the construction and transmission of the national collective memory depend on the politics of memory implemented by the State. Although the concept of collective memory cannot be reduced to its political construction, public authorities hold a monopoly of instruments used to transmit memories, as Johann Michel argued.¹⁰³ Michel added that official institutional actors have the ability to act on the imagination of collective groups.¹⁰⁴ They shape the social framework on which the collective memory depends. Those contesting the statues of Colbert and Franco seek to challenge the ability of state institutions to construct the national collective memory. For instance, Rokhaya Diallo, in a televised debate hosted by *C Politique*, stated that there was a clear ratio of power favouring supporters of slavery’s descendants in every sphere of the society, including politics of memory.¹⁰⁵ Likewise, Eduardo Ranz, along with several Spanish associations of memory, condemned how the figure of Franco is protected when it comes to commemorating this part of history. Ranz indicated that the figure of Franco during the 1921 Riff war and the dictator of Spain for forty years cannot be separated and therefore, anyone defending the existence of this statue must be a Franco supporter.¹⁰⁶

The last aspect of Halbwachs’ definition of collective memory challenged by these contestations is the lack of diversity in representation of the past that focuses on a single point of view. Establishing an inclusive memory, therein integrating multiple representations of the past, is another objective of these conflicts of memories. These contestations of statues call for different accounts of the past to be represented and remembered, promoting them in every sphere of the society, including the public space. The French debate illustrates perfectly this objective. Louis Georges Tin stated that “a deeper issue of these debates is the existence of cohabiting memories”.¹⁰⁷ Those in favour of a more inclusive public space often referred to a future time, a future

¹⁰² Moreno, “La memoria defrauda,” 5

¹⁰³ Michel, “L’evolution des politiaues mémorielles?” 5

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, 5

¹⁰⁵ Rokhaya Diallo, “Débat de la semaine: Faut-il déboulonner les statues,”

¹⁰⁶ Guzman and Rivas, “Melilla defiende por vía judicial la última estatua de Franco“

¹⁰⁷ Tin, “Vos héros sont parfois nos bourreaux“

society of living together. Writer Edouard Glissant’s idea of a memory of the future was reminded in the debate hosted by *C politique*.¹⁰⁸ A public conversation on the memory of the future should be initiated. By memory of the future, politician guest Charlotte Girard implied the establishment of a memory which is oriented to the future. In other words, while the present assesses the past according to its needs, such as values and norms, attention should be given to what the future needs. Opponents of remodelling the public space, in both Spain and France, mentioned a fear of division. Spanish leaders have always been particularly cautious not to divide society and dread Franco’s supporters’ reactions should the statue be removed. They are right to be cautious as in 2018, the local extreme right party, VOX, took a photo in front of the statue with the Spanish flag, triggering an intense reaction from social media users revealing the division within Spain when it comes to memories of Franco (see Appendix I).¹⁰⁹ Likewise, in France, Alain Finkielkraut believed that starting a debate on what should be removed from the public space will create tensions and anger may arise among the white population.¹¹⁰ Furthermore, when asked if the removal of the statue would not divide French people, Louis Georges Tin argued that division was already there and was, in fact, the core of the issue.¹¹¹ According to him, and his supporters, racism is fed by the existence of a prevalent historical narrative that dominates memories in the public space.

Throughout this chapter, I analysed the social and political context from which the contestations around the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco derived. Debate participants brought in the discussion arguments related to this context. It appears that the purpose of these discussions was to contest or defend the initial meanings of the statues, and, simultaneously, the construction and transmission of memories within the national social group. Memories of specific historical periods were instrumentalized by each side to support their positions to construct their arguments. While one side argued against the homogeneity and single perspective of the nation’s

¹⁰⁸ Charlotte Girard, “Débat de la semaine : Faut-il déboulonner les statues“

¹⁰⁹ “VOX Melilla se muestra en contra de la exhumación de los restos de Franco “, *Melilla Hoy*, accessed 05.04.2019, <https://www.melillahoy.es/noticia/108555/politica/vox-melilla-se-muestra-en-contra-de-la-exhumacion-de-los-restos-de-franco-.html>

¹¹⁰ Alain Finkielkraut , “Débat de la semaine: Faut-il déboulonner les statues?“ *C Politique*, November, 26,2017

¹¹¹ Louis Georges Tin, “On va plus loin“

Sherilyn Bouyer

Erasmus University of Rotterdam – Master's thesis History of Society

collective memory, the other side argued that memories should never be removed from public spaces and be protected. Next chapter will analyse another argument which strengthened both of these positions.

Chapter 3.

“How do you feel about this statue?”

Emotional engagement in Memory Politics.

This chapter will focus on another dominant type of arguments in the discussions around the statue of Franco in Melilla and the statue of Colbert in Paris. Analysing discourses on conflicts over statues revealed that different positions were connected to emotions such as pain or humiliation, but also pride or joy. By emotions, I mean the fact of being moved by symbols and manifestations of the past and the memories which are associated with them. What I found interesting was the fact that emotions were explicitly expressed by participants of the debates. Often, feelings appeared as a trigger factor that initiated the discussions challenging the existence of objects in the public space. Supporters of these statues reacted by expressing their own feelings regarding the statue. It appears that by producing emotional arguments, participants of the debates strengthened their positions. Throughout this chapter, I will enquire about the emotional engagement in memory conflicts. Additionally, this chapter will extend my argument that despite opposite settings and contexts, parallels between my case studies can be drawn.

The first section will focus on my primary sources and extract arguments expressing explicit emotions. Drawing upon Sara Ahmed’s analysis of the power of emotions, I will suggest affective involvement to be an instrument of discourse.¹¹² In a second section, I will evaluate the extent to which affective engagement is relevant in order to understand conflicts over statues. The last part will assess how emotions are a leading argument manipulated to implement and modify contemporary memory politics. While I will discuss the concept of emotions as a social power, I will also emphasise that emotions are historically constructed. Each of these parts will lead to responses to the sub question of this chapter: *To what extent are emotions instrumentalized by opposing sides of the debates?*

¹¹² Sara Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014)

3.1. Expressing explicit emotions.

As I listened to radio debates or read through articles and social media comments related to the two cases, I came across a variety of positions mentioning specific emotions. A simple question arose: Why did each side of the debates surrounding the statues of Colbert and of Franco decide to refer to emotions and how did they do so? They are not hidden behind claims; they are explicitly stressed upon. Drawing upon Sara Ahmed’s work on affective economies and politics of emotions, I will analyse my sources with the objective of understanding how emotions “function as a very powerful social drive”.¹¹³ Ahmed distinguished a specific aspect in the concept of emotions, namely the fact of naming emotions. Although assessing which feelings are expressed is an important task, I am more interested to understand why debate participants chose to justify their positions by naming emotions explicitly. Looking at the debate in France and in Spain, I easily noticed how naming emotions triggered conversations and was used as a point of reference throughout the debate.

For both of my cases, I had access to a variety of sources ranging from televised and radio debates, written press, websites and blog posts, and social media comments. Additionally, I conducted interviews with two key actors of the French and Spanish debate. Borrowing methods from Ahmed, I paid careful attention to words chosen by those expressing their positions. Her focus on “the emotionality of texts”¹¹⁴ provided me with a guide to explore how texts moved and eventually generated effects. My analysis will revolve around extracting every named emotion by participants on each sides of the debate and those who reported on the discussions either by organizing debates or writing about it. My goal is to probe the meanings of these feelings. While they are an articulation of the discussion, they are an argument in themselves. The second element of analysis will be the relationship between the speaker and the person/group to whom it is directed. In other words, a special attention will be given to pronouns such as “I” and “our” or “you/your”.

Following Knudsen and Stage’s distinction between two types of affected data, I identified two categories in my sources.¹¹⁵ The first category lists data produced by the body in affect, thereby the affected person naming or expressing an emotion.

¹¹³ Ahmed, *The cultural politics of emotions*, 8

¹¹⁴ Ahmed, *The cultural politics of emotions*, 14

¹¹⁵ Britta Timm Knudsen and Carsten Stage, *Affective Methodologies: Developing Cultural Research Strategies for the Study of Affect*

The second category lists what Knudsen and Stage called “secondhand data”, thereby reporting emotional responses or experiences.¹¹⁶ Secondhand data is produced by intermediaries in the debates or by surveys enquiring on which emotions are attached to specific experiences or memories. Why are these two categories important? Because they prove that looking for effects in discourses is more complex than it seems. Indeed, it is not only about which feelings are named but also about the way they are expressed and by whom, thereby probing if they are experienced feelings or reported feelings. Both are of equal significance, as they demonstrate the importance given to feelings in conflicts of memories, specifically in regard to statues.

Concerning the statue of Colbert in Paris, I identified two types of emotions in two tables, one gathering all emotions that triggered the controversy (table 1), thereby emotions used to demand the removal of the statue of Colbert, the other focusing on what I analysed to be *counter emotions* (table 2), namely naming feelings to respond to those offended by the statues and therefore protecting their existence.

Table 1: Emotions to strengthen the demand of removing the statue of Colbert.

	Original term	English translation	Context
Firsthand produced affected data: emotional argument	“Vous n’êtes pas touché par l’histoire de l’esclavage mais certains citoyens le sont »	“You are not affected by the slavery experience, but fellow citizens are”	Radio debate on <i>Europe 1</i> : Rokhaya Diallo tried to conclude her position after hearing her demand was absurd
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Notre bourreau” • “Colbert est une figure hideuse” • “Je suis en colère” • “Je suis dégouté, sentiment de vomir “ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Our executioner” • “Colbert is an hideous figure”; • “Outraged”; • “Disgusted, feeling of throwing up” 	Words of Louis Georges Tin repeated on several occasions during interviews. He was not asked what he felt, he said it as part of his position.

¹¹⁶ Ibid, 8

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Honteux”; • “Insultant”; • “Choquant”; • Colere 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Shameful”; • “Insulting”; • “Shocking”; • Anger 	A selection of the most common feelings expressed – by French citizens on social media.
	“Les descendants d’africains déportés n’ont pas à se sentir insultés dans l’espace public“	“Descendants of deported Africans should not felt insulted in public spaces“	Leonora Miao, writer, interviewed for the TV program “28 minutes” on Arte.
	“Nous, esclaves noirs des colonies Françaises des Antilles verront la statue de Colbert retirée. “	“Us, black slaves from French colonies in Caribbean will see removed the statue of Colbert “	Twitter user commenting on the debate raised by Louis Georges Tin
	“Quand un nom semble être une attaque contre la population, il semble légitime de le changer“	“When a name seems like an attack against a population, it seems justified to change it.”	Historian Philippe Darriulat asked about his opinion regarding the demands of removing the statue of Colbert
Second hand affected data: Questions about emotions + reported emotions	“Est-ce que la communauté noire en est affectée? “	“Is the black community affected by it?”	Mediators asked this question in televised debates. Response: The question divides with one side replying that it does, and the other rejecting that the black community can be affected by events of the 18 th century.
	“Est-ce insupportable? “	“Is it unbearable?”	(implying the statue) asked by Bourdin, host of Bourdin Direct on RMC. Louis Georges Tin replied by confirming that it is.
	“Est ce que les figures historiques sont dérangeantes?”	“Are historical figures disturbing?”	“Disturbing” is mentioned in newspapers articles – rhetorical question.

Sources: Rokhaya Diallo and Robert Ménard, "Hondelatte raconte," interview by Christophe Hondelatte, *Europe 1*, September 21, 2017; Louis Georges Tin, "Vos héros sont parfois nos bourreaux," *Libération*, Aout 28, 2017; Louis Gorges Tin and Jean Jacques Bourdin, "Bourdin Direct," » *RMC*, September 20, 2017; Louis Georges Tin, « la 1^{ère}, » interview by France TV, September 17, 2017; Louis Georges Tin, interview by Sherilyn Bouyer, March 13, 2019; Leonora Miao, "28 minutes," *Arte*, October 10, 2017; Philippe Darriulat, "De Charlottesville à Colbert: Faut-il déboulonner tous les personnages historiques qui dérangent?" interview by Hadrien Mathoux, *Marianne*, September 04, 2017; Rebecca Fitoussi, " On va plus loin," *Public Senat*, September 20, 2017

Bearing in mind my argument that emotions are argumentative tools which both strengthen the position of participants but also fuel the debate surrounding contested statues, a few elements need to be highlighted. To begin with, while each participant displayed specific feelings, the same feelings were often repeated. For instance, shame, shock and anger were expressed by the majority. It appears that repeating feelings highlights the power of emotions in driving contestations. For instance, Louis Georges Tin mentioned on several occasions what feelings the statue provoked in him. In his original column, he expressed how outraged, insulted and ashamed he felt. These three emotions were repeated every time he was interviewed or asked to take part in debates. When I interviewed him, I asked him if his positions remained the same two years after he initiated a debate. He replied by repeating the same feelings. However, he expressed additional feelings of disgust and of being nauseous every time he would pass the statue. Tin made a point of restating his feelings on every occasion and so did other participants. Therefore, it seems, emotions are not simply hinted at while conveying positions, they are an essential part of the argument.

Furthermore, emotions also seem to provide the debate with a narrative. Following Ahmed's suggestion that emotions sometimes offer a script to an argument, I noticed that emotional experiences of slavery are often on this side of the debate used as an introduction to further arguments. For instance, Louis Georges Tin's column started with the following statement "Your heroes are our prosecutors" introducing his

position with the story of Colbert and his role in the legalisation of slavery.¹¹⁷ While, part of the society might have heard stories of Colbert as a heroic figure, Tin was told a different story with Colbert identified as a fearful figure. In the debate hosted by radio station *Europe 1*, guest Rokhaya Diallo stated “we are affected by the memories of slavery”.¹¹⁸ A social media user commented “Us, descendants of black slaves cannot expect to get respect”.¹¹⁹ These examples demonstrate that emotions refer to a story but also create and drive the narrative of the debate. One felt hurt and demanded for their emotions to be taken into account. While no emotions was specifically named in the provided examples, the pronouns “we”, “us”, “your” suggest that the orator intended on emotionally engaging with a specific group or on a specific topic.

Journalists and debate hosts understood that emotions were a point of reference to address during debates. Questions were formulated in a neutral, yet curious way, as they enquired about how these statues move descendants of slaves. When journalists reported on the debates, they did not mention specific emotions, but they mentioned the fact that they “disturbed” specific groups. Observations show a clear interest for what feelings are involved and why so.

Table 2: Counter emotions: Responding to the demands of removing the statue of Colbert with emotions.

	Original term	English translation	Context
	“Pauvre Colbert”	“Poor Colbert”	Radio Notre Dame: Journalist Charlotte d’Ornellas expressed sympathy while giving her opinion.
	- “On doit se calmer” - “On doit assumer” - “Nous ne pouvons pas echapper le passe“	- “We have to calm down” - “We have to assume” - “We can’t run away from the past” - Nobody is perfect”	TV program <i>Les Grandes Gueules</i> in which different guests reacted vehemently against the demands to remove the statue

¹¹⁷ Louis Georges Tin, “Vos héros sont parfois nos bourreaux“

¹¹⁸ Rokhaya Diallo, “Hondelatte raconte”

¹¹⁹ @M. Thenard, “As long as the statue of Colbert stands in front of the French Assembly, us descendants of slaves cannot expect any respect”, June 4th, 2019

Firsthand produced affected data: emotional argument	- “Personne est parfait“ - “Tout le monde serait heureux si nous posons des plaques“ - “les associations antiracismes ont échouées“	- “Everyone is happy if we put plaques” - “antiracism associations have failed”	
	Peur : - “Nous allons être encore plus divisés“ - “Nous allons tout effacer“ - “Nous allons encourager les tensions“	Fear: - “We will end up even more divided” - “We will remove everything” - “We are going to foster tensions”	TV debate (<i>Public Senat, C Politique</i>), Radio debate (<i>Europe 1</i>): In response to guests invited expressing the demands of removing the statue.
	- “Décevant“ - “Absurde“	- “Disappointing” - “Absurd” - “Stupid”	First reaction of most opponents giving their opinion. Ex: Robert Menard, Alain Filkelkraut
	- “Nous avons de plus gros problèmes”	- Angrily stating “We have bigger issue”	Several times mentioned (<i>Les Grandes gueules</i> , newspapers articles, social media comments)
	- “Pourquoi devrions nous avoir honte?”	- “Why should we be ashamed?”	Countering back the argument of shame (Social media, TV debate <i>Les Grandes Gueules</i>)
		- Pride over the abolitionist movement	(Alain Filkelkraut) Shift focus on abolitionist movement – European exception
Second hand affected data: Questions about emotions + reported emotions	“Inapproprié”	“inappropriate”	Newspaper articles reporting on the debate
	Peur: Et quoi apres?	Fear: “What’s next?”	Mediators or journalists reporting on the debate
	“N’ouvres vous pas la boite de Pandore qui permettra à toutes les association de demander de retirer	Concern: “Don’t you open up open a Pandora box enabling every other associations to ask for similar removal?”	Mediator on <i>Public Senat</i>

	des symboles identiques?”		
--	---------------------------	--	--

Sources: Marine Rosset and Charlotte d’Ornellas, “Faut-il déboulonner les statues de Colbert?” *Radio Notre Dame*, September 19, 2017; Olivier Truchot, “Le monde de Macron,” *Les Grandes Gueules*, September 19, 2017; Rokhaya Diallo and Robert Ménard, “Hondelatte raconte,” interview by Christophe Hondelatte, *Europe 1*, September 21, 2017; Karim Rissouli, “Débat de la semaine: Faut-il déboulonner les statues?” *C Politique*, November, 26, 2017; Rebecca Fitoussi, “On va plus loin,” *Public Senat*, September 20, 2017; Facebook comments on TV program of *C Politique*, Rokhaya Diallo’s facebook page, November 28, 2017; Hadrien Mathoux, “De Charlottesville à Colbert: Faut-il déboulonner tous les personnages historiques qui dérangent?” *Marianne*, September 04, 2017; François Reynaert, “Napoléon, Colbert, Robespierre et les autres... Faut-il déboulonner nos grands hommes?” *L’obs*, November 22, 2017.

Supporters of the statues used the similar emotional strategy to convey their positions and to respond to opposite arguments. I referred to emotions expressed in reaction to the contestation of statues as *counter emotions*. My analysis led me to distinguish between two reasons for feelings to be named on this side of the debate. On one hand, emotions enabled to express reactions to the controversy and on the other hand, feelings provoked by the memories of the slavery era were also used to defend their position.

As the controversy drew in France, media interviewed historians and public figures to cover the topic and start a conversation. This resulted in heated debates with supporters of the statues defending them with ardour. For instance, supporters qualified the controversy of “absurd”, “stupid”, “disappointing” and even “inappropriate”. Feelings of fear and concern were the most commonly expressed and reported on. “Fear of division”, “Concern over an unlimited process” “Fear of opening a Pandora box” leading to a “monuments and identity purge” were arguments I came across. The meanings behind these feelings are noteworthy. Indeed, this side of the debate feared division and a purge of their memories. Paradoxically, this is exactly what the other side denounced: the existence of a division and ignorance of their memories. Therefore, supporters of the statues appear to project similar feelings to

those displayed by their opponents, namely unity and protection of a constructed collective memory.

When it comes to referring to the memories of slavery, no one obviously expressed pride about France’s involvement in slavery but feelings towards this period were still articulated. For instance, one debate participant, along with a defensive tone, wondered “why should we be ashamed?”. This appears to be a feeling shared by the supporters of the statue as they attempted to distance themselves from history and the actions of eighteenth-century France. Simultaneously, however, pride was also expressed directed towards Colbert’s actions in boosting France’s economy in the eighteenth-century, and, the nineteenth century abolition period coined as “a European exception”. A paradox between distancing themselves from the negative side of history, but also expressing pride over the positive legacies of history can be observed.

A similar analysis of the debate on the statue of Franco can be made. Tables below list the two types I encountered in my research: emotions displayed to contest the statue of Franco (Table 3) and counter emotions (Table 4).

Table 3: Emotions expressed to demand the removal of the statue of Franco

	Original term	English translation	Context
First hand produced affected data: emotional argument	- Humillado - Pena - Tristeza - Asco	•Victimhood – real stories “My grand father was shot”. •Humiliation •Misery •Disgusting	Repeated emotions by victims of Franco through associations or through social media
	- Sorpresa - Polémica - Vergonzoso	•Surprised •Polemical •Shameful	Repeating emotions upon encountering/hearing about the statue of Franco still standing in the streets:
	- Lamentado: “Somos, por desgracia, la ciudad con mayor número de calles y símbolos anticonstitucionales, y tenemos el dudoso honor de contar con la última estatua de Francisco Franco en	- Regret: - “We are, sadly, the town with the most Francoist symbols”	PSOE, political party during a press conference prompting the local government to remove the statue

	el mundo ubicada en un espacio público”		
	“Es inseparable la persona Francisco Franco con la figura del que fue dictador durante 40 años. Y cualquier defensa del franquismo significa que uno es franquista”	•“You are a Francoist”	Eduardo Ranz, mentioned by El Pais in response to the argument of the conservative government of Melilla, defending the statue.
Second hand affected data: Questions about emotions + reported emotions	“¿Qué sentimiento le provoca a Ud. pensar en la Guerra Civil en primer lugar? ¿Y en segundo lugar?” ¿Y qué sentimiento le provoca en primer lugar pensar en el franquismo? ¿Y en segundo lugar? - Tristeza - Rabia - Medio - Incomodidad	“What sentiments are triggered by memories of the Civil war?” • sadness 70% • rage 35% • fear 20% • uncomfortable 7% “and of Franco’s regime ?” • sadness 25% • rage 40% • fear 18% • uncomfortable 18%	Survey “Memories of the Civil War and Franco’s period”.
	“Dignidad de las victimas”	“Retrieving victims’ dignity”	Response of Eduardo Ranz when asked about his initiative to sue Spanish towns.

Sources: Twitter analysis, “Estatua de Franco (Melilla),” TripAdvisor, last accessed on 05.06.2019, https://www.tripadvisor.fr/Attraction_Review-g187515-d8299367-Reviews-Estatua_de_Franco-Melilla.html; Salvado Carnicero, “Melilla: un parque temático franquista,” *Infolibre*, November 22, 2017; Francisco Vizcaino “PSOE pide quitar la estatua de Franco para que Melilla no sea el ultimo vestigio del facismo en Europa,” *El diario.es*, November 11, 2017; Javier Guzman and Luis Manuel Rivas, “Melilla defiende por vía judicial la última estatua de Franco,” *El País*, November 20, 2017; Memorias de la Guerra Civil y el Franquismo, Estudio n 2.760, CIS, Abril 2008; E.F Gordon, “Ranz amplía a 167 municipios de Castilla y León su demanda contra la simbología franquista,” *La Nueva Cronica*, October 16, 2016.

When analysing my sources on the statue of Franco, I noticed a similar pattern of the same feelings being frequently expressed. The same vocabulary was used, and the same tone was implied. Words as “shameful” and “shocked” were recurring arguments opening or closing one’s position. On some occasion, one word appeared to be enough to convey the position of social media users. Even though a large part of the arguments referred to Franco, the Historical Memory Law and Spanish memory, expressing explicit emotions seems to be a stronger argument. The persuasion power of emotions will be further discussed in the following chapter.

Using emotions can serve two purposes. The first purpose is the one followed by direct victims of Franco, or their families who stressed upon the fact that they felt humiliated that the statue of the ruler who repressed them or their families is still being honoured in the streets. Victims explicitly mentioned anger or feelings of disgust. What’s more, personal stories involving emotional experiences are an element within discourses around memories of Franco. When someone said “my grandfather was shot”, they emotionalized an argument through the use of personal stories.¹²⁰ They did not only name an emotion, they told it. This element strikes as it reveals the emotional engagement of victims towards the statue of Franco. People came together to petition against the statue not only because “victims were shot” but because they were the ones who suffered from it. In other words, the use of the pronoun “my” personalised the story and explicitly expressed the extent of the affective engagement between the orator and the object of the discussion.

Besides the word in itself, pronouns also suggest the emotional engagement between the orator and a specific group or on a specific topic. Statements such as “We are victims of Franco” were used to connect affected individuals together and strengthen the group’s position. Pronouns were also used through invectives. Addressing opponents by stressing upon a distinct “You” can be an emotion inducing strategy. For instance, by declaring “you are a Franco supporter”, participants intended on shaming the other side. The figure of Franco being connected to a dark time in Spain’s history, labelling someone a Franco supporter generate a specific affect, namely feelings of embarrassment.

¹²⁰ AFP, “Franco symbols live on in Spain 40 years after his death,” *The local.es*, March 9, 2015

The second purpose is followed by participants of the discussions, who, while not identifying as direct victims of Franco, still expressed surprise and regret. Communicating regrets is the position I encountered the most. Notably, it was voiced out by Melilla socialist party PSOE which regretted the fact that Melilla is the last town displaying memories of Franco’s. PSOE statement meant to blame the local government who allowed it. Analysing emotions allows to identify local opposition’s positions.

In table 3, I also introduced a 2008 survey on memories of the Civil war and successive Franco’s period. Two questions asked “What sentiments are triggered thinking of the memory of the Civil War/Franco”, indicating the importance given to emotions attached to these periods. ¹²¹

My case analysis revealed that emotions triggered the demands to remove the statue of Franco but were also the purpose of the contestations. Indeed, those demanding the removal of the statue of Franco expressed feelings of “sadness and humiliation” towards the statue and these emotions were central in their arguments repeated through the years. It is because they feel that way that they initiated their demands in their first place and continued with civic actions.

Table 4: Counter emotions: Responding to the demands of removing the statue of Franco with emotions.

	Original term	English translation	Context
Firsthand produced affected data: emotional argument		Pride over Franco liberating Melilla.	Narrative of the conservative party of Melilla defending the statue
	“Ellos (Franco y el resto de militares) llegaron en 1921 y desfilaron por la ciudad para que el pueblo recuperara la confianza. Si para Eduardo Ranz esto	The statue symbolises feelings of hope and confidence in time of hardship. “It has value”.	Juan Antonio Bellver, director of the department of culture of Melilla, interviewed by el Pais

¹²¹ Memorias de la Guerra Civil y el Franquismo, Estudio n 2.760, C/S, Abril 2008

	no tiene valor, yo creo que si la tiene”		
	“La estatua no exalta o humilla a ningún colectivo”	“the statue does not humiliate any Spaniards”	Melilla’s government in the catalogue of monuments preconstitutional
Second hand affected data: Questions about emotions + reported emotions	“¿Qué sentimiento le provoca a Ud. pensar en la Guerra Civil en primer lugar? ¿Y en segundo lugar?” ¿Y qué sentimiento le provoca en primer lugar pensar en el franquismo? ¿Y en segundo lugar? - Patriotismo - Nostalgia - Orgullo	“What sentiments are triggered by memories of the Civil war, and of Franco’s regime in first place?” • Patriotism 2% • Nostalgia 3% • Pride 1% “ In second place?” • Patriotism 5% • Nostalgia 6% • Pride 2%	Survey “Memories of the Civil War and Franco’s period”.

Sources: Rebeca Alcantara, “Imbroda: “No soy franquista, pero la estatua es por quienes salvaron a Melilla en 1921,” *El faro de Melilla*, October 25, 2016; Javier Guzman and Luis Manuel Rivas, “Melilla defiende por vía judicial la última estatua de Franco,” *El País*, November 20, 2017; Consejería de Cultura y Festejos, “Catalogo monumentos, placas y escudios preconstitucionales,” *Ciudad Autonoma de Melilla*, August 27, 2017; Memorias de la Guerra Civil y el Franquismo, Estudio n 2.760, *CIS*, Abril 2008.

My analysis of *counter emotions* expressed by those defending the statue of Franco led me identify three different motives. First comes the rejection of the emotions expressed by their opponents. In the catalogue listing the remains of Francoist symbols that Melilla was compelled to write in 2017, the government mentioned that the statue did not humiliate any social groups.

The second motive is the reaction to the controversy raised by those demanding the removal of the statue. Defence of the statue was not grounded on contemporary concerns but rather on the memory attached to it. On every occasion where supporters of the statue of Franco in Melilla needed to express their position, they named only an emotional argument. They expressed their pride over the memory associated with the figure of Franco, who in 1921 Melilla, as leader of the Legion,

liberated Melilla from the Berbers invasion during the Riff War. The government insisted that his arrival restored faith and hope in Melilla as people increased effort in the war. Therefore, his statue stands to remind Melilla’s population this moment in history.

The third motive is to express the emotions induced by the memories of Franco to argue their position. Unlike memories of slavery, memories of Franco are diverse and complex. It is not uncommon to encounter comments expressing nostalgia of Franco’s period. As I exposed in the second chapter, memories of Franco in Spain are divisive notably because some contemporaries still remember Franco’s Regime positively and wish to protect his memory for future generations.

My research reveals the articulation of emotions on each side of the debate and their ability to strengthen positions. Emotions initiated the debates, fed it and were used as arguments. The next two sections will explore the power of emotions in conflicts of memory.

3-2. Memories and emotions:

Producing affective engagement in representations of the past.

In this section, my objective is to understand why debate participants in France and in Spain, explicitly referred to emotions. I intend to assess the power of emotional engagement in conflicts of memory. Manifestations of the past in public spaces carry memories of a specific time. According to Jo Labanyi “present day attitudes to the past are always emotionally charged”¹²². I will evaluate the extent to which contested statues in the public spaces highlight the emotional engagement attached to these symbols, embodying historical figures and events of the past.

While it is clearer how someone can be affected by a certain event occurring during their lifetime, feelings regarding events of the past are more complex to pin down. How are these emotions passed on to future generation? Why did a descendent of an eighteenth-century slave express feeling of pain in twenty first century France when looking at the statue of Colbert? Why did a Spanish Civil War

¹²² Jo Labanyi, “The politics of memory in contemporary Spain,” 122

victim’s granddaughter feel anger in 2017 facing a statue glorifying Francisco Franco? In order to understand their emotions, I will draw upon Sara Ahmed’s study assessing the capacity to be affected by memories of the past, as well as her definition of emotions.¹²³ She relied on Descartes’ argument in his work *The passion of the soul* that feelings are shaped by the contact one has with an object.¹²⁴ Feelings depend on the interpretation one gives to an object, identifying them as harmful or beneficial. Ahmed built on this argument and claimed that contact with an object does not have to be materialized. In other words, memories can trigger emotions. In addition, these memories can be shaped by interpretations given by former generations and transmitted to members of present generations confronted with the same situation. Anthropologists Catherine Lutz and Lila Abu-Lughod explored the idea of emotions as a construction.¹²⁵ They deemed specific social and cultural conditions to be responsible for constructing and transmitting from generations to generations emotions attached to events or stories. Thereby, if a Melilla citizen grew up educated in the idea that Francisco Franco was a hero in the war against Berber groups saving the city, he is likely to feel grateful that a statue honours him in 2017. Juan Antonio Bellever, director of Cultural Festivities of Melilla, reminded in an interview that Franco’s arrival to the town in 1921 instilled hope and confidence into local troops and concluded that “it has value”.¹²⁶ His statement implies that his feelings towards Franco had been constructed by the memories of 1920s war and cultivated, thus far, by dominant social conditions. On the opposite side, victims of Franco passed on their anger and their resentment within their families or within social associations. When the representative of PSOE stated in a press conference “Franco was a dictator and should not be in the streets”, she expressed the anger of hundreds of thousands of descendants of victims constructed by decades of social structures protecting the memories of Franco and disregarding their stories.¹²⁷

¹²³ Ahmed, *The cultural politics of emotions*, 7

¹²⁴ Rene Descartes, *The passions of the soul*, trans. John Cottingham (Cambridge University Press, 1985)

¹²⁵ Catherine Lutz and Lila Abu-Lughod, *Language and the Politics of Emotion* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990)

¹²⁶ Javier Guzman and Luis Manuel Rivas, “Melilla defiende por vía judicial la última estatua de Franco“

¹²⁷ Melilla PSOE, “Moh: “Melilla es una ciudad moderna y europea, no puede ser el último bastión del franquismo,” *Melilla PSOE*, October 26, 2016, <http://web.psoe.es/melilla/news/835206/page/moh-melilla-una-ciudad-moderna-europea-puede-ser-ultimo-bastion-del-franquismo-.html>

I questioned these emotional constructions following Geoffrey M. White’s analysis of public collective representation and private personal cognition and emotion.¹²⁸ He used the metaphor “internalization” to define “the process whereby cultural symbols and texts obtain emotional significance for the individual”.¹²⁹ Further on, he argued that “collective histories and sentiments are interactively formed as people variously learn, argue over, celebrate, and resist representations of the past.”¹³⁰ White’s analysis complement the concepts of collective memory and politics of memory I presented in the second chapter. Indeed, Halbwachs’ explained that individual memory depends on the collective memory which is constructed, shared and passed on by a specific social group through social interaction and social structures. Individuals emotions seem to be shaped through the same interaction and within the same framework, creating collective emotions. In other words, memories and associated emotions are simultaneously constructed and passed on from one generation to another. Therefore, as institutional politics of memories intend to shape the national collective memory, they also participate in the construction of collective emotions. The case of Colbert’s statue confirms this argument. As previously explained, France’s memories of slavery were, for a long time, shadowed by official remembrance of the European abolitionist’s movement. During the TV debate hosted by *C Politique*, Alain Finkielkraut defended the statue of Colbert displaying pride in the “French and European movement of abolishing slavery” that he qualified as “a significant European heritage”.¹³¹ His statement can be explained by French state’s cultivation of pride about being a pioneer in eradicating slavery.

However, my focus is not only on emotional engagement in constructed representations of the past, but also, on the manifestation of emotions in contestations of statues. I come back to a question I pondered earlier about the statue’s role. In the article “*Cast in stone: monuments, geography, and nationalism*”, Nuala Johnson defined a statue as followed:

“Statues, as part of the cityscape or rural landscape, act not only as concentrated nodes but also as circuits of memory where individual elements can be jettisoned from popular consciousness.”¹³²

¹²⁸Geoffrey M. White, “Emotional Remembering: The Pragmatics of National Memory,” *Ethos* 27, No. 4, December 1999): 505-529

¹²⁹ Ibid, 506

¹³⁰ Ibid, 508

¹³¹Alain Finkielkraut, “Débat de la semaine : Faut-il déboulonner les statues?” *C Politique*

¹³² Nuala Johnson, “Cast in stone: monuments, geography, and nationalism,” *Environment and Planning I: Society and Space* 13 (1995): 63

While the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco were built in two distinct periods, respectively the beginning of the nineteenth century and the last part of the twentieth century, they were commissioned to serve the same purpose: celebrating local or national heroes and the memories they were attached to. Colbert and Franco were selected for their qualities as heroes of France’s history and of Melilla’s history. Therefore, the initial role of a statue is to be a visual expression of one’s history and to create common pride around one single figure or event. Recent contestations proved that contemporary perspective might differ from original plans. What happens when a statue does not inspire pride to all citizens? When the 1977 government of Melilla commissioned a statue of Franco, they might not have expected that tourists visiting the city forty years later, would be surprised to be greeted by the statue glorifying Franco.¹³³

On the popular website Tripadvisor the statue of Franco is listed as one of the attractions to visit in Melilla.¹³⁴ I analysed the reviews left on the page by visitors. With reviews ranging from “Terrible” to “Excellent”, comments revealed a division of popular opinion. Those who gave a “Excellent” or a “Very Good” rating left a positive comment on the statue, saluting Melilla’s original decision to respect history, rejecting thereby decisions to remove any symbols. Some remarks qualified the statue as “a fantastic and well-deserved homage”, one expressed gratitude towards “a great leader” for all his actions during his lifetime.¹³⁵ Other comments rated the statue as “terrible” and shared their emotions, calling the monument “disgusting”, “deplorable”, “shameful”, “humiliating”, “sad”. Furthermore, two examples I extracted from my sources illustrate how statues have the ability to provoke two distinct emotional experiences. In July 2014, it was reported that various organisations covered the statue with black cloth to pay homage to the victims on the anniversary of the beginning of the Spanish Civil War (see Appendix II).¹³⁶ The following year, members of the Guardia Civil (Civil Guard) gathered around the statue with the Spanish flag after participating in the celebration of the *Día de las Fuerzas Armadas* (Day of Armed Forces) and took

¹³³ “Estatua de Franco (Melilla),” TripAdvisor, last accessed on 05.06.2019, https://www.tripadvisor.fr/Attraction_Review-g187515-d8299367-Reviews-Estatua_de_Franco-Melilla.html

¹³⁴ Ibid

¹³⁵ Fernandosilves, “Un gran militar,” TripAdvisor, October 18, 2016

¹³⁶ “Cubren la estatua de Franco en Melilla por aniversario de la Guerra Civil,” Foro por la memoria, last accessed 02.04.2019, <https://www.foroporlamemoria.info/2014/07/cubren-la-estatua-de-franco-en-melilla-por-aniversario-de-la-guerra-civil/>

a photo displaying pride (see Appendix III). The photo made headlines and was extensively commented on social media, denouncing or saluting it.¹³⁷

Turning to the French case, the same observation can be made. Although, the statue of Colbert is not a tourist attraction, passer-by shared emotional reactions to the statue. During our interview, Louis Georges Tin qualified the statue of Colbert as “an incarnation of abomination” provoking him to feel nauseous.¹³⁸ Therefore, emotions are triggered because statues are “circuits of memories”, borrowing Johnson’s term.¹³⁹ That’s why, on one side, those contesting the statue do so because they question the memory associated with it, while others, against the removal, fear a violent “memory clear out” insinuating they would feel hurt to see these visual memories removed from public spaces.¹⁴⁰

Therefore, statues have undoubtedly an emotive force. However, the variety of responses indicates that a broad spectrum of affective experiences needs to be considered when analysing conflicts around manifestations of the past. Emotive experiences need to be contextualised and understood as resulting from converging factors. Emotions towards a statue and the memory attached to it have simultaneously been constructed. Constructed collective memory and collective emotion implemented by national memory politics aim to trigger either pride or belonging. When the memory attached to the statue becomes an object of contestation, emotional experiences of pain and sadness trigger civic initiatives to change national memory politics. The next section will explore what happens when distinct emotions convene in discussions around statues. Drawing upon Verovsek’s work on “the communicative pathways between informal and formal sphere”, I will suggest emotions to be a powerful communicative tool between civic associations or citizens and institutional organisations.¹⁴¹

¹³⁷ Pedro Agueda, “Los antidisturbios de la Guardia Civil en Melilla se fotografian ante la estatua de Franco,” *El diario.es*, June 11, 2015 https://www.eldiario.es/politica/antidisturbios-Guardia-Civil-Franco-Melilla_0_397561208.html

¹³⁸ Louis Georges Tin, interviewed by Sherilyn Bouyer, March 13, 2019

¹³⁹ Johnson, “Cast in stone,” 63

¹⁴⁰ Thomas Snegaroff, “Debat de la semaine: Faut-il déboulonner les statues Colbert?” *C Politique*

¹⁴¹ Peter J. Verovsek, “Collective memory, politics, and the influence of the past: the politics of memory as a research paradigm,” 530

3.3. Multiple feelings, one place.

Ahmed discussed the ability of emotions to foster social and political alliances. Relying on her concept of emotions, my case analysis probes how naming feelings are not only points of reference to convey their positions but also produces effects.¹⁴² Because emotions have the ability to alter policies, civic groups used them as a strategical tool to support their demand to remove a contested statue. Furthermore, what is stake in conflicts around statues is not only the power of emotions to trigger discussions, but also, the convergence of conflicting emotions. Throughout this section, I will explore how emotions of distinct parties cohabit and collide. As emotions play a significant role in formulating positions and driving debates, I will explore the influence of emotions in the decision-making process. What is at stake is not only the integration of everyone’s memories but also the integration of everyone’s feelings.

In their 2017 article, Dibbits, Willemsen and Rana merged the concepts of emotions and networking and introduced the methodology of “emotion-networking”.¹⁴³ Emotion networking encourages awareness of each other’s feelings and interests in heritage making. Within a set-up social setting, participants are inclined to take in different displayed feelings and, potentially, influenced by the presence of others, to shift their own emotions. As a result, new sorts of connections between divergent actors and their opposite interests can result from affective engagement. Applied to conflicts around statues, the emotion networking method would stress on social and emotional engagement to address the issue. As I explored in the section above, emotions drove the debates and defined the participants’ positions. Distinct emotions were confronted within the setting of a formal or informal debate. However, this confrontation seemed to not be enough to lead to a consensus. Therefore, awareness of the opposite group’s emotions may still need to be further encouraged in both Spain and France. Nonetheless, these interactions are interesting to analyse because the objective of each side is still for their feelings to be taken into consideration in the decision of either keeping or removing the statue.

¹⁴² Ahmed, *the cultural politics of emotions*, 8

¹⁴³ H.C Dibbits, M. Willemsen, Jasmijn Rana, “Moved by the tears of others: Emotion networking in the heritage sphere,” 977-988

Moreover, while I was exploring social and emotional interactions around statues outside of my case studies in France and Spain, I came across the 2007 conflicts around the Bronze Soldier in Tallinn, Estonia. Karsten Brüggemann & Andres Kasekamp wrote an article about the quarrel over the soviet memorial statue and, notably, reported on an imagined conversation developed by semiotician Mihhail Lotman.¹⁴⁴ To solve the conflict and come to terms with the past, Lotman envisioned a fictional discussion in front of the Bronze Soldier:

“Russians who notice the discomfort of Estonians say ‘If this bronze soldier disturbs anyone, then we should best move it away.’ The Estonians reply, ‘No, no, if the soldier is precious to someone then we best let it stay. Let’s vote.’ They vote. Since there are a few more Estonians, then the bronze soldier remains.”¹⁴⁵

While Lotman’s fictional discussion did not materialize itself around the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco, a tendency to allow for emotions to be an influence in reaching decisions can be observed. In both debates, beside emotionally involved participants, I also observed that some members of the society, who did not feel emotionally engaged themselves, still took into account expressed feelings and positioned themselves in the discussion.

Soon after the CRAN first contested the statue of Colbert, a group of artists wrote an open letter published in the *Huffington Post* calling for a national debate to reflect upon artworks in public spaces.¹⁴⁶ The contestation of Colbert’s figure led them to conclude that some artworks were troubling public order and therefore needed to be addressed. They regretted that artworks hurt some people and volunteered to take part in a collective debate to work towards building a fair space in France. Interviewed by the newspaper *Marianne*, French historian Philippe Darriulat understood that emotions were involved and argued that “when a name seems like an attack against a population, it seems justified to change it”.¹⁴⁷ The necessity to discuss the issue of memories in public spaces appears to be agreed upon by several debate participants. It does not mean that they always agreed with suggestions of removal, but they still acknowledged the importance to give to the emotions of others.

¹⁴⁴ Karsten Brüggemann and Andres Kasekamp, “The politics of history and the War of Monuments in Estonia,” *Nationalities Papers*, 36:3 (June 2008): 441

¹⁴⁵ Ibid, 441

¹⁴⁶ Moïse Marthelly, “En France aussi, il faut enlever les symboles esclavagistes,” *Huffington Post*, September 19, 2017, https://www.huffingtonpost.fr/moise-marthelly/en-france-aussi-il-faut-enlever-les-symboles-esclavagistes_a_23213119/

¹⁴⁷ Philippe Darriulat, “De Charlottesville à Colbert: Faut-il déboulonner tous les personnages historiques qui dérangent?” interview by Hadrien Mathoux, *Marianne*, September 04, 2017

Likewise, in Spain, as memories of victims became more prominent in the public sphere, stakeholders, cultural and political institutions allowed for emotions to take a central role in decision making. They did so because they wished to give justice to the victims, to pay homage to their memories, long ignored in public life. Members of political party EQUO Melilla voiced this concern when I reached out to them.¹⁴⁸ They did not mention personal stories linking them to victims of Franco but regarded the emotions of those affected as a priority to be protected.

Furthermore, Tin’s and Spanish associations of Franco’s victims’ demands to remove statues underlined another objective. Indeed, they aspired to a deeper change in their respective society, thereby reconciling communities of distinct memories and creating a more inclusive public space respectful of everyone’s feelings. This goal for the future is widely spread among participants of the debate and seems to be the purpose of the discussions in the first place: How to foster a responsible, inclusive and peaceful society?

In France, the objective is to encourage the decolonization of the space and of the mind. Feeling hurt, opponents to the statue of Colbert considered the removal as a form of reparation for descendants of slaves. In the interview I conducted, Louis Georges Tin stressed upon the fact that without reparation, there can’t be reconciliation.¹⁴⁹ Supporters of the statue’s opinion on the need for reparation differs. Indeed, they considered that contemporary citizens should not be held accountable for the actions of eighteenth-century Frenchmen and dismissed all suggestions to reconfigure the public space. Curiously, however, some suggested adding informative signs under statues in order to make everyone “happy” and to please everyone, thereby pretending to acknowledge the opponent’s feelings.¹⁵⁰

In Spain, reparation for the victim was also an objective of the contestation. Groups arguing in favour of the removal of the statue insisted on the need to restore “dignity” for the victims. For instance, Eduardo Ranz explained to have sued the government of Melilla for not removing Francoist symbols, to prevent victims to be further humiliated.¹⁵¹ Similarly, supporters of the statues expressed fear to divide Spanish society again. Furthermore, they did not seem inclined to build a more

¹⁴⁸ Equo Melilla, work email through EUROCLIO, March 21, 2019

¹⁴⁹ Louis Georges Tin, interview by Sherilyn Bouyer

¹⁵⁰ Olivier Truchot, “Le monde de Macron,” *Les Grandes Gueules*, September 19, 2017

¹⁵¹ Eduardo Ranz, interview by Sherilyn Bouyer

inclusive society. For instance, Melilla officials expressed their regret that some people were “still stuck in the past” and wished to remove “a part of history”.¹⁵² The president of the municipality of Melilla, Juan Jose Imbroda, disregarded the existence of victims' emotions and stated that no one should feel hurt by the statue because it is not a reminder of Franco, the leader of the government, but of Franco, leader of the army in 1921.¹⁵³ As the statue's opponent, seeking reparation and reconciliation, expressed emotions to connect with the statue's supporters, the latter are yet to allow for these emotions to change the society in which they evolve.

“We should foster inclusive memories to be reflected in public spaces” declared Diallo, in favour of removing the statue of Colbert, invited by *C Politique*.¹⁵⁴ It appears, the configuration of the public space was raised as one concern. In a simultaneous process, integrating everyone's memories in every aspect of the society implies to take into consideration, and eventually integrate, everyone's feelings when configuring the streets. Interestingly, the French legislator enacted a law on public spaces stating that “the name in a public space must not stir troubles for public order, must not hurt people's sensibilities”.¹⁵⁵ However, the law does not indicate potential removal or renaming monuments built prior. In Spain, a public survey conducted in 2008 questioned Spanish citizens on the memories of the civil war and of Franco's Regime.¹⁵⁶ Citizens were asked on what policies Spain should encourage. For instance, they agreed at 55% the need to remove every symbol paying homage to Franco and a majority also voiced the need for victims to obtain reparation. For example, 70% of the people interviewed supported the idea to build a monument dedicated to the victims of the civil war and of the repressive regime. More generally, I noticed that a strong majority favours a better management of memories of the civil war. Citizens regretted the lack of opportunities to be informed on this part of history. Reconciliation cannot be achieved when discussions around memories of Franco are put aside. These imaginations of a future society were expressed within the discussion

¹⁵² Nerea de Tena Alvarez, “La Fiscalía archiva la denuncia de Equo contra Imbroda por mantener monumentos franquistas,” *Melilla Hoy*, August 19, 2016, <https://www.melillahoy.es/noticia/75716/politica/la-fiscalia-archiva-la-denuncia-de-equo-contra-imbroda-por-mantener-monumentos-franquistas.html>

¹⁵³ Rebeca Alcantara, “Imbroda: “No soy franquista, pero la estatua es por quienes salvaron a Melilla en 1921,” *El faro de Melilla*, October 25, 2016

¹⁵⁴ Rokhaya Diallo, “Débat de la semaine: Faut-il déboulonner les statues”

¹⁵⁵ Law 2121-29, General Code of the local authorities, <https://www.senat.fr/questions/base/2015/qSEQ150917787.html>

¹⁵⁶ Memorias de la Guerra Civil y el Franquismo, Estudio n 2.760, C/S, Abril 2008

of conflicts around statues, revealing how contesting a specific statue is a first step in promoting inclusive and respectful infrastructures within public space. In the next chapter, I will explore another argument supporting these imaginations of the future.

Throughout this chapter, I explored the explicit use of emotions in the discussions related to conflicts of memories. In light of the data I extracted, I argued that conflicts over statues imply, not only, to question the institutional construction of collective memories, but also the construction of collective emotions. Indeed, memories lived on emotions and societies cultivated notions of pride regarding an event while a minority represses feelings of anger, disgust, sadness and humiliation. Because of their resentment, this minority was inclined to contest manifestations of the past in public spaces representing memories and emotions of one dominant group. The role of the emotional argument was to trigger contestations but also to drive the discussions as it strengthened the positions of each site of debate participants. Furthermore, producing emotional arguments also have the power to potentially modify the memory culture of a given society. Next chapter will highlight the last argument I identified which produces a new frame shaping the memory culture.

Chapter 4: **“How are our neighbours dealing with it?”** **Highlighting the European context in ongoing discussions around** **contested statues in France and in Spain**

Participants in discussions around the statue of Franco and the statue of Colbert brought forward different types of arguments. I already explored arguments referring to the construction of the nation’s memories and to emotions. In this last empirical chapter, I will analyse the arguments referring to the international, and more specifically the European context. Once more, this argument was produced by individuals or established groups seeking the removal of the statues in order to strengthen their positions. Yet, opponents to the removal also considered the international context when they expressed their opinions. The discussions revealed conflicting attitudes towards Europe. I distinguished different types of references; Comments on cases of contested statues or on comparable historical figures, but also, interestingly, references to European shaped values and norms. Based on this first observation, I first wonder why did actors of the debates decide to refer to foreign cases or supranational values? How did these references serve their positions? In this chapter, I will discuss the notion of Europe, not only in terms of the community, or the supranational structure, but I will also address Europe as an idea. The sub-question guiding my analysis is the following: *To what extent does the European community produce a new frame of memory politics in discussions around contested statues?*

The chapter will follow a similar pattern as the previous ones. The first section of the chapter will be an analysis of my sources, extracting positions, opinions and arguments where external examples or influences were brought up. Further on, the second section will tackle the emergence of the European memory and the development of cosmopolitan repertoires of values. It will allow me to explore how it came to influence conflicts of memories around the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco. The last section will explore how Europe represents a new frame of memory politics. I will address the extent to which common memory policies or norms have the ability to address and deal with conflicts of memories in public spaces. Eventually, this chapter will intend to explore how the European context can simultaneously bring a new set of feelings used by different sides of the discussions but also, be a mediator in stimulating a variety of cultural policies at national level.

4.1. Measuring up to your neighbour: Comparison to other states.

Throughout this section, I will analyse both of my case studies separately. As mentioned previously, the statue of Colbert in Paris and the statue of Franco in Melilla involve distinct memories. Yet, in both cases, participants of the debates brought up equivalent examples encountered in neighbouring states and eventually referred to similar norms and values influenced by the European context. I closely analysed my primary sources to focus on positions commenting on cases occurring abroad and will now assess their purpose and argumentative power.

In France, as I already mentioned, the debate around the statue of Colbert started in August 2017, triggered by the events across Atlantic. French news reported on the violence caused by the defence of a Confederate statue in the United States.¹⁵⁷ Racism in the United States was addressed as the media denounced the violence used in Charlottesville. Based on this reaction from the media, but also from social media users who responded to the violence, Louis Georges Tin, in his initial column, prompted French citizens to have a look at French statues.¹⁵⁸ During our interview, he told me how irritated he had felt and that his irritation stimulated him to write his column on *Liberation* contesting the figure of Colbert in public spaces.¹⁵⁹ In the column, he wrote the following: “we can’t be shocked and moved by what is happening in the United States and not by the situation in France”.¹⁶⁰ He intended to encourage French citizens to have a look at French landscape and acknowledge the colonised space in which they live. Throughout the debate, he referred to the American events on multiple occasions. In saying so, he intended to instil feelings of shame into the statue’s supporters. He regretted that French citizens appeared willing to denounce foreign

¹⁵⁷ Chloé Rochereuil, “Les statues des soldats confédérés tombent après les violences de Charlottesville,” *France 24*, August, 15, 2017, <https://www.france24.com/fr/20170815-statués-soldats-confederés-tombent-aprés-violences-charlottesville> ; Rédaction JDD, “Charlottesville: pourquoi la statue du général Lee fait polémique,” *Le journal de Dimanche*, August 16, 2017, <https://www.lejdd.fr/International/charlottesville-pourquoi-la-statue-du-general-lee-fait-polemique-3412646> ; Th.B, “Etats-Unis : pourquoi Charlottesville cristallise la haine de la droite extrême,” *Le parisien*, August 13, 2017, <http://www.leparisien.fr/faits-divers/etats-unis-pourquoi-charlottesville-cristallise-la-haine-de-la-droite-extreme-13-08-2017-7190445.php>

¹⁵⁸ Louis Georges Tin, “Vos héros sont parfois nos bourreaux”

¹⁵⁹ Louis Georges Tin, interview by Sherilyn Bouyer

¹⁶⁰ Louis Georges Tin, “Vos héros sont parfois nos bourreaux”

situations but overlooked the similar situation known in France. Indeed, violence in Charlottesville occurred around a statue of a confederate general who endorsed slavery. Then, what about French statues honouring figures who also supported slavery? Invited as a guest for the TV Program *On va plus loin*, Tin was asked if the comparison he drew between France and the United States was appropriate.¹⁶¹ He replied that in both cases, the contested figures were connected to a crime against humanity. It seems that Tin used analogous cases to strengthen his demand to remove the name of Colbert from public spaces. I will come back later to his mention of “crimes against humanity” which is particularly interesting.

Throughout the debate, the comparison with the events in the United States was often made, either defending it or rejecting its relevance. Rokhaya Diallo, the second main spokesperson arguing in favour of the removal of the statue, also referred to the American statues to introduce her arguments, which she exposed for instance on the radio *EUROPE 1*.¹⁶² She also used the comparison to provide context for the current demand in France and to introduce it as fitting within a global issue. However, the comparison with the events in Charlottesville was widely rejected by the supporters of the statue of Colbert. As mentioned before, on the TV programme *On Va Plus Loin*, Tin was asked about the relevance of the comparison between both states.¹⁶³ Rebecca Fitoussi, the host of the program, asked “can we say it is exactly the same situation?”, she insisted on the word “exactly” implying she judged the comparison inappropriate.¹⁶⁴ Her doubts were shared by guest, Journalist Francois D’Orcival, who also questioned the comparison. D’Orcival acknowledged the fact that France should “not give lessons to the United States” but that, both states were not to be compared.¹⁶⁵ To support his argument, he pointed out the conditions in which slavery had been abolished and how this abolition has been remembered since in both states. He mentioned the French Remembrance Day of the abolition of slavery, on the tenth of May, and the fact that, in France, slavery has not been an issue since it was abolished in 1848. D’Orcival also mentioned the fact that racism due to slavery in the US results in a completely different confrontation around contested statues. Therefore, according to D’Orcival, comparing between the French and the American cases was

¹⁶¹ Louis Georges Tin, “On va plus loin,” *Public Senat*, September 20, 2017

¹⁶² Rokhaya Diallo, “Hondelatte raconte”

¹⁶³ Rebecca Fitoussi, “On va plus loin,” *Public Senat*

¹⁶⁴ Ibid

¹⁶⁵ Ibid

irrelevant. It was further rejected by debate participants. On one occurrence, during the TV program *Les Grandes Gueules*, the discussion became quite heated as all the guests disagreed with the demands initiated by Louis Georges Tin. One of them, Didier Giraud, farmer, shouted his opposition calling the demands “an American trend” unsuitable to France.¹⁶⁶ Some newspapers, notably *Marianne*, considered the demands to be “an English way of doing” inappropriate to France.¹⁶⁷ I will explore later the intensity of the rejection as proving the importance of the European context in these conflicts.

As the comparison with the American situation was rejected, spokespersons in favour of the removal, used other foreign comparisons, geographically closer, in their argument. Once more, Louis Georges Tin was the first to compare the figure of Colbert with the figure of Hitler. I encountered the comparison with Hitler on multiple occasions on social media posts, mostly Twitter and Facebook, commenting on televised and radio programs. The comparison with Hitler was made to remind the fact that in Germany, no statue of Hitler can be found because of the atrocities he committed and the pain it would cause to his victims if otherwise. Tin argued that, on the contrary, in France, multiple public buildings and statues celebrating figures involved in slavery, an institution responsible of comparable atrocities were still to be found in the public space.¹⁶⁸ Addressing the comparison, supporters of the statue often commented on Colbert’s role as minister of economy and his positive impact in France’s growth before the Age of Enlightenment. During our interview, Tin explained countering this argument by recalling that Hitler had “successfully boosted German economy”, implying therefore that the figure of Colbert cannot be defended based solely on his “good impact” in French economy.¹⁶⁹

Eventually, I noticed that the figure of Colbert connected with memories of slavery were compared to figures associated with memories of the Holocaust, or World War II. During the debate *Les grandes gueules*, which gathered participants with different backgrounds, ranging from lawyer, public office worker and farmer, memories of slavery were compared to memories of the Holocaust attached, not to the figure of Hitler, but to the figure of Marshall Petain, a well-known French general of World War

¹⁶⁶ Didier Giraud, “Le monde de Macron, “ *Les Grandes Gueules*, September 19, 2017

¹⁶⁷ Hadrien Mathoux, “De Charlottesville à Colbert: Faut-il déboulonner tous les personnages historiques qui dérangent? “ *Marianne*

¹⁶⁸ Louis Georges Tin, interview by Sherilyn Bouyer

¹⁶⁹ Ibid

I.¹⁷⁰ Marshall Petain was celebrated for his heroic actions in the war in multiple streets and statues throughout France during the Interwar Period. However, during World War II, he became chief of the Vichy regime, the authoritarian regime in occupied France under the supervision of the Nazis. As such, he actively collaborated and participated in the deportation of Jewish people. At the end of the war, he was convicted for treason. Contestations over the legacy of Petain in public spaces emerged after victims of the Shoah spoke out. His memory was deemed inappropriate to keep on being celebrated. As a result, statues and streets were progressively removed and renamed. The last street to be renamed occurred in 2013 and was located in the small village of Belrain, a renaming which barely attracted media attention. Belrain Mayor, Patrick Gondouin stated having made this decision because he believed the name might someday raise issues.¹⁷¹ Decision makers opted to remove the legacy of Petain because of his involvement in Vichy France and in the Jewish deportation. According to Louis Georges Tin, the removal of figures involved in Vichy France and Jewish deportation indicated precisely that more intention is given to memories of victims of the Holocaust than to memories of descendants of slaves.¹⁷²

The fact of mentioning Petain and figures involved in the Holocaust in the discussions around the statue of Colbert is interesting for two reasons. First, on the radio *Europe 1*, Rokhaya Diallo, invited to join the debate of the day about the figure of Colbert in public spaces, made a reference to the United States but not about statues of slavery supporters, but about a plaque named after Petain in New York.¹⁷³ Indeed, following the removal movement of confederate statues in the United States, the mayor of New York decided to also remove a plaque which had been installed to commemorate Petain and his actions during the World War I. It seems that Diallo decided to refer to a figure involved in the Jewish deportation as it was a stronger argument than the reference about figures connected to slavery in the United States. Furthermore, the reference also proves the European emphasis on memories of the Shoah. Indeed, statues or streets named after figures involved in Jewish deportation have been removed from public spaces. The same cannot be said about figures

¹⁷⁰ Olivier Truchot, "Le monde de Macron," *Les Grandes Gueules*

¹⁷¹ Patrick Gondouin, "La dernière rue de Petain va être dépatisée," interview by *L'express.fr* and *AFP*, *L'express*, April, 5th, 2013, https://www.lexpress.fr/actualite/societe/la-derniere-rue-petain-en-france-va-etre-debaptisee_1237597.html

¹⁷² Louis Georges Tin, Interview by Sherilyn Bouyer

¹⁷³ Rokhaya Diallo, "Hondelatte raconte"

involved in the slave trade. I will explore in my next section this comparison of memories within the European context.

In the Spanish case, references to foreign cases have also been made on multiple occasions by those demanding for the removal of the statue of Franco. While they did not explicitly refer to comparable situations of contestations, the figure of Franco was repeatedly compared to historical figures connected to fascist regimes. Because Franco was recognised as an authoritarian and dictator leader, comparisons were made with the figures of Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin. These three figures, as unquestioned figures of fascism, repressive regimes and authoritarian ruling were strong references.

“Why a statue of Franco in the streets? There are no statues of Hitler in Germany” commented a TripAdvisor reviewer while one twitter user pondered “Can you imagine a statue on Hitler in Germany? it is unbelievable”.¹⁷⁴ The TripAdvisor reviewer expressed surprise when visiting the city and compared the situation with the figure of Hitler. On twitter, posts made on the statue of Franco are quite frequent, often commenting under newspaper articles reporting on the situation in Melilla. Likewise, surprise was expressed by imagining a statue of Hitler in Germany. Both of these questions can be encountered on multiple occasions by individuals using such online platforms to give their opinions. In doing so, they intended to shame Spain for allowing the celebration of an authoritarian leader when neighbourhood states do not.

While the figure of Hitler was the most brought up in the discussion, the statue of Franco was largely associated with fascism in Europe. For instance, local secretary of socialist political party PSOE Melilla, Francisco Vizcaino, voiced out his concern to see the city of Melilla turning into a symbol of “the last traces of fascism in Europe” and prompted Conservative local government to remove the statue, in accordance with the judge ruling¹⁷⁵ Vizcaino added that it would be “impossible to imagine a statue of Hitler in Germany, for his actions during WWI while no one would consider in Russia the statue of Stalin, no matter the fact that he defeated the Nazis”.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁴ Mancunian53, “Shocked to see this,” *TripAdvisor*, October 16, 2017; @RiquitaLevy, “Melilla ese lugar de Espana dond puedes encontrar estatua d Franco. Imaginaos lo mismo Alemani con Hitler,” *Twitter*, October 18, 2012

¹⁷⁵ “Francisco Vizcaino “PSOE pide quitar la estatua de Franco para que Melilla no sea el ultimo vestigio del facismo en Europa,” *El diario.es*, November 11, 2017

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid*: “Es imposible pensar que pongan una estatua de Hitler en Alemania, por su actuacion en la Primera Guerra mundial; nadie se plantearia en Rusia se recuperaran las estatuas de Stalin, por mucho que venciera a los nazis.” translation mine

Once more, foreign examples were used to legitimate the demand to remove the statue of Franco. Interviewed by news media, Eduardo Ranz, made the same type of comparisons. Notably, newspaper *Local.es* reported on Ranz's declaration that "it would be unconceivable to see a statue of the Fuhrer in Germany or of Il Duce in Italy."¹⁷⁷ He added, emphasizing on the connection he draws between Germany and Spain, that "it would be like if in Germany a victim of Nazis saw a swastika in the streets. It's unthinkable".¹⁷⁸ Therefore, it seems drawing connections between well-known historical figures resonates with people and is an argumentative tool to expose one's positions and demands.

Comparisons with past European fascist regimes caused two kinds of reactions. First of all, Spanish citizens or political and cultural groups defending the statue, and wishing to preserve the figure of Franco and his rule, refused the comparison between Hitler, dictator, and Franco, ruler of Spain for thirty-five years. In 2015, interviewed for the daily national newspaper *el Pais*, Jaime Alonso, vice president of Francisco Franco Foundation, whose objective is to protect the memories of Franco, stated that comparing Franco with Hitler would be "to ignore the nature of what he was".¹⁷⁹ According to him, Franco was not Hitler, and not a dictator, and therefore, the comparison cannot be made. Numerous comments made by people interviewed, or simply posting their positions on social media platforms, rejected the idea of Franco as a dictator, mentioning feelings of pride or nostalgia towards his actions during the Civil War and his rule. The statue of Franco TripAdvisor page provided me with numerous comments expressing nostalgia towards Franco's rule and applauding Melilla for allowing his memory to live on through a statue. On the 18th of October 2016, a review titled "a great military leader" glorified Franco for the role he played in preventing the invasion of Spain by Nazi Germany.¹⁸⁰ The review also mentioned that Franco prevented the threat of communism to spread in Spain, an argument which can be found in other reviews.

The complexity involved in qualifying Franco can be found in today's Spanish society. My own observations living in Spain allowed me to understand why

¹⁷⁷ AFP, "Franco symbols live on in Spain 40 years after his death," *The local.es*

¹⁷⁸ Ibid

¹⁷⁹ J. Jimenez Galvez and Isabel Valdes Aragonés, "What is left of Franco's legacy?" *El pais*, November 20, 2015

https://elpais.com/elpais/2015/11/20/inenglish/1448008408_633418.html?rel=mas?rel=mas

¹⁸⁰ Fernandosilves, "Un gran military," *TripAdvisor*, October 18, 2016

some Spaniards, opposed to take down the statue of Franco, were not willing to associate Franco with Hitler, unlike supporters of removing the statue. During one conversation, which occurred on December 2018, I was told about the positive aspects brought by Franco during his rule, notably how he boosted Spain's economy after the Civil war and created safe jobs.¹⁸¹ These stories highlighted that if, some might oppose the removal of the statue of Franco, it was not because they sought to protect his memory as a dictator but because they deemed other aspects of his rule to be worth remembering. Contemporary perspectives of Franco's rule were revealed by the 2008 survey entitled "Memories of the Civil War and Franco's period". 65 questions referred to memories one might have regarding Franco's time. Those randomly questioned had to give information about themselves and select among one of the given responses which represented best their own experiences and subsequent memories of this period.¹⁸² One of the questions asked Spaniards to give their opinion about several statements regarding Franco's rule. The last statement "Franco's rule had good and bad things" was approved by 58% proving once more the complexity of the memories attached to Franco. It also explains why comparison with foreign states such as Germany were rejected as, unlike the figure of Hitler, the figure of Franco is not exclusively negatively remembered by a majority of the population.

Second, the figure of Franco was compared to figures of fascism in Europe in an attempt to shame, or at least denounce, the government of Melilla's decision not to remove the statue of Franco, a decision deemed to go against European standards. Concerned for Melilla to be infamous around Europe for honouring fascist figures, PSOE delegate of the Spanish government in Melilla, Sabrina Moh, voiced her desire to see Melilla turned into a "modern, twentieth first century and European city".¹⁸³ Along these lines, a TripAdvisor user argued that "there is no place for Franco's statue in today's society".¹⁸⁴ Emilio Silva, founder and president of Association for the recovery of Historical Memory, also mentioned that "This does not happen to any other democratic countries in the world".¹⁸⁵ These arguments all

¹⁸¹ It was a conversation which took place in Cadiz, Andalucia where I was visiting a Spanish family. I asked some questions about the memories of Franco as part of my research for this thesis.

¹⁸² *Memorias de la Guerra Civil y el Franquismo*, Estudio n 2.760, CIS, Abril 2008

¹⁸³ Paqui Sanchez T., "Sabrina Moh insta a la ciudad a cumplir la ley de Memoria Historica"

¹⁸⁴ Kingpaul100, "What??? Had to visit!" *TripAdvisor*, March 9, 2019

¹⁸⁵ Emilio Silva, "Franco symbols live on in Spain 40 years after his death," interview by AFP, *The local.es*, March 9, 2015

referred to “democratic” or “European” standards that shape “today’s society”. These references to values and standards will be further studied in the next two sections, but for now, it is interesting to observe how Melilla was compared to other European cities or countries, which are considered more European. Hence, the demand to remove the statue of Franco appears to reveal a desire to import foreign ways of dealing with the past to Spain.

Therefore, in both cases, when it comes to arguing about removing the statue of Colbert or the statue of Franco, drawing connections between comparable situations encountered in Europe appears to strengthen and legitimize the demands. Beyond the comparison with other cases, participants of the discussion made references to European shaped norms and values. The next section will explore this element allowing me to contextualise both discussions within the European context in which they evolved. How are memories of slavery and memories of Franco’s regime framed by European institutions and organisations? Can the existence of a constructed European collective memory influence discussions around contested statues within member states? Can victims use the European framework as a coercive strength in their demands? I asked myself these questions after investigating my sources and they will guide my analysis for the next two sections of this chapter.

4.2. The European collective memory: Shaping European norms and values.

In this section, Halbwachs’s concept of collective memory will guide my analysis. Halbwachs conceived collective memory as being developed by social structures and interactions. In the second chapter, I explored this concept looking at state-sponsored structures implementing remembrance policies in order to construct the national collective memory. My objective throughout these following sections is to broaden my scope of analysis and look at my case studies through the perspective of the European framework. As I already exposed, both of my case studies referred to memories and values associated with the European context. Now, I will analyse the emergence of a European memory and assess how memories of slavery and memories of Franco associated with the statues of my case studies have been influenced by this development.

The European community grew after World War II from a strictly economic cooperation to a political and cultural collaboration between member States. As time went by, will to strengthen the union led to an aspiration of forging a European identity among European citizens. To do so, established European institutions relied on specific historical events and shared experiences of the past. In his work *Building Europe*, scholar Cris Shore explored the number of initiatives undertaken by European institutions to promote common traditions, common commemorations and common memories to celebrate.¹⁸⁶ Along with these emerging initiatives, European institutions appeared to have the ability to construct forms of collective memory, adding to the already existing national framework. German socialist Willfried Spohn considered that: “under the impact of Europeanisation, national memories are transformed and reconstructed by layers of a transnational European memory but not substituted by a European collective memory”.¹⁸⁷ Spohn’s argument is the focus of my analysis. How did the construction of the European memory influence the development of memories of slavery and of Franco at a national level?

Drawing upon Anderson’s statement in his *Imagined communities*, national societies have been the dominant frames of memory and memory politics since the nineteenth century.¹⁸⁸ However, after the second world war, transnational structures emerged and became another frame of memory politics. In the chapter “Cosmopolitan memory” of her work *Memoryland*, Scholar Sharon Macdonald explored the influential work of sociologists Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider who argued on the “transition from national to cosmopolitan memory cultures”.¹⁸⁹ By cosmopolitan, they referred to the European memory that which developed in the second half of the twentyth century. Their input was significant as they assessed the extent to which European frames of actions came to have an effect on national memory culture. Furthermore, they argued that the Holocaust has been the “paradigmatic case” of the emerging cosmopolitan memory.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁶ Cris Shore, *Building Europe. The Cultural Politics of European Integration* (Oxford: Routledge, 2000)

¹⁸⁷ Willfried Spohn, “National Identities and Collective Memory in an Enlarged Europe,” in *Collective Memory and European Identity: The Effects of Integration and Enlargement*, ed. Klaus Eder (Aldershot: Taylor and Francis, 2005), 4

¹⁸⁸ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 2006)

¹⁸⁹ Sharon Macdonald, “Cosmopolitan Memories,” in *Memorylands. Heritage and Identity in Europe Today* (London/New York: Routledge, 2013): 188; Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider “Memory unbound: the Holocaust and the formation of cosmopolitan memory,” *European Journal of Social Theory* 5, no. 1(2005): 87

¹⁹⁰ Levy and Sznaider, “Memory unbound,” 98

Before I explain how memories of the Holocaust affected both of my case studies, I will briefly outline how memories of the Holocaust have been managed in the public sphere since the end of World War II. In the aftermath of the war, victims of the Holocaust were not given a space to voice their stories and their suffering. Their memories remained isolated until the 1970s/1980s when the mediatization of the trial of the main organisers of the Holocaust, notably Adolf Eichmann’s trial in 1961, spread across Western Europe. The rise in historical research and testimonies of victims revealing the atrocities committed during the war fostered States and European institutions to progressively sponsor commemorations and reparations for the victims. This development was also helped by the fact that memories of the Holocaust were shared across Europe encouraging the European community to emphasize on these common memories and shared experiences of the past in the construction of the European memory.

Levy and Sznajder argued that “memories of Holocaust were *detrterritorialised*” and were turned from “a series of facts to an idea”¹⁹¹. In other words, the way memories of the Holocaust have been addressed and managed became a model to address other types memories. Memories of the Holocaust encouraged the development of the “moral story of good against evil” and of a model on how to deal with difficult memories of the past across Europe and beyond ¹⁹² French Historian Henry Rousso argued that the remembrance process of the Holocaust triggered the development of standardized repertoires of actions.¹⁹³ It mobilised actions such as seeking political and legal recognition, but also reparation for victims of human rights abuses. States institutions were forced to recognise their participation in the deportation of Jews and expressed public apologies. One example of this politics of recognition occurred in France on July 16th 1995 when French President, Jacques Chirac, recognised the responsibility of the French State in the Holocaust.¹⁹⁴ Memories of the Holocaust also mobilised repertoires of values which were, and still are, brought up by other mnemonic groups, thus establishing common patterns between different types of memories. Levy and Sznajder mentioned how memories are addressed in

¹⁹¹ Levy and Sznajder, “Memory Unbound,” 100

¹⁹² Ibid, 100

¹⁹³ Henry Rousso, “Histoire mémoire et politiques mémorielles,” review of *Face au passé ; essais sur la mémoire contemporaine*, by Martine Giboureau, May 2016

¹⁹⁴ “Discours de Jacques Chirac sur la responsabilité de Vichy dans la déportation, 1995,” *INA*, last accessed 15.06.2019, <https://fresques.ina.fr/jalons/fiche-media/InaEdu01248/discours-de-jacques-chirac-sur-la-responsabilite-de-vichy-dans-la-deportation-1995.html>

regards of a “future orientation”, namely dealing with difficult memories to inform future generations and make sure this will not happen again.¹⁹⁵ Furthermore, memories of the holocaust shaped a human rights discourse which is constantly mobilised to address atrocities of the past. These different actions and values mobilised across different mnemonic groups are part of the construction of a cosmopolitan memory culture which eventually shaped the discourse of the debates around the contested statues of Colbert and Franco.

In a 2015 article, Sebastian M. Büttner & Anna Delius noted that local or national discourses were “strongly linked with more general discourses on coming to terms with the past”.¹⁹⁶ Below I will address both of my case studies and explore how the European context, in which these general discourses originated, influenced the discussions.

Across Europe, memories of European slavery have been addressed similarly. Comparing Great Britain, the Netherlands and France, which are States that participated in slave trade, enables to outline parallels starting with the isolation of these memories throughout the twentieth century. European institutions took part in the lack of remembrance regarding slavery and, despite being a shared past experience among European member states, did not integrate the memories of the European slave trade and slavery in the European memory. French historian Françoise Vergès analysed this oversight and stated that Europe cannot be founded on the Enlightenment’s racism and is not ready to challenge this common history.¹⁹⁷ Yet, both national states and the European community eventually participated in the emergence and rise of initiatives aiming to counter the dominant discourse regarding slavery. From a discourse focused on remembering the European abolition of slavery, various projects in educational, cultural and political fields started to take into account the stories of slaves and their descendants. This development was encouraged by the emergence of memories of Holocaust in each aspect of society.

Mnemonic groups formed by descendants of slaves attempting to get their memories recognised by official institutions and in the public spaces were influenced by the discourse and values constructed with the remembrance of the Holocaust. One

¹⁹⁵ Levy and Sznajder, 101

¹⁹⁶ Sebastian M. Büttner & Anna Delius, “World Culture in European Memory Politics? New European Memory Agents Between Epistemic Framing and Political Agenda Setting,” *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 23:3, (2015): 394

¹⁹⁷ Françoise Vergès, “Les troubles de la mémoire,” 1146

example is the notion of crime against humanity. The notion was forged in the aftermath of World War II to qualify and try crimes committed during the conflict and especially towards the Holocaust. In 2001, French parliament passed a law which recognised slavery and the slave trade as crimes against humanity. It was a significant step as, up until now, the notion had been applied almost exclusively to crimes related to the Holocaust in France. Descendants of slave could now use this transnational constructed norm to support their demands of recognition of their memories and reparation for their ancestors' suffering. It is quite significant that this notion was brought in the discussions around the statue of Colbert in 2017. Louis Georges Tin, in the debate on the radio RMC, reminded that slavery has been recognised a crime against humanity, therefore arguing that his demand was justifiable.¹⁹⁸ On the TV program *28 minutes*, French writer Leonora Miao stated the following: "If someone committed a crime against humanity, it should not be celebrated in the public space".¹⁹⁹ Referring to this constructed norm to convey her argument appeared to be sufficient for Miao. Both Tin and Miao also implied that in France there are no statues connected to figures involved in the Holocaust because they committed a crime against humanity, yet there are several statues of figures associated with slavery despite the fact that they committed a crime against humanity.

The European context through the notion of crime against humanity was used as an argument in the discussions around the statue of Colbert. Memories of slavery were compared to memories of the Holocaust. Descendants of slaves were seeking for their memories to be protected as those of the victims of the Holocaust are. Drawing upon Henry Rousso's work, the emphasis put on remembering difficult pasts reveals how memories have become a fundamental value and a human right of contemporary societies.²⁰⁰ Rousso also argued that the way memories are addressed in societies are a democratic indicator. I explore this last element through the discussions around the statue of Franco.

The case of the last statue of Franco is interesting as the impact of the Europeanisation can be observed regarding two elements. First, a particularity in Spanish authoritarian regime compared to the Nazi regime or Eastern Communism regimes can be observe as Franco was not defeated but died as a ruler. After his death,

¹⁹⁸ Louis Gorges Tin, "Bourdin Direct," *RMC*

¹⁹⁹ Leonora Miao, "28 minutes," *Arte*, October 10, 2017

²⁰⁰ Rousso, "Histoire mémoire et politiques mémorielles"

it took a few years for Spain to transition to democracy and in 1986, or eleven years after Franco's death, Spain joined the European community. Spain was first considered a model of a smooth and fast transition post authoritarian regime. The 2008 poll by CIS on memories of the Civil War and Franco's rule in Spain revealed that a few participants noted Spain's transition to democracy to be a model for other countries.²⁰¹ This image was shattered as victims came out in public spaces and historical research increased. In the past decade, criticism grew surrounding the transition. Scholar Carolyn Boyd explored the fact that, according to several public figures and citizens, the transition to democracy actually undermined Spain's democratic character compared to European states, notably Germany and France.²⁰² Boyd deemed this judgment to be particularly unfair as she recalled that both France and Germany also developed policies of active forgetting in the first years after the war. Yet, as Spain did not prosecute groups involved in crimes under Spanish' dictatorship and left untouched symbols of Franco in the public landscape, the image of Spain having failed to come to terms with the past developed in the twentieth first century. The end of the Cold war, the communism rule and the integration of new nation states from former communist authoritarian regimes especially contributed to this image of Spain. Therefore, it seems that the national struggle of dealing with Spain's fascist past was reflected in European institutions. Indeed, while European institutions promoted remembrance of fascism, they stressed upon memories of Nazi fascism and communist fascism and often overlooked Southern European fascism regimes, including Franco's.

In the recent discussions around the statue of Franco, the European context was brought as an argument through the model of the democratic norm. Indeed, as I observed the multiple references to European states I exposed earlier, the discussion clearly highlighted the desire to turn Spain into a respected democracy alongside its European neighbours. Those asking for the removal of the statue of Franco blamed Melilla for being less "European" and less "democratic" implying that there are European standards to be met. Melilla failed to meet them solely because of the existence of the statue of Franco. In other words, by refusing to remove the statue of Franco, the government of Melilla was blamed for being undemocratic and denying fundamental rights. To be qualified as a proper democracy, it seems Spain has to prove

²⁰¹ *Memorias de la Guerra Civil y el Franquismo*, Estudio n 2.760, *CIS*

²⁰² Carolyn P. Boyd, "The Politics of History and Memory in Democratic Spain," 142

its ability to come to terms with dark periods of the nation's past. One way of doing so would be to equal European states in actions and in values by not allowing the government of Melilla to celebrate fascism. Furthermore, victims of Franco compared their situation with victims of other types of fascism. For instance, the online newspaper *local.es*, reported on the testimony of Chon Vargas, a descendent of Franco's victims.²⁰³ Vargas compared Franco's victims to Hitler's victims and stated that "Jews received reparation. We also demand it."²⁰⁴ This statement illustrates perfectly the way victims of Franco's rule used foreign examples to articulate their demands for better recognition.

By referring to these European constructed norms and values, as well as equivalent cases, I argue that participants of the discussions around the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco were affected by what Europe represents. While in the third chapter I argued that participants of the debates were moved by the manifestations of the past symbolised by the statues and the memories that are associated with it, it seems that to some extent, Europe also becomes an emotion. Indeed, values and norms shaped by the European context mobilised specific feelings projected in the discussions. Those asking for the removal of the statue projected feelings of progress, tolerance and social cohesion. They sought to reconfigure the public space based on these European values and shaped a more inclusive public sphere where tolerance and cohabiting memories replaced dominant and oppressive memories. On the opposite, those defending the statues projected feelings such as fear to see memories being purged from Europe because of the rise of multicultural societies. They projected nationalistic attitudes as they valued the particularity of their nation and of the dominant narrative of the past nurtured for decades. Finally, they rejected notions of social cohesion and tolerance promoted by European institutions. What I found interesting is the fact that, in discussions around contested statues, it was not only conflicting memories and conflicting emotions converging, but also conflicting attitudes towards the European context.

In conclusion, this section sought to analyse the emergence of cosmopolitan memories and transnational memories which influenced, not only the integration of memories of slavery and memories of Franco's victims, but also the

²⁰³ Chon Vargas, "Franco symbols live on in Spain 40 years after his death," interview by AFP, *The local.es*, March 9, 2015

²⁰⁴ Ibid

construction of norms and values used in discussions around the statues to strengthen their positions. Europe became a set of references, for comparable cases but also for values and emotions. The next section will explore the extent to which the European community is a new frame of memory politics to deal with a global phenomenon of contested memories in public spaces, of which the statues of Colbert and of Franco are only two examples.

4.3. Conflicts of memories in public spaces: Seeking a European response?

The contestations around the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco are illustrative debates at local levels about national issues regarding memories in public spaces. In this next section, I will analyse my sources in light of the transnational issue of memories in public spaces and explore how European memory politics could possibly provide responses to address this issue. I will support my argument with the already discussed concept of memory politics and scholars’ analysis of the emergence of Europe as another frame of memory politics.

While the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco were national conflicts on manifestations of the past reflected in public spaces, the phenomenon of contentious sites, ranging from statues to buildings and street names, is global and cross borders. When the question of the statue of Colbert was raised in France, there was a general awareness of this global phenomenon. Indeed, Louis Georges Tin, when he initiated the discussion, first referred to similar contentious monuments around the world, stressing upon the confederate statues in the United States.²⁰⁵ Then, each time the issue of the statue of Colbert was addressed in the media, debate participants attested of the emergence of a “debate around the world”.²⁰⁶ In March 2019, the online news platform *FranceTV info* published a post on statues glorifying colonial figures and mentioned Jacqueline Lalouette’s recent work *Un peuple des statues*.²⁰⁷ Lalouette referred to the controversial question of statues in the US and

²⁰⁵ Louis Georges Tin, “Vos héros sont parfois nos bourreaux“

²⁰⁶Tirhankar Chanda, “Lee, Colbert, Faïdherbe: Statues esclavagistes,” *Rfi*, Octobre 20, 2017, <http://www.rfi.fr/hebdo/20171020-lee-colbert-faidherbe-statues-esclavagistes-etats-unis-louis-georges-tin-cran-lee>

²⁰⁷Pierre Magnan, “Faut-il deboulonner les statues qui glorifient la France coloniale?“ *Francetvinfo*, March 17, 2019

stated that “it was not only American” implying therein that the issue can be found in different places.²⁰⁸ Yet, Lalouette admitted that the movement of contesting statues did not gather as much participants in France than it did in the United States. Nonetheless, the debate in France fits within this global phenomenon of contested sites in public spaces. As for the statue of Franco, it is noteworthy to point out that several foreign newspapers reported on the current situation in Melilla, or on the overall legacy of Franco in public spaces. To name but a few, *Theguardian*, *Telegraph* and *FranceInfo* reported the info on several occasions as the debate progressed in Spain.²⁰⁹ It shows the important mediatisation received for disputes around statues, contributing to informing different states of comparable situations.

In both my case studies, participants of the discussions acknowledged influences coming from international and European frameworks. French scholar Sebastian Ledoux noted what he called the “Europeanisation of remembrance”, hereby remembrance policies or initiatives promoted by values and goals coming from the established European structure.²¹⁰ In the last section, I explored the values and norms originating from the European context which influenced the discussions around the contested statues of Franco and Colbert. Now, I argue that this standardization of actions and values across borders enabled European memory politics to become another frame to implement remembrance policies. European institutions have the ability and power to articulate remembrance practices and to transmit them to national institutions. In a 2007 article, Aleida Assmann explored the extent to which Europe could be qualified as a community of memory.²¹¹ Assmann discussed the idea of a European community of memories as providing a set of references, hereby values or norms that are agreed upon by members of the community. Assmann added that this European community of memories can help deal or at least address, conflicting memories encountered locally or nationally. Assmann’s analysis demonstrated the fact

²⁰⁸ Ibid

²⁰⁹ Giles Tremlett, “Spain removes last statue of Franco in mainland Spain,” *Theguardian*, December 18, 2008, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/dec/18/franco-statue-spain>; Isambard Wilkinson, “Madrid removes its final statue of General Franco,” *The telegraph*, March 18, 2005, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/spain/1485950/Madrid-removes-its-final-statue-of-General-Franco.html>; “Espagne: les villes appelées à retirer les symboles franquistes de leurs bâtiments,” *Francetvinfo*, accessed 02.04.2019 https://www.francetvinfo.fr/monde/espagne/les-villes-appelées-a-retirer-les-symboles-franquistes-de-leurs-batiments_3177699.html <https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-35551297>

²¹⁰ Sébastien Ledoux, “Histoire mémoire et politiques mémorielles,” review of *Le devoir de mémoire*, by Martine Giboureau, May 2016

²¹¹ Aleida Assmann, “Europe: A community of memory?”

that, since 1945, European supranational cultural and political institutions have progressively encouraged specific norms and values in order to create common methods of producing memory narratives, or memory in public spaces and to create a common framework in which conflicts of memory can be solved. Spanish and French citizens supporting a reconfiguration of the public space and a removal of contested statues recognised the power of European institutions to impact on local decisions and used it. For instance, the European framework stressed upon the recognition of victims of fascism and called for fascism to be condemned. At the time of the enactment of the Historical Memory law in 2007, Jose Antonio Moreno, president of the association *Foro por la memoria*, recalled that both the Council of Europe and the European parliament had recognised the illegitimate character of Franco's regime.²¹² More recently, in 2018, the European parliament passed a motion outlawing groups glorifying fascism.²¹³ The Foundation of Francisco Franco was targeted as one of those group. Spanish journalists, scholars, members of associations referred to these European resolutions because they valued them as a supranational force in discussions about the legacy of Franco in public spaces. Likewise, French citizens supporting the removal of the statue of Colbert intended to demonstrate the European emphasis on remembrance of the Holocaust and compared it to remembrance of slavery across Europe in order to import common remembrance practices.

As contestations of representations of the past have standardized across the globe, addressing such conflicts became an object of concern. Because of the European standardization of values and practices, I argue that the European community provides a potential solution to deal with such contestations. Jan-Werner Muller suggested this development in a 2010 reflection about what constitutes the European memory.²¹⁴ Muller first introduced an interesting definition of the European memory:

commitment of the part of European countries to work through the past as individual nations in the name of shared universal principles and through Europeanised practices while clearly addressing different nationally specific pasts.²¹⁵

²¹² José Antonio Moreno, "La memoria defrauda: Notas sobre el denominado proyecto de ley de memoria"

²¹³ Joe Gerrard, "European parliament names Franco foundation in fascist group ban call," *Euroweeklynews*, October 26, 2018, <https://www.euroweeklynews.com/2018/10/26/european-parliament-names-franco-foundation-in-fascist-group-ban-call/#.XM7ouJV7k3E>

²¹⁴ Jan-Werner Muller, "On European Memory," 41

²¹⁵ *Ibid*, 27

Drawing upon Muller’s analysis, universal principles and Europeanised practices can prove influential at local and national level to deal with contentious past. While, Muller discussed these Europeanised practices on a conceptual level, the research I carried out with two specific case studies allows me to further his analysis supported by empirical data. Indeed, as I argued throughout this chapter, supporters to remove contested statues were aware of universal principles which they addressed in their arguments, attempting to respect such principles. As Europeanised practices developed towards memories of the Holocaust, mnemonic groups associated with memories of slavery or memories of Franco’s rule sought to broaden these practices to their own memories.

Drawing upon Assmann’s analysis that ““memories are not only located but framed within the European horizon of values”, I argue that the European context is brought in the discussions about conflicts of memories as an imagination, an idea of the future. The European framework offers alternatives to face local conflicts, or rather, offers an imagined future, in which memories and representations of the past are framed by universal rights and values. Memory, as a representation of the past, would live on protected by the imagined European community. In discussions around contested statues, Europe provides a horizon of possibilities to go after.

Therefore, the European context does not only shape values and norms, or provides emotions to be projected, or arguments to strengthen demands of removing statues, it shapes a new frame of actions and remembrance policies and creates an image, a horizon to attain. However, it does not mean that the European community is the only active framework to address contested statues. Indeed, as Macdonald argued, national frameworks are not replaced but joined by European frameworks. Although Europeanised practices or cosmopolitan processes add another frame of memory politics, they do not replace the national framework.”²¹⁶ Both are not a limitation to the other, they rather benefit from both dynamisms seeking for the most appropriate and sustainable response to a global phenomenon of memories challenged in public spaces, a phenomenon of which the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco are only two examples.

²¹⁶ Sharon Macdonald, “Cosmopolitan Memories”, 118

Throughout this chapter, I identified the emergence of a cosmopolitan, and more specifically European, memory culture. Arguments referring to examples of comparable situations encountered abroad but also to values and norms shaped by the European framework were brought up in discussions around the statues of Colbert and of Franco. I argued that the European framework influenced local discussions of memories through the construction of the European memory and the emphasis put on memories of the Holocaust. Memories of the Holocaust and the way it has been addressed became a model and shaped repertoire of values and actions used by other mnemonic groups protecting other types of memories. I argued that Europe brought a new set of references and a new set of feelings to address conflicts of memories. Finally, the European framework produces a new horizon of possibilities for those seeking the removal of the statues, but also, proves to be another frame of memory politics, which, along with the national framework, can provide responses to the issue of contested memories and emotions in public spaces.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

At the start of my research, my intention was to observe and analyse discussions addressing the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco. My objective was to select two distinct case studies, involving different memories and national settings, and highlight similarities between them, notably the types of arguments brought forward in debates. Both discussions in my case studies are still ongoing, although they do not attract as much attention anymore. My research question was the following: *What is the role of the different types of arguments produced in discussions around contested statues in France and in Spain?* Throughout my thesis, I identified three types of arguments and analysed their role in the discussions around contested statues. The arguments produced challenged the articulation of memories, emotions and attitudes towards the European community. They strengthened positions, legitimized demands and sought to modify the current configuration of the public space because of emotions, supranational values and norms involved. By analysing arguments, it allowed me to recognise the purpose, the motivations of debate participants and the challenges and concerns they bring to light.

The first argument I identified is related to the objective of participants taking part in the discussions, either seeking to contest or defend the statue. Beyond the artefact that is the statue, I argued that participants contested or sought to protect the institutional construction of the national collective memory. I explored how arguments addressing the issue of conflicting memories in public spaces are in lines with the socio, political and historical context and the development of a national memory culture from one generation to another. Therefore, participants supporting the removal of the statues argued that memories of slavery and memories of Franco's rule had long been isolated or lack multiperspectivity and that they aspired to shift the official narrative of the nation's representations of the past. Their objective was to shape an inclusive public space in which different representations of the past, and memories, are assimilated. Their opponents argued that removing monuments would lead to a divided and conflicted society. They claimed their positions to be protecting memories from being forgotten. On both side, debate participants argued on the relevance to address the nation's collective memory, either to modify its construction or protect it.

The second argument I addressed was an emotional argument. Throughout my third chapter, I explored the role of emotions in memory politics. I noticed that debate

participants conveyed their positions through specific feelings, notably pride or humiliation towards the statues. I argued that the emotional argument served to strengthen their positions and I attempted to explore why they did so. I highlighted how emotions associated with memories had also been constructed and transmitted from generations to generations. As a result, as memories live on in emotions, feelings drive discussions about contested statues. Furthermore, I drew attention to the power of emotions in implementing remembrance policies and therein the possibility to use emotional engagement to address the issue of memories in public spaces.

Last, I observed that the European context was also brought in discussions around the statue of Colbert and the statue of Franco as an argument. Mnemonic groups requesting for statues to be removed would draw comparison between their case and equivalent situations encountered in neighbouring states and would also refer to specific values and norms which originated from the European context. Through the construction of the European memory and the emphasis put on transnational and cosmopolitan remembrances attitudes, notably through memories of the Holocaust, constructed norms and values drove the discussions around contested statues. By bringing in the European framework and its values and norms, I argued that debate participants were moved by what Europe represents, either idealising it or rejecting it. These conflicting attitudes towards Europe converged in the discussions around contested statues, seeking or refusing European institutions' ability to become another frame of memory politics. However, I argued that because of what Europe represents, European institutions have the ability to seek sustainable responses to address the transnational and contemporary issue of conflicting memories in public spaces.

I framed my research with three different concepts, namely collective memory, politics of memory and emotions. All proved to be useful for analysing different types of arguments and the overall context of the discussions. The theories combined provided me with a stronger analysis as I connected all of them for different purposes. The concept of collective memory as developed by Halbwachs focuses on the importance of social structure and social interaction, which originates from state sponsored memory politics, but also from the interaction within the society which evolved from generation to generations with, notably, isolated voices emerging in the public sphere. While I analysed which memories had been constructed and passed on, I emphasised on the social structures and social interactions through the concept of

memory politics. State sponsored narratives of the past and remembrance policies, but also the cultivation of other narratives by mnemonic groups and the actions they took to have their memories represented in different sphere of the society. Last, with the concept of emotions, I explored how emotions associated with memories had also been constructed and imposed by dominant social structures. Yet, as minorities groups would project different feelings, divergent emotions converged in discussions about conflicts of memories. Social interactions, through the expression of emotions, was challenged and redefined.

Throughout my thesis, I proposed directives to better understand the issue exposed by the statues of Colbert and of Franco. I limited myself to two case studies in order to provide a detail research from which key elements can be extracted. Yet, the analysis is not exclusive to these two statues and can be transferred to further cases. My analysis allowed to understand the discussions, where the issue came from, who was involved, what arguments debate participants brought, how these arguments strengthened their positions and what encouraged or framed their attitudes towards contested statues. While this thesis is by no means a practical guide providing advices to stakeholders confronted to the issue of conflicting memories in public spaces, it assessed the socio, cultural and political framework in which these conflicts unfolded. The assessment, strengthened by academic analysis, allows for a better understanding of a current matter encountered in multicultural societies.

Following the analysis of each of my chapters, the evaluation I made would benefit from a few research projects. First, the question of collective memory connected to national identity should be explored. How do conflicts of memory relate to the identity crisis societies are facing now? I hinted the fact that the contestations came to challenge what is experienced as the identity of the nation, resulting in, either, groups seeking a redefinition of the identity of the nation or, others trying to preserve it. Additionally, although I applied the concept of collective memory to the national group, it can also be applied to smaller size groups, notably community groups which have cultivated their own memories for generations. This focus on mnemonic groups' collective memories would bring interesting perspectives.

In the third chapter, I used the methodology of emotion networking to highlight the power of affective engagement in connecting divergent emotions within a social setting. It would be interesting to practically apply the methodology by organising events, in which different parties involved in the discussions around the statue of

Colbert and of Franco are invited. It would be interesting to observe how each participant directly convey their emotions and if the exchanges could result in a willingness from all parties involved to address the problem.

Finally, as I discussed in my introduction, this thesis was motivated by my contribution to the project "Contested Histories in public spaces" during my internship with EUROCLIO and the Historical Justice and Reconciliation. The project is one of the initiatives targeting the transnational phenomenon of conflicting memories in public spaces. It proves the importance given to transnational structures for researching in depth about the issue and come up with possible solutions, or, at least with guidelines. Moreover, the project brings to light the importance of detailed research, notably contextualising the conflicts. While it values the particularities of each case, it also intends to draw up common guidelines despite the differences. My thesis aimed to do exactly so by selecting case studies with opposed settings but highlighting the use of similar arguments. When the project will come to an end, it will be time to assess the ability of supranational structures to suggest parameters to consider, guides to follow and strategies to carry out, and observe the extent to which national institutions are willing to make use of these recommendations.

Because it is a global and contemporary issue, conflicts of memories in public spaces should be addressed. In my thesis, I exposed what elements need to be considered to address the conflict. The issue of contested statues is a national issue challenging present day societies with their ability to come to terms with difficult and controversial periods of their national history. The national collective memory defined majorities and minorities groups of memories, a definition that is defied by debate participants contesting statues and the homogeneity and hegemony of representations of the past in public spaces. It is also an issue of personal and collective emotions. If a statue stirs negative emotions and hurts people, the subject should be raised in consideration of everyone's feelings. Last, it is an issue affected by the emergence of cosmopolitan values, norms and attitudes. The European framework is not only discussed because of its ability to trigger policies, but also because of its ability to affect and moved debate participants seeking to reconfigure the public space by using Europe as an emotion. However, where do the borders of Europe stop? The issue of contested memories in public spaces goes beyond European boundaries. Are there universal values, norms and emotions framing the global phenomenon of contested

Sherilyn Bouyer

Erasmus University of Rotterdam – Master's thesis History of Society

memories in public spaces? It would be interesting to extend the scope of this thesis and analyse and compare case studies located across the globe.

List of sources

Case study 1: The statue of Jean Baptiste Colbert

Title	Platform	Date	Author	Link
Newspapers articles				
“la dernière rue de Petain va être dépatisée”	<i>L’Express</i>	05.04.2013	AFP	https://www.lexpress.fr/actualite/societe/la-derniere-rue-petaain-en-france-va-etre-debaptisee_1237597.html
« Etats-Unis : pourquoi Charlottesville cristallise la haine de la droite extrême »	Le parisien	13.08.2017	Th.B	http://www.leparisien.fr/faits-divers/etats-unis-pourquoi-charlottesville-cristallise-la-haine-de-la-droite-extreme-13-08-2017-7190445.php
« 1941 : La fonte des statues »	Retronews	08.09.2017	Marina Bellot	https://www.retronews.fr/conflits-et-relations-internationales/echo-de-presse/2017/09/08/1941-la-fonte-des-statues
“Lee, Colbert, Faidherbe et les autres: Que faire des statues des esclavagistes?”	Rfi: Les voix du monde	20.10.2017	Tirthankar Chanda	http://www.rfi.fr/hebdo/20171020-lee-colbert-faidherbe-statues-esclavagistes-etats-unis-louis-georges-tin-cran-lee
« Christiane Taubira : «Le mythe français de l’égalité, un mythe noble, empêche de revenir sur le crime de l’esclavage» »	Liberation	06.10.2017	Sonya Faure et Catherine Calvet	https://www.liberation.fr/debats/2017/10/06/christiane-taubira-le-mythe-francais-de-l-egalite-un-mythe-noble-empêche-de-revenir-sur-le-crime-de-1601455
« Société Esclavage : Plusieurs personnalités appellent à déboulonner « les statues de la honte » de Colbert »	Minute News	18.09.2017	Flora	https://www.minutenews.fr/actualite/societe/esclavage-plusieurs-personnalites-appellent-a-deboulonner-statues-de-honte-de-colbert-223839.html
« La mémoire de l’esclavage ne devrait pas	<i>Le Monde</i>	23.09.2017	Benoit Hopquin	https://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2017/09/23/la-memoire-de-l-esclavage-ne-devrait-pas-

tomber dans le champ des provocations »				tomber-dans-le-champ-des-provocations_5190173_3232.html
«La guerre des statues n'aura pas lieu »	CQFD	01.2018	Anatole Istria	http://cqfd-journal.org/spip.php?page=pages_mobiles&squelette_mobile=mobile/article&id_article=1894
« Faut-il deboulonner les statues qui glorifient la France coloniale »	FranceTV info	17.03.2019	Pierre Magnan	https://www.francetvinfo.fr/monde/afrique/senegal/faut-il-deboulonner-les-statues-qui-glorifient-la-france-coloniale_3202149.html
« Que faire des statues des négriers français? »	Slate.fr	29.08.2017	Vincent Manilève	http://www.slate.fr/story/150252/villes-francaise-esclavage-memoire?utm_campaign=Echobox&utm_medium=Social&utm_source=Facebook#link_time=1525881868
« En France aussi, il faut enlever les symboles esclavagistes »,	Huffington Post	19.09.2017	Moïse Marthelly	https://www.huffingtonpost.fr/moise-marthelly/en-france-aussi-il-faut-enlever-les-symboles-esclavagistes_a_23213119/
«De Charlottesville a Colbert: Faut-il deboulonner tous les personnages historiques qui derangent? »	Marianne	4.09.2017	Hadrien Mathoux	https://www.marianne.net/politique/de-charlottesville-colbert-faut-il-deboulonner-tous-les-personnages-historiques-qui
«Faut-il debaptiser les lieux publics Colbert»	Histoire coloniale	11.10.2017	X	https://histoirecoloniale.net/Faut-il-debaptiser-les-lieux-publics-Colbert.html
« Charlottesville : pourquoi la statue du général Lee fait polémique »	Le Journal de Dimanche	16.08.2017	Redaction JDD	https://www.lejdd.fr/International/charlottesville-pourquoi-la-statue-du-general-lee-fait-polemique-3412646
« Napoléon, Colbert, Robespierre et les autres... Faut-il déboulonner	L'OBS	22.11.2017	François Reynaert	https://www.nouvelobs.com/histoire/20171121.OBS7624/napoleon-colbert-robepierre-et-les-autres-faut-il-deboulonner-nos-grands-hommes.html

nos grands hommes ? »				
« Les statues des soldats confédérés tombent après les violences de Charlottesville »	France 24	15.08.2017	Chloé Rochereuil	https://www.france24.com/fr/20170815-statues-soldats-confederes-tombent-apres-violences-charlottesville
« Vos heros sont parfois nos bourreaux »	<i>Liberation</i>	28.08.2017	Louis Georges Tin	https://www.liberation.fr/debats/2017/08/28/vos-heros-sont-parfois-nos-bourreaux_1592510
«Mémoire de l’esclavage: « Débaptisons les collèges et les lycées Colbert ! »	Le Monde	19.09.2017	Louis Georges Tin and Louis Sala Molins	https://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2017/09/17/debaptisons-les-colleges-et-les-lycees-colbert_5186813_3232.html
« Travail de mémoire et histoire : Faut-il débaptiser les lieux publics Colbert ? »	Humanite	03.10.2017	Françoise Vergès	https://www.humanite.fr/travail-de-memoire-et-histoire-faut-il-debaptiser-les-lieux-publics-colbert-642923
TV debates				
28 minutes	Arte	12.10.2017	Leonora Miao	Access through Facebook
« Débat de la semaine : Faut-il déboulonner les statues »	C Politique, France 5	26.11.2017	With Karim Rissouli, Rokhaya Diallo, Alain Filkielkraut , Charlotte Girard, Thomas Snegaroff	https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=1716404318400892
La 1ere	France TV		With Louis Georges Tin and Dimitri Casalli	Access through Facebook
Le monde de Macron	Les grandes gueules, RMC/Numero 23	19.09.2017	Olivier Truchot and Alain Marshall	Access through Facebook
“Match des idées”	On va plus loin, Public Senat	20.09.2017	With Rebecca Fitoussi;	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0f8ijX5WkBE

			François d'Orcival and Louis Georges Tin	
Fait du jour	TV5 Monde	19.09.2017	Louis Georges Tin and Dimitri Casalli	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IL4r55jIF8Y
Radio debates				
“Hondelatte raconte”	Europe 1	21.09.2017	With Christophe Hondelatte ,Robert Menard and Rokhaya Diallo	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qZrdeqatHI4&t=10s
« Faut-il déboulonner les statues de Colbert »	Radio NotreDame	19.09.2017	With Marine Rosset and Charlotte d'Ornellas	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r5OUdq-olbM
Bourdin Direct	RMC	20.09.2017	With Bourdin, Louis Georges Tin and audience	Access through Facebook
Further sources:				
Interview: Louis Georges Tin, conducted on the 13.03.2019 Data extracted from social media on Twitter and Facebook of users commenting on newspapers article or TV and radio debates published on these platforms.				
« Histoire du Palais Bourbon et de l'hôtel de Lassay”	Assemblée Nationale	Accessed 10.04.2019	Assemblée Nationale	http://www2.assemblee-nationale.fr/decouvrir-l-assemblee/patrimoine/palais-bourbon-et-hotel-de-lassay
“Vos héros sont nos bourreaux. De Charlottesville à Paris : cessez de célébrer les esclavagistes !”	CRAN	23.08.2017	Louis Georges Tin	https://le-cran.fr/vos-heros-sont-nos-bourreaux-de-charlottesville-a-paris-cessez-de-celebrer-les-esclavagistes/
Modalités de dénomination d'un lieu public	Senat.fr	11.08.2016	Ministere de l'Interieur	https://www.senat.fr/questions/base/2015/qSEQ150917787.html

Case study 2: The statue of Francisco Franco, Melilla

Title	Platform	Date	Author	Link
Media articles				
“Franco symbols live on in Spain 40 years after his death”	The local.es	08.02.2019	AFP	https://www.thelocal.es/20150309/franco-symbols-live-on-in-spain-40-years-after-his-death
“Equo denuncia que Melilla se niega a cumplir la Ley de Memoria Histórica”	Diariosur.es	15.11.2013	Agencia EFE	https://www.diariosur.es/agencias/20131115/local/melilla/equo-denuncia-melilla-niega-cumplir_201311151704.html
“Imbroda: “No soy franquista, pero la estatua es por quienes salvaron a Melilla en 1921”	El faro de Melilla	25.10.2016	Rebeca Alcantara,	https://elfarodemelilla.es/imbroda-no-franquista-la-estatua-quienes-salvaron-melilla-1921/
“Los antidisturbios de la Guardia Civil en Melilla se fotografían ante la estatua de Franco”	Eldiario.es	11.06.2015	Pedro Águeda	https://www.eldiario.es/politica/antidisturbios-Guardia-Civil-Franco-Melilla_0_397561208.html
“Una de Memoria Histórica: Melilla le debe la vida a Franco”	Eldebate.es	09.01.2019	Alfonso Basallo	https://eldebate.es/rigor-historico/una-de-memoria-historica-melilla-le-debe-la-vida-a-franco-20190109
« Reportaje: Caza a los símbolos del franquismo todavía presentes en España”	Milenio	11.03.2015	Ingrid Bazinet	https://www.milenio.com/internacional/reportaje-caza-simbolos-franquismo-presentes-espana
“Facing up to Franco: Spain 40 years on”	<i>Financial Times</i>	08.05.2015	Tobias Buck	https://www.ft.com/content/5e4e6aac-f42f-11e4-99de-00144feab7de

“Melilla: un parque temático franquista”	Infolibre	22.11.2017	Salvador Carnicero	https://www.infolibre.es/noticias/politica/2017/11/22/la_estatua_melilla_uno_los_ultimos_vestigios_franco_estas_son_las_huellas_borradas_las_que_quedan_por_borrar_72225_1012.html
“La Fiscalía archiva la denuncia de Equo contra Imbroda por mantener monumentos franquistas”	Melilla Hoy	19.08.2016	Nerea de Tena Álvarez	https://www.melillahoy.es/noticia/75716/politica/la-fiscalia-archiva-la-denuncia-de-equo-contra-imbroda-por-mantener-monumentos-franquistas.html
“Melilla retira el monumento franquista Héroes de España”	<i>El Confidencial</i>	12.08.2017	EC	https://www.elconfidencial.com/espana/2017-08-12/retirada-de-simbolos-franquistas_1428254/
“Podemos pide la retirada de la estatua de Franco ubicada en Melilla”	<i>Europa Press</i>	27.07.2015	Europa Press	https://www.europapress.es/ceuta-y-melilla/noticia-podemos-pide-retirada-estatua-franco-ubicada-melilla-20150727200132.html
“PSOE pide quitar la estatua de Franco "para que Melilla no sea el último vestigio del fascismo en Europa”	<i>Eldiario.es</i>	21.11.2017	Europa Press	https://www.eldiario.es/politica/PSOE-Franco-Melilla-vestigio-Europa_0_710430212.html
“Melilla burla reiteradamente la Ley de Memoria Histórica”	Publico	01.10.2009	Jose Pablo Garcia	https://www.publico.es/actualidad/melilla-burla-reiteradamente-ley-memoria.html
“European parliament names Franco foundation in fascist group ban call”,	<i>Euroweeklynews</i>	26.10.2018	Joe Gerrard,	https://www.euroweeklynews.com/2018/10/26/european-parliament-names-franco-foundation-in-fascist-group-ban-call/#.XM7ouJV7k3E

“Donde están las estatuas que Honraban a Franco?”	Publico	17.12.2017	Julia Gonzalez Ubeda	https://www.publico.es/politica/memoria-historica-estatuas-honraban-franco.html
“Ranz amplía a 167 municipios de Castilla y León su demanda contra la simbología franquista”	<i>La Nueva Cronica</i>	16.10.2016	E.F Gordon	https://www.lanuevacronica.com/ranz-amplia-a-167-municipios-de-castilla-y-leon-su-demanda-contra-la-simbologia-franquista
“Melilla defiende por vía judicial la última estatua de Franco”	<i>El país</i>	20.11.2017	Javier Guzman	https://elpais.com/elpais/2017/08/23/videos/1503498176_527481.html
“Cumplir la ley de Memoria Historica en Melilla depende de que la gente lo quiera”	El faro de Melilla	24.02.2017	Jose Jamon Urtasun	https://elfarodemelilla.es/cumplir-la-ley-memoria-historica-melilla-depende-la-gente-lo-quiera/
What is left of Franco’s legacy?”	<i>El pais</i>	02/04/2019	J. Jiménez Gálvez ; Isabel Valdés Aragonés	https://elpais.com/elpais/2015/11/20/inenglish/1448008408_633418.html?rel=mas?rel=mas
“La Fundación Franco y otras siete asociaciones fascistas que perviven en España y que el Gobierno quiere ilegalizar”	<i>El diario.es</i>	11.07.2018	Juan Miguel Baquero	https://www.eldiario.es/sociedad/fundaciones-Francisco-Franco-Gobierno-ilegalizar_0_791621665.html
“La última estatua de Franco que el ‘popular’ Imbroda se niega a retirar”	<i>Nuevatribuna.es</i>		Nueva Tribuna.es	https://www.nuevatribuna.es/articulo/sociedad/ultima-estatua-franco-popular-imbroda-niega-retirar/20161123174143134093.html
“Melilla condena por no aplicar la ley de la Memoria histórica”	Cadena Ser	21.10.2016	Alfonso Ojea	http://cadenaser.com/ser/2016/10/21/tribunales/1477052504_142087.html

“Melilla mantendrá una estatua de Franco”	<i>La Vanguardia</i>	14.10.2017	Redacción	https://www.lavanguardia.com/vida/20071014/53401994850/melilla-mantendra-una-estatua-de-franco.html
“Podemos critica al PP por “exponer a Melilla” al recuerdo del franquismo”	Melilla Hoy	23.10.2016	Redacción Melilla Hoy	https://www.melillahoy.es/noticia/78603/politica/podemos-critica-al-pp-por-exponer-a-melilla-al-recuerdo-del-franquismo.html
“VOX Melilla se muestra en contra de la exhumación de los restos de Franco”	Melilla Hoy	22.10.2018	Redacción Melilla Hoy	https://www.melillahoy.es/noticia/108555/politica/vox-melilla-se-muestra-en-contra-de-la-exhumacion-de-los-restos-de-franco-.html
“Sabrina Moh insta a la ciudad a cumplir la ley de Memoria Historica”	Melilla Hoy	2.07.2018	Paqui Sanchez T.	https://www.melillahoy.es/noticia/106760/politica/sabrina-moh-insta-a-la-ciudad-a-cumplir-la-ley-de-memoria-historica.html
“Spain removes last Franco statue from mainland”	<i>The Guardian</i>	18.12.2008	Giles Tremlett	https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/dec/18/franco-statue-spain
“En Melilla no hay catálogo de vestigios que exaltan la dictadura”	El faro de Melilla	08.06.2016	Manuel Vega	https://elfarodemelilla.es/en-melilla-no-hay-catalogo-de-vestigios-que-exaltan-la-dictadura/
Further sources:				
“El homenaje al comandante Franco es la única estatua que no ha sido retirada de la vía pública. A la Memoria Histórica sólo le queda Melilla...”	Asociación La Memoria Viva	21.10.2010	D. Mazón / C. Gullón	https://lamemoriaviva.wordpress.com/2010/03/21/el-homenaje-al-comandante-franco-es-la-unica-estatua-que-no-ha-sido-retirada-de-la-via-publica-a-la-memoria-historica-solo-le-queda-melilla/
Tag Francisco Franco	Asociación Memoria Histórica	-	-	https://memoriahistorica.org.es/tag/francisco-franco/

Memorias de la guerra civil y el Franquismo Estudio nº 2.760	CIS, Centro de Investigaciones sociológicas	Abril 2008	-	
Catalogo monumentos, placas y escudios preconstitucional es. Ciudad Autonoma de Melilla	Ciudad Autonoma de Melilla. Consejeria de Cultura y Festejos	“Elaborado entre 2009-2016”	-	
“Equo Melilla le pide al Presidente que deje de engañar a los melillenses con los monumentos franquistas”	Equo Melilla	25.10.2016	Equo Melilla	http://melilla.partidoequo.es/?p=952
Memoria historica party file	Equo Melilla	21.03.2019	Equo Melilla	Personal communication
TAG Franco Melilla	Federación estatal de foro por la memoria	-	-	https://www.foroporlamemoria.info/2014/07/cubren-la-estatua-de-franco-en-melilla-por-aniversario-de-la-guerra-civil/
Ley Memoria Historica	Gobierno Justicia	2007	-	https://leymemoria.mjusticia.gob.es/cs/Satellite/LeyMemoria/es/memoria-historica-522007
“Gonzo entrevista al abogado Eduardo Ranz para hablar de Memoria Histórica”	La Sexta	14.04.2016	Gonzo	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lyjWQgSg9k0
« Moh: “Melilla es una ciudad moderna y europea, no puede ser el último bastión del franquismo” »	Melilla PSOE	26.10.2016	Melilla PSOE	http://web.psoe.es/melilla/news/835206/page/moh-melilla-una-ciudad-moderna-europea-puede-ser-ultimo-bastion-del-franquismo.html
“Estatua Francisco Franco”	TripAdvisor	Last accessed		https://www.tripadvisor.fr/Attraction_Review-g187515-d8299367-

		02.06. 2019	Reviews- Estatua de Franco- Melilla.html
Interview: Eduardo Ranz, 28.03.2019 Data extracted from Twitter from users addressing the statue of Franco in Melilla or replying to news reporting on the case.			

Bibliography

- Aguilar Fernandez, Paloma and Carsten Humlebaek. “Collective Memory and National Identity in the Spanish Democracy: The Legacies of Francoism and the Civil War.” *History and Memory* 14, no. 1,2 (2002): 121–164.
- Agulhon, Maurice. “Imagerie civique et décor urbain.” *Ethnologies française.V*, no.1 (1975): 33-56.
- Ahmed, Sara. *The cultural politics of emotions*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Ahmed, Sara. “Affective Economies.” *Social Text* 79, Vol. 22, n. 2 (2004): 117-139.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 2006.
- Antonio Moreno, Jose. “La memoria defrauda: Notas sobre el denominado proyecto de ley de memoria.” *Hispania Nova. Revista de Historia Contemporánea*, no. 6 (2006).
- Assmann, Aleida. “Europe: A community of memory?” *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute*, no. 40 (Spring 2017): 11-26.
- Assmann, Aleida. “Four Formats of Memory: From Individual to Collective Constructions of the Past.’ In *Cultural Memory and Historical Consciousness in the German-Speaking World Since 1500*, edited by Christian Emden and David Midgley, 19-37. Bern: Peter Lang, 2004.
- Blanchard, Pascal and Isabelle Veyrat Masson. *Guerres de mémoires: La France et son histoire*. Paris: Editions La Decouverte, 2008.
- Blight, David B. “The Memory Boom: Why and Why now?” In *Memory in mind and Culture*, edited by Pascal Boyer and James W. Wertsch, 238-252. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- Boyd Carolyn P. "The Politics of History and Memory in Democratic Spain." *AAPSS* 617 (May 2018): 133 – 148.
- Brendese, P.J. *The power of memory in democratic politics*. New York: University of Rochester Press, 2014.
- Brice, Catherine. "Monuments: pacificateurs ou agitateurs de mémoire." In *Les guerres de mémoires*, edited by Pascal Blanchard and Isabelle Veyrat Masson, 199-208. Paris: Editions La Decouverte, 2008.
- Brüggemann, Karsten and Andres Kasekamp. "The politics of history and the War of Monuments in Estonia." *Nationalities Papers*, 36:3 (June 2008): 425 – 448.
- Büttner, Sebastian M.& Anna Delius. "World Culture in European Memory Politics? New European Memory Agents Between Epistemic Framing and Political Agenda Setting." *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23:3 (2015): 391-404.
- Choi, Suhi. "Standing between intransient history and transient memories: The statue of MacArthur in South Korea." *Memory Studies* 7, no. 2 (2014): 191 – 206.
- Confino, Alon. "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method." *The American Historical Review* 102, No. 5 (Dec 1997): 1386-1403.
- Connerton, Paul. *How societies remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Connerton, Paul. "Seven types of forgetting." *Memory studies* 1 n.1 (2008): 59-71.
- Crang, M. and D. Tolia-Kelly. "Nation, Race and Affect: Senses and Sensibilities at National Heritage Sites." *Environment and Planning A* 42, 10 (2017): 2315–2331.
- Descartes René. *The passions of the soul*. Translated by John Cottingham. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Dibbits, H.C, Jasmijn Rana, and M. Willemsen. "Moved by tears of others: emotion networking in the heritage sphere." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 23, no. 10 (August 2010): 977-988.
- Erll, Astrid. *Memory in Culture*. Translated by Sara B. Young. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

- Gregory, K., and A. Witcomb. "Beyond Nostalgia: The Role of Affect in Generating Historical Understanding at Heritage Sites." In *Museum Revolutions: How Museums Change and Are Changed*, edited by S. J. Knell, S. Macleod, and S. Watson, 263-275. Abingdon: Routledge, 2007.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France, 1952.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *La mémoire collective*. Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France, 1967.
- Hasquenoph, Sophie and Serge Barcelinni. *Le devoir de mémoire. Histoire des politiques mémorielles*. Paris: Soteca, 2017.
- Hourcade, Renaud. "Une vie sous la surface des politiques mémorielles: mémoires officielles et mémoires souterraines de l'esclavage." *Nuevo Mundo Mundos Nuevos : Comptes rendus et essais historiographiques* (29 september 2014) <http://journals.openedition.org/nuevomundo/67277>;
DOI:10.4000/nuevomundo.67277
- Johnson, Nuala. "Cast in stone: monuments, geography, and nationalism." *Environment and Planning I: Society and Space* 13 (1995): 51 -65.
- Knudsen Britta, Timm and Carsten Stage. *Affective Methodologies: Developing Cultural Research Strategies for the Study of Affect*. Basingtoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Labanyi, Jo. "The politics of memory in contemporary Spain." *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 9:2(2008): 119-125.
- Ledoux, Sébastien. *Le devoir de mémoire: une formule et son histoire*. Paris: CNRS éditions, 2016.
- Levy, Daniel and Natan Sznaider. "Memory unbound: the Holocaust and the formation of cosmopolitan memory." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 n.1 (2002): 87-106.
- Lutz, Catherine and Lila Abu-Lughod. *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Macdonald, Sharon. "Cosmopolitan Memories." In *Memorylands. Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*, edited by Sharon Macdonald, 188-215. London/New York: Routledge, 2013.

- Michel, Johann. *Gouverner les mémoires: Les politiques mémorielles en France*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 2010.
- Michel, Johann. "L'évolution des politiques mémorielles: l'état et les nouveaux acteurs." *Migrations Société* 6, no 138 (2011): 59 -70.
- Muller, Jan-Werner. "On European Memory: Some conceptual and normative remarks." In *A European Memory? Contested histories and Politics of Remembrance*, edited by Małgorzata Pakier, Bo Stråth, 25-37. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.
- Nora, Pierre. "La mémoire collective." In *La nouvelle histoire*, edited by Jacques Le Goff, 398. Paris: Retz-CEPL, 1978.
- Nora, Pierre. *Les Lieux de mémoire*, 3 tomes. Paris: Gallimard, 1997.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Representations* 26 (1989): 7-24.
- Pakier, Małgorzata, and Bo Stråth. *A European Memory? Contested histories and Politics of Remembrance*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.
- Rigney, Ann. 'The Dynamics of Remembrance: Texts between Monumentality and Morphing.' In *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, edited by Astrid Erll, Ansgar Nünning and Sara B. Young, 345-353. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2008.
- Rousso, Henry. *Face au passé: essais sur la mémoire contemporaine*. Paris: éditions Belin, 2016.
- Rubin, Jonah S. "How Francisco Franco governs from beyond the grave: An infrastructural approach to memory politics in contemporary Spain." *American Ethnologist – Journal of the American ethnological society* 45, no. 2 (2018): 214-227.
- Sevillano Calero, Francisco. "La construcción de la memoria y el olvido en la España democrática.» *Ayer*, no.52 (2003): 297-319.
- Shore, Cris. *Building Europe. The Cultural Politics of European Integration*. Oxford: Routledge, 2000.
- Spohn, Willfried. "National Identities and Collective Memory in an Enlarged Europe." In *Collective Memory and European Identity: The Effects of Integration and Enlargement*, edited by Klaus Eder, 1-14. Aldershot: Taylor and Francis, 2005.

- Stora, Benjamin and Thierry Leclere. *La guerre des mémoires face à son passé colonial*. La Tour d'Aigues: Éditions de l'Aube, 2007.
- Thrift, Nigel. "Intensities of feeling: Towards a spatial politics of affect." *Geografiska annaler* 86, B 1 (2004): 57–78.
- Vergès, Françoise. "Les troubles de la mémoire." *Cahiers d'études africaines* 179,3-4, (2005): 1143-1177.
- Verovsek, Peter J. "Collective memory, politics, and the influence of the past: the politics of memory as a research paradigm." *Politics, Groups and Identities*, 4:3 (2016): 529-543.
- Viejo-Rose, Dacia. *Reconstructing Spain: Cultural Heritage and Memory after Civil War*. Brighton, UK: Sussex Academic Press, 2011.
- Wertsch, James V. *Voices of Collective Remembering*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Wetherell, Margaret. *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*. Sage, London, 2012.
- White, Geoffrey, M. "Emotional Remembering: The Pragmatics of National Memory." *Ethos* 27, No. 4 (December 1999), 505-529.
- Zapico Barbeito, Monica. "Investigating the Crimes of the Franco Regime: Legal Possibilities, Obligations of the Spanish State and Duties Towards the Victims." *International Criminal Law Review* 10 (2010): 243 – 274.

APPENDIXES:

- I- **Photography of the Melilla extreme-right party, Vox, in front of the statue of Franco.**



Source: “VOX Melilla se muestra en contra de la exhumación de los restos de Franco “, *Melilla Hoy*, accessed 05.04.2019, <https://www.melillahoy.es/noticia/108555/politica/vox-melilla-se-muestra-en-contra-de-la-exhumacion-de-los-restos-de-franco-.html>

- II- Photography of the statue of Franco in Melilla, covered with a black cloth as an homage to the victims of the Spanish Civil War, on the anniversary of the beginning of the war.**



Source: "Cubren la estatua de Franco en Melilla por aniversario de la Guerra Civil", *Foro por la memoria*, last accessed 02.04.2019, <https://www.foroporlamemoria.info/2014/07/cubren-la-estatua-de-franco-en-melilla-por-aniversario-de-la-guerra-civil/>

III- Photography of members of the Melilla Guardia Civil, posing in front of the statue of Franco, Melilla.



Source: Pedro Agueda, “Los antidisturbios de la Guardia Civil en Melilla se fotografían ante la estatua de Franco”, *El diario.es*, June 11, 2015 https://www.eldiario.es/politica/antidisturbios-Guardia-Civil-Franco-Melilla_0_397561208.html