

# DISTINGUISHED LECTURES



Robert Schuman Centre  
*for advanced studies*

The Ursula Hirschmann Annual Lecture on  
Gender and Europe

**Luisa Passerini**

**Women in Europe, Women in Love:  
Searching for New Forms of Subjectivity**



European  
University  
Institute

ISSN 1830-155X

**EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE, FLORENCE**  
**ROBERT SCHUMAN CENTRE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES**

**The Ursula Hirschmann Annual Lecture on Gender and Europe**

*Women in Europe, Women in Love:  
Searching for New Forms of Subjectivity*

**LUISA PASSERINI**

Professor at the Kulturwissenschaftliches Institut, Essen, Germany,  
and Università di Torino, Italy

European University Institute, Florence  
20 May 2003

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed or utilised in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, or otherwise, without the prior permission in writing from the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies.

Download and print of the electronic edition for personal non commercial use is permitted on fair use grounds:  
one readable copy per machine and one printed copy per page.  
Each copy should include the notice of copyright.

Permission for quotation should be addressed to the author(s) through the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies.  
Source should be acknowledged.

ISSN 1830-155X

© 2005 Luisa Passerini and the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

Printed in Italy in April 2005  
European University Institute  
Badia Fiesolana  
I – 50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)  
Italy

<http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/publications/>

The **Ursula Hirshmann Annual Lecture Series on Gender and Europe** is the annual lecture of the Gender Studies Programme of the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies. The series seeks to stimulate research and thinking which link ideas about Europe and the study of gender.

Named after Ursula Hirschmann, who created the group *Femmes pour l'Europe* in Brussels in 1975 as a space to reflect on, critique and contribute to the contemporary debate on the construction of Europe, the series is a reminder of this engagement. Ursula Hirschmann was born in Berlin in 1913, to a Jewish family, and when the Nazis seized power in Germany, she migrated first to France and then to Italy. In 1941 she played an important role in the creation and diffusion of Spinelli's *Ventotene Manifesto*. She married two anti-Fascists and Europeanists, Eugenio Colorni and Altiero Spinelli. Some of her autobiographical writings have been published as *Noi senza patria* (Bologna, Il Mulino, 1993).

The Gender Studies Programme was established at the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies at the European University Institute in October 2000, and builds on over a decade's work in this field at the EUI. The Programme's general objectives are to support and develop the scholarly work of research students, fellows, academic staff and visitors to the EUI in the study of gender, and to stimulate interdisciplinary work across the EUI's four teaching departments. In addition to the Annual Lecture, the Programme holds regular seminars and workshops organized around various themes, often in collaboration with the departments.

The EUI and the RSCAS are not responsible for the opinions expressed by the author(s).



# LECTURE

by

**Luisa Passerini**

Professor at the Kulturwissenschaftliches Institut, Essen, Germany,  
and Università di Torino, Italy

## **Women in Europe, Women in Love: Searching for New Forms of Subjectivity**

### **Introduction<sup>1</sup>**

It is a particular pleasure to have the opportunity to deliver this lecture in this context. As many of you already know, I was the founding director of the Gender Studies Programme in the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies in October 2001, under the directorship of Yves Mény. Together with Dawn Lyon as programme co-ordinator, we embarked upon the ambitious project of creating a stronger institutional space for gender studies at the Institute. The continuation of this lecture series bears witness to those efforts.

This lecture is composed of three parts, expressing three different directions of research that stem from the conceptual triangle Europe/love/gender. This triangle seems to me of the utmost theoretical and historical interest, because it questions the role of women and men in both the public and the private sphere, the public one being represented by Europe and the private by love. When I say 'love' in this talk, I mean to indicate a specific form of love, the passion uniting/dividing the couple, whether heterosexual or homosexual. It is in this sense that love has been associated with Europeanness, and this type of love has been used as a metaphor for public love, such as the kind that holds a community together, from the town to the nation.

The first part of this lecture focuses on the historical connections between the two first terms of the triangle, i.e. Europe and love, connections that require a critique of the form of Eurocentrism that developed in this field. The second part, on the reciprocal implications between the first and the third terms, seeks to gender the concept of the 'good European' and to remind us of some contributions made by women to Europeanness and Europeanism and to love. The third part, based on an ongoing research project, reunites the three terms by taking into consideration present-day (and recent past) forms of women's subjectivity in their movements between the Eastern and Western parts of Europe. The three parts, although they show the multiplicity of approaches that are necessary in cultural history in order to study that conceptual triangle, converge on the interest that it has for us to understand what forms women's subjectivity takes today in its public and private forms.

The need to go through these three steps can be summarised as follows. In the first step, the notion of the European subject must be considered from the point of view of a critical history. This subject has been understood in the past as male and white, and its Europeanness has been modelled likewise, reserving to women a secondary role. Similarly, disparate roles have been assigned to genders in the field of love; even feminism, while criticising this whole conception, has found it difficult to come up with a notion of the female subject capable at the same time of love and Europeanness. Therefore, it is particularly necessary to discover the ways in which women have experienced their being European and subjects of the love discourse, in order to change our vision of both. This will be done here by taking into consideration, in the second step, some Western European women who in the twentieth century were exemplary in these respects; therefore, while the first part of this lecture is developed in terms of intellectual history, the second is based on the biographical approach. Finally, the third part looks at contemporary women from Eastern and Western Europe, not famous like the previous ones, and approached with the method of oral history. This last part has to take the form of notes, which will be developed in the further stages of an ongoing research. The three steps in this lecture also show some possible articulations of the historical discipline in contributing to the study of women and of Europe.

## **I. The European Subject, Love and Feminism**

The point of departure is the critique of a discourse that was dominant in the last two and a half centuries, starting from the Enlightenment. According to this narrative, first courtly and then romantic love were invented by Europeans and transmitted to other continents and cultures that had not yet reached such a high level of heterosexual relationships (Passerini 1999).

This first part is needed in order to deconstruct Eurocentric and essentialist assumptions that are present in many ways in this discourse. The critique must be directed to a double essentialism, the one in conceptualising Europe and the other in conceptualising love. Europeanness has often been defined on the basis of contents that have been appropriated and monopolised, transforming the place of their historical genesis—Europe—into the exclusive owner of many values, among them primarily democracy and equality. ‘Critique of essentialism’ in this case means not only doing a deconstruction at the theoretical level, but also analysing the historicity of ‘European’ values, and studying the historical and spatial meaning of European diversity rather than extolling it as a sign of superiority.

As far as love is concerned, a typical contradiction of traditional European essentialism used to have to do with women: on the one hand asserting that love and peace pertain to the feminine essence, therefore connecting love more with women than with men; on the other hand denying women the position of the subject of the love discourse, apart from a few ‘*grandes amoureuses*’, exceptional women such as Héloïse or Rousseau’s Julie, who paid a very high price for this pre-eminent role, and some poets and mystics. However, even the role of the love poet was not always possible for women, as shown by the insistence in denying for a long time the existence of the *trobairitz*, and attributing their works to men under pseudonyms.

The connection Europe/love has been traditionally envisaged on the basis of a division of roles between male and female dominant in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup>. According to it, the subject of the European love discourse can only be a man, white and often Christian (or lay in an anti-Christian way); women can only be the object of such a love discourse, displaying that kind of ‘passive seduction’ that confirms the roles (Dauphin & Farge 2001).

In the dominant discourse connecting love and Europe, love was understood in a double sense, as private and as political. The former was supposed, in an essentialist perspective, to be the basis of the second. It was the competence of ‘woman’ in motherhood and private relationships that allowed her to become also a bearer of political love, and became the foundation of her efforts as an agent of social assistance and political peace. There is a large documentation on this attitude in the sciences of anthropology, psychology and sociology at the turn from the 19<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> century: from Cesare Lombroso in Italy (Babini, Minuz & Tagliavini 1989) to Charles Turgeon in France (Rochefort 2001), the scientists shared a definition of ‘woman’ that condemned any breaking of the rigid boundaries between the sexes, including of course homosexuality (Milletti 1994). The singular (‘woman’) was equivalent to denying the capacity for individualisation—therefore pluralisation—on the part of women. For positivists, the inferiority of ‘woman’ was not simply biological, it was moral; of course this inferiority is anchored in biology, because it is the fact of being tied to the biological destiny of producing children that makes ‘woman’ less capable of moral responsibility, and incapable of creativity and genius, unless she resembles a man. Her task is, besides bearing children (without maternity she is not a real woman), to provide material and intellectual assistance to great men. It should be remembered that these positions were shared by intelligent and progressive women of the epoch such as Lombroso’s daughters (Dolza 1990). They were less feminist, in spite of being emancipated women, than some of the men who were their contemporaries.

While there is no space here to develop the issue of race, I will mention at least that in this division of gender roles true masculinity—defined as a mixture of potency and moderation—was in European civilisation reserved for white males. The ‘others’, such as Jews, blacks and *mestizos*, were seen as oscillating between impotence or passivity, on the one hand, and lubricity or extreme lust, on the other; such a double condition was often attributed to women as well. In sexual terms, the position of the ‘other’ races was therefore often assimilated to a sort of feminisation. While the extreme versions of this view are to be found in various forms of fascism, it is easy to discover traces of similar convictions even in the liberal versions of masculinity and in the common attitudes of European males.

Femininity and masculinity, in the forms we know them now, are cultural and social constructs of very *longue durée*, cultural and social ways of understanding the biological. Thus we envisage femininity and masculinity no longer as the essences pertaining respectively to women and men, but rather as the poles of a continuum along which individuals negotiate and combine their own forms of gender identification. This means, as psychoanalysis on the one hand and the women’s and gay movements on the other have claimed, that inside every man there is a feminine aspect and inside every woman a masculine one. Saying that every human being is gendered does not mean merely that s/he is a woman or a man, but that s/he partakes of both, and may possibly alternate these



two statuses in her/his life, constructing her/his gender-belonging in a sequence that does not need to be coherent.

A further consequence of this anti-essentialist approach is that the dichotomy women/men is relativised as far as the position of the subject goes. The individual subject can recognise the conditions under which it lives and decide to try to change some that oppress it. After using the female and male pronouns and possessives, I have now gone to adopting the neuter. In fact, my perspective includes the possibility for the subject to step sideways from, if not out of, the gender dichotomy as it is traditionally formulated—the opposition of ‘she’ and ‘he’—and take the position of an ‘it’ (Passerini 1990). It is a discursive position I am talking about, the discourse of a subject talking from outside, or before, its determination as a she or a he, the zero or negative point as theorised by Maurice Blanchot, a mere possibility, perhaps never fully realised at the social level, but somehow attainable at the discursive level. To give an example, the love discourse, as spoken by the subject put on stage by Roland Barthes, is at the same time clearly homosexual and yet sometimes devoid of gender determinations, as its words can be recognised by innumerable human beings, capable of combining masculine and feminine in innumerable variations.

The actual processes of gendering are very complex in terms of cultural history. For instance, some of the Europeanists I have been studying developed theories of the connections between Europe and love from a male perspective, while at the same time acknowledging the ‘feminine’ component of their personality, which they recognised as precisely what allowed them a special sensitivity towards love.

The rigidity in assigning gender roles was challenged by feminism, including the attitude towards love. Both the scientific debate and common opinion posed feminism and femininity as contradictory, assuming the opposition of ‘*égalité des sexes et charme féminin, émancipation des femmes et séduction*’ (Rochefort, 214). The first wave of feminism had to face the accusation that by making women identical to men, it was bringing to a violent end seduction, love and desire, defined as the heart of European civilisation. First-wave feminism was divided: some feminists judged ‘frivolous’ women and their desire to seduce very severely; some on the contrary saw the de-eroticisation of relationships with men as a liberation, a way of giving women a true individuality. Others however, like Marguerite Durand, the French journalist known for her charm and beauty, but also for her fight in defence of Dreyfus, wanted to appropriate seduction; the militancy of women in her newspaper *La Fronde* (1890s) was opposed to austerity, while advocating freedom for women. From here to envisaging a new conception of love, including sexuality but also friendship, esteem, self-discovery, there was just one step—made by feminist novels of the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. Women’s freedom and the refusal to give up seduction seemed then to be able to go hand in hand.

Things were not so simple. The totalitarian regimes between the wars suppressed or distorted the prospect of emancipation for women, imposing coercive forms of modernisation that continued to keep their lives centred on home and motherhood. In democratic countries limitations were still strong; for instance in a country like France suffrage was granted only after the Second World War, while processes of modernisation involving women and the domestic spheres came about in social and economic areas.

Specifically in that period, the ideology of Europeanism gave women not only the usual object-position in private relationships, but also a specific subordinated role in public affairs. An example from the history of the ideas on European unity: Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, creator of Pan-Europa, after proposing (in 1923) a federation of European states based on economic and political co-operation, also theorised (Coudenhove-Kalergi 1927) that the European soul could be saved from its deep crisis only by rescuing ‘the highest good and value of Europe’, i.e. love, from the threat of being replaced by mere sexuality. This could be done, according to Coudenhove-Kalergi, only by restoring the difference between women and men, i.e. between fighters and mothers. Women could then be entrusted with the political mission of peace to be undertaken following ‘the logic of the heart’. They were to fight for the peace of the whole world, working hand in hand with their ‘American sisters’.

Here again we have encountered essentialism in the definition of gender relationships and gender roles in Europeanism. While today we reject this approach, we do not wish to deny the great contributions of many women to the cause of peace and Europeanness in the same period when Coudenhove-Kalergi was writing. The League of Nations based in Geneva was to some extent a vehicle for the specific interests of women’s organisations in Europe, who turned to the League on the basis of the consideration that women, being denied forms of citizenship such as suffrage, had no ‘fatherland’. Members of the International Women’s League for Peace and Freedom, who had advocated female suffrage during the First World War, regarded the League as their particular cause. Feminists exploited the existence of the League of Nations to promote married women’s nationality rights and to raise international awareness of the ‘white slave trade’. All this ‘merely extended the familiar role of woman as social pacifier’ (Caine & Sluga 2000), while at the same time in most of Europe the ‘new woman’, i.e. the one emancipated in various forms, was regarded as the explicit antagonist of the male hero. Returning soldiers from the First World War perceived the new public roles of women, emerging from the responsibilities women had taken up on the domestic front, as a threat to their status as men.

During that war, and again in the Second World War, women took up roles of resistants and combatants, while at the same time not abandoning, even in battle, the roles of mothers and carers. In the second half of the century, while the European Community and then Union was being constructed, going from the economic to the political sphere (and here too women were present, as the example of *Femmes pour l’Europe* shows), the process of women’s emancipation in most European countries accelerated. This was true first of all in the economic and social fields—women at the forefront of consumption and increasingly engaged in work outside the domestic sphere, in the 1950s and early 1960s—and in the late 1960s also in politics, but with the intent to change the very definition of what politics is.

Second-wave feminism encountered the same dilemmas as the first wave. Feminists in the 1970s criticised romantic love as ‘the pivot of women’s oppression’, considering ‘romanticism as a cultural tool of male power to keep women from knowing their condition’ (Firestone 1970), since its false idealisation concealed gender inferiority through the so-called ‘pedestal treatment’. In this perspective, gender and class conspired to sustain romantic love and its deceptions. For Germaine Greer romantic love—originating as idle adulterous fantasies of the nobility—replaced parental coercion when the Protestant middle classes started abandoning arranged marriages in favour of free and

equal unions; in that sense romantic love was a prelude to the ‘establishment marriages’ of modern times. Juliet Mitchell then changed the territory of the polemics observing that at the end of sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries women became the object of the romantic tale, while previously the subject of passion was man. Therefore the romance shifted from being about a male sexual subject to being about a woman—considered as the object of love and sex. In the course of this process, romantic love shifted from oppositional, adulterous love in the Middle Ages to becoming part of a conformist marital love in modern times and to the massification of culture represented by popular fiction and TV serials. Altogether, these feminist scholars did not challenge the Eurocentric paradigm of romantic love; the male subject was implicitly European or Western, but no explicit criticism went in this direction, which remains an important one for future research and debate to explore.

Feminism in Europe was colour-blind for a long time. Even the radical feminism of the 1970s and 1980s was equally blind, convinced as we were of the certainty of a universal sisterhood based on individuality. Not that we did not understand that the process of becoming a full subject also implied conflicts among women; but we did not yet consider race a dimension of feminist politics. I believe that this was a type of ethnocentrism, in the sense that we did not question the way we were seen by other cultures; we assumed that every woman could follow the same path to her own emancipation, i.e. the reference to self-experience made possible by the solidarity of the small group and the movement. This attitude implied taking for granted the fact of being ‘white’ and not even imagining that this could impinge on our way of perceiving or conceptualising universality. That is why it is of the utmost importance that feminists are producing analyses of what whiteness means in Europe today (Griffin-Braidotti 2003), or of the forms of racism that migrants encounter in Europe (Brah 1993; Essed 1995).

An important role in redefining eroticism was played in the feminist movement by radical lesbians. I believe that some of the dilemmas exposed by Elizabeth Wilson in the 1980s, when she was explaining her being a lesbian but refusing to consider lesbianism as a solution to heterosexuality or as the transcendent moment of sisterhood or as the desexualised version of homosexuality, are still true: ‘I could never identify with the feminist ideal woman—affirmative, woman-loving, positive, strong’, writes Wilson, ‘I always wanted my lover to be *other*, not like me’. Rightly she brings out the issue of lesbian sadomasochism, and therefore implicitly, I would say, of the death drive and its link with the pleasure drive. Wilson does not care so much about sadomasochism as about romanticism—but the two may well be linked. She sees ‘romance as the refined thrill of psychic pain, and a pornography of the feelings’, in which emotions replace sexual parts: ‘romantic passion is transformation, the secularisation of spiritual impulses that once expressed themselves in mysticism, ritual and magic’. What reappears in the problematic relationship between love and feminism is the dark side, the forbidden, including violence and subjection—rejected or ignored by the puritanical as well as the optimistic-naïve sides of feminism.

Still in 1993, such an important feminist and political theorist as Geneviève Fraisse could write a relevant essay on the ‘supposed incompatibility between love and feminism’. According to Fraisse, the old antifeminist imaginary is still alive, in the assumption that feminism kills the amorous game. The first cause of incompatibility is the confusion between justice and love: feminists are still divided, as they share two

opposite traditions: that of free love and displaying of passions—Fourier—as well as that advocating laws and institutions protecting women from male abuses—Proudhon. In both traditions, love has to do with a better world, a justice transforming even love relationships. But in this way feminism easily falls into normativity and moralism; it does not accept the side of love which has to do with disorder, excess, conflict. In other words it ignores the lessons of Sade and Jarry, says Fraisse, who much like Wilson brings up the issue of sadomasochism.

Again, I would say, we are confronted with the link between love and violence, or death. I would like to recall that love, as in the Persian tale of Leyla and Majnun or the European one of Tristan and Isolde, can be a dangerous antisocial folly and contiguous to death. At this point, we can no longer have a rosy eirenic image of love, rather a problematic one: love can also be also a disruptive force, in as far as, redesigning the borders of the self through the identification with the other, a specific other, it can lead to enrichment but also to loss. This perhaps is one of the positions where the neuter reappears: the pre- and anti-social position of despair and loneliness.

The line of research I have briefly sketched intends to illustrate the situatedness of love, and the situatedness of Europe. It aims at situating and historicising the so-called universal abstract subject, not only by showing the limitations of its conceptualisation in the past, but also by showing historically that Europeans have been and can now more and more be of various colours or gender positions, and of different religions, or no religion at all. Breaking the essentialist links, between woman/love/peace and between the European subject/male/white/Christian, for the sake of situatedness allows us to see new links, between freedom and pleasure, between emancipation and love, for women as well as for men.

Situatedness can also be found in the study of individual cases, showing some historical examples of women as full subjects of thought, decisions and emotions.

## II. Gendering the ‘Great European’

The theme of the ‘great European’ is recurrent in the history of European culture. It was used in the past to indicate a man of high culture who supported peace and solidarity among European nations, had a deep sense of European culture, and was able to find himself equally at ease in many European capitals, from Paris to Vienna, from London to Berlin, because he knew many languages and could count on networks all over Europe, which allowed him to have interlocutors in various cities. This European community was based on contacts created and granted by publications and/or initiatives in the fields of art and music. Women were not excluded from these circles, since they ran salons and in the twentieth century increasingly played a role in publishing houses, bookshops, galleries. However, I have never encountered the term ‘great European’ applied to a woman. I have found it used for Emile Verhaeren by Stefan Zweig and for Zweig himself by Jules Romain, for Goethe by André Suarès, as well as by many for Denis de Rougemont. Even for a young man like Leo Ferrero, who died at 30 years of age, the obituaries included expressions such as: ‘he was on the way to becoming a great European’. But I have not yet found the term used for women. In the case of Louise Weiss, she has been simply called ‘*l’européenne*’, the European woman (as she called herself in the title of her

autobiography), as if the mere fact of being actively engaged in Europeanism were to be considered exceptional for a woman.

In this part, I will briefly mention some of the women who would deserve that title, whether they are well or little known or unknown, in order to show the changes that gendering could bring into the very concept of the ‘great European’, and to indicate the multiplicity and variety of the contributions to Europeanness made by women. The ones I chose, who were either Europeanist or who simply felt European and made it explicit, were all, because of the chronological framework of my own research, born before the First World War; but I am sure that many could be found in other historical periods, if one searched for them.

The first is **Margaret Storm Jameson**, essayist and writer, born in Yorkshire and ‘grown up to understand and love Europe while remaining loyal to her roots: “I am a little Englander on one side (the left, the side of the heart) and on the other I try to be a good European”’ (Jameson 1984). She was active in the peace conferences in the 1930s and in the federalist movement; she criticised anti-Semitism, helped refugees from Germany, and supported the emancipation of colonies. Storm Jameson pleaded for public opinion to accept the necessity of taking the first steps towards a European union, in a process to be started by England and aiming at a Europe in which all people and especially children would enjoy the same degree of comfort and security. Thus she believed in reconstructing and developing certain social services in Europe, such as communications and medicine. Storm Jameson was not a feminist; she had never thought of herself as either male or female and she wrote: ‘You just go on with what you have to do’ (Passerini 1999). However, she challenged any traditional definition of the feminine, expressing irony towards the traditional image of women at the service of a political cause. Love for her was mainly the love for her local place of belonging and then for Europe, and then a universal love for humanity, in an escalation of kinds of love that would not compete with each other, but on the contrary support the effort to build a Europe of ordinary human beings.

The second woman is **Louise Weiss**, whom I already mentioned, the French journalist and activist, founder of the journal *L’Europe Nouvelle* (1918-34) and collaborator of Aristide Briand, the French premier who in 1930 presented a Memorandum for a United Europe to the League of Nations. Weiss advocated the League of Nations to become a forum of international peaceful arbitration of European conflicts, seeking new legal mechanisms that might avoid another international war. She was the creator of the *Ecole de la Paix* in Paris, in which intellectuals and politicians met to debate about peace in the period 1930-36; from 1934 she agitated restlessly for women’s suffrage (which did not yet exist in France) and refused a ministerial post with Léon Blum, because the condition he had set was to stop the suffrage campaign (Bertin 1999). At the same time, in her autobiographical writings she uses terms such as ‘my feminine inadequacy’, attributing to it the unhappy ending of her two marriages. She longed for ‘romantic possibilities’, which led her to a rather extraordinary love story with somebody she called the Chevalier de Saint-Magloire, a gentleman farmer in the Brie area, south-east of Paris, who had distinguished himself in the trenches of the First World War. Since he was married to a woman who was mentally ill, this love had the mark of impossibility, in spite of being reciprocated. The two lovers, both in their late forties, were allowed to live their passion only for a short time, in 1939 and the first half of 1940; she visited him regularly during visitors’ hours at the front, but in June 1940 the Chevalier—who could well have avoided

being a soldier—was killed at his artillery position. This love, which in cultural terms had the signs of regression—as shown by the insistence on the name and character of the aristocratic love, an image from the past—and its bitter end, represented a ‘deep personal trauma superimposed upon a crisis of intellectual ideas and values’ (Bess 1993) that accentuated the shift of Weiss’s ideas towards authoritarianism and right-wing rigidity. Her positions included advocating paternalism towards ‘primitive people’, but not the dismantling of colonial structures and the emancipation of the colonised. Elected to the European Parliament on a neo-Gaullist ticket, she opened the first parliament session as its eldest member in 1979.

The third woman is **Giorgina Arian Levi**, an Italian Jew who married a German medical doctor and was obliged to migrate to Bolivia in 1938 because of the Fascist racial laws. Author of a thesis on the history of Jews in Europe in contemporary and modern times that brought her the title of doctor in Letters in 1933, she taught in secondary schools in Torino in the 1930s. In Bolivia she was a teacher at all levels of schools and learned to understand the *indios* and their culture, regarding her own culture in a new critical way; she was active, like her husband, in the émigrés’ organisations against Fascism and Nazism. When she came back to Europe in 1946, she entered the Italian communist party and became a Member of Parliament. Giorgina Levi is now 93 and still active in peace activity within the Jewish Old People’s House in Turin. The letters between her and her husband Heinz Arian are a moving testimony of how they felt European at the same time as being chased out of Europe. When they were leaving Europe on a boat that called at Barcelona, their last European port, they wrote to friends and relatives regretting to leave ‘*notre mère l’Europe*’ (Heinz), ‘*la Patria Europa*’ (Giorgina).

In a long interview, Giorgina Levi has evoked her Bolivian experience:

With time, nostalgia undergoes an evolution [...] at the beginning one has nostalgia for a street, for a borough where one used to live. Then comes nostalgia for the whole town, then nostalgia for the whole of Italy, the desire to go back in any way to that country, and in the last times, the yearning for Europe (Filippa 1990).

Like other women travellers (for instance Anne Marie Schwarzenbach in Asia), she contrasted the sense of space in various continents, feeling touched by ‘the beauty of immense lands, solitude, desert. We do not know such ample spaces in Europe’. She was at the time reflecting on colonialism, on the exploitation of the *indios*, on her own Eurocentric prejudices: ‘I was wrong in seeing the *mestizos* from my point of view as European and I was not yet able to understand their world, their attitudes of lying, not being punctual, indolence’ (Filippa 1990). Her solidarity in Bolivia went especially to Polish Jews, who were despised by everybody, and to the *indios*.

And fourthly, **Ursula Hirschmann**, to whom these lectures are entitled. It is useful to remind ourselves of something she wrote, in her unfinished autobiography, *Noi senza patria*, in which she gives a lucid description of what happened, privileging a ‘subjective’ form such as love:

I want to observe here, without false modesty, that perhaps I deserve the highest mark in love. This does not mean that I did not make one hundred mistakes. But I am happy with my man, I love my children, I am loved by them with that quantity of hatred that is inevitable, I have avoided big blunders, I know how to behave with the naturalness acquired during long years of apprenticeship. But for all this, what a

high price I paid! Practically all my life has been a continuous effort around 'love', i.e. around nothing. Had I become a doctor or an architect, I would have used all the treasure of my inventiveness, my instinct and my intellect for this goal outside myself. Such an objectivisation of my person would have taught me directly that detachment and balance that I pursued with such immense effort through the wrong way, the 'feminine' one (Hirschmann 1993).

This passage shows how clear she was about the various options that were possible to a woman in her position. She may not have been the only one in such a position. In relation to her and her activity in this respect, I would like to convey to you some of the first archival results of ongoing research on women's subjectivity in Europe, which is funded by the European Union and based at the Robert Schuman Centre (GRINE).<sup>2</sup> The archives at the EUI have recently been given the papers *Femmes pour l'Europe*, founded by Ursula Hirschmann in the 1960s, and has classified them (Previti Allaire 2003). From these papers as well as from an interview with the donor, Fausta Deshormes, it is possible to formulate some provisional hypotheses on the historical relevance of this group.<sup>3</sup>

The group was created in Brussels in 1975, uniting a cluster of women who shared the same intuition that women had an interest in Europe. The group was composed largely of the wives of Euro-bureaucrats, and some of them, like Ursula herself, felt unhappy or uneasy in the role of wife, having previously been a militant, while others were engaged in politics at different levels. Thus, one of the stimuli to create the group was the perception of a tension between the private and the public. The group organised a conference in 1976 on the construction of Europe and its relation to women, and one member of the group, Fausta Deshormes, went on to oversee the production of a journal, *Femmes d'Europe*, within the European Commission. A prize was also created aimed at recognising the 'mothers of Europe' rather than laying all the stress—as is often done even today—on the founding 'fathers'. What seems most interesting in our perspective is that some of the women who participated in this group defined themselves as 'femmes' in the ambivalent meaning that this term has in French, indicating not only women but also wives. It was on the basis of their condition as wives of men who were politically engaged in European affairs that they decided to make explicit their point of view as European women. In other words, they openly acted on the basis of gender, making their gendered condition the starting point of their reflections (*Des européennes* 1979).

*Femmes pour l'Europe* found alliance with conservative women's groups rather than radical feminist group, because the former were more interested in Europe than the latter, so that their relationships were either institutional or with groups and individuals situated on the moderate fringes of the new-wave feminism of the 1970s. In a book dedicated to Ursula Hirschmann by her friends and colleagues, we find hints of Eurocentrism, which is totally consistent with that epoch and certainly present also in radical feminism. In spite of declarations in favour of '*femmes immigrées*' or '*femmes du quatrième monde*', and of self-definitions as the 'European sisters of migrant women', the attitude is still that of giving voice to, or making justice for, the underprivileged (*Des européennes* 1979). However, a voice combining Europeanness and women's solidarity was at the end of the 1970s quite isolated, and its sound is very valuable to us today; the very definition of themselves as European women is relevant to our present effort. Altogether, the heritage from *Femmes pour l'Europe* is one that we gladly accept, although not uncritically.

Keeping in mind the context in which Ursula Hirschmann acted and thought, let us go back to the question of love. Since her letters are not available, it might be useful to quote a letter to her by her second husband, the Europeanist Altiero Spinelli, which expresses the nature of their bond well.

On 7 July 1970 Altiero Spinelli wrote from Strasbourg, where as Commissioner he was engaged in the effort 'to make a real parliament emerge from this formless European assembly':

My beloved Ursel,

Today at 6 I was left with nothing to do and I went walking alone for two hours in Strasbourg [...] now it is almost midnight [...] I had you on the phone and to hear your very dear voice gave me the impression of having you here [...] in my solitude by now you are always present.

Rethinking my deepest life, I must say that in one thing I am not similar to prophets. I don't feel myself all in action [...] I have an enclosed garden which comes before action, a sphere [...] where one can live with fullness, with happiness, owning always everything, therefore with a deep sense of perfection and eternity, of infinity. This enclosed garden is you, present past and future and real, four-dimensioned. It is you and it is us, it is our love. (*L'Europa di Altiero Spinelli* 1994)

At the end of this second section we can first of all make some considerations on the diversity of the ideas of love and Europe that the four European women I have introduced had in their public and private lives. The range of their political attitudes was wide: Ursula Hirschmann had been a Marxist and evolved towards a sort of radical-liberal socialism; Giorgina Levi became a Marxist in exile and a communist after the Second World War; Louise Weiss went from radical pacifism to a right-wing authoritarianism; Margaret Storm Jameson was loyal to her liberal federalism and pacifism. This wide range should remind us to avoid the ideological illusion that women, when they are politically active, are always on the side of the oppressed.

These four women also differed greatly in their ideas concerning women's condition, reaching their own emancipation in various ways—politics, work, writing—and asserting their solidarity on the basis of other women with feminist or non-feminist outlooks. The range of these women shows without any doubt that Europeaness for them was not a choice made only on ideological grounds; instead, it was relatively independent from their political ideas. Some went on identifying with Europe in the most difficult conditions, some acted consciously as Europeanist. All of them developed an identification with Europe on the basis of a deep passion that connected the private and the political, and that always involved some type of love. Finally, in private life, some believed in romantic love and some were sceptical or very reserved about it.

Altogether, they seem to have anticipated in their lives the points made by Geneviève Fraisse: that female eroticism is still in the process of being discovered and that feminism has introduced much more than love into the lives of women, while at the same time keeping up the claim for love: to have everything, not to accept the exclusion of love from militancy.

All this allows us to sketch a gendered definition of the 'Great European' as a figure not necessarily linked with fame and the public, but rather somebody involved in the public sphere in new forms. Among such new forms is the recognition of oneself as a



gendered subject, willing to find out what it can mean to be a European, therefore in tentative ways, and engaged in redefining the relationship between the public and the private according to one's own experience. Actually this subject tries to find new ways to combine Europe and love, if I can express her effort with present-day words.

Therefore this type of subjectivity is not necessarily linked with 'greatness' in the sense of intellectual or artistic achievement. The men who were defined as 'great Europeans' were eminently mobile in the world of culture. The women we have encountered were active in various fields, among them love—that 'nothing' which according to Hirschmann required a high effort of subjectivisation. Finally, men are present in this story too, as husbands and lovers. Gendering the European subject allows us to introduce masculinity into our discourse, to give back to the male actors of Europeanism their specificity, their forms of maleness in the interchange with women and other men.

We shall now find other women, who are constructing their own ways of being European and being mobile through Europe, i.e. of becoming more and more fully the subjects of their lives.

### **III. Women between the East and West of Europe**

This section of my lecture is based on the first results of the GRINE research project, due to be finished a year from now. The project includes theoretical parts on the connections between migration and subjectivity in Europe today, juridical considerations on the conditions of a gendered subject in the Union, and a historical analysis of women's migration from Bulgaria and Hungary to Holland and Italy in recent times. I will draw particularly from this last direction of research, which uses various sources including a series of original oral interviews. One of the aspects that we consider most important in this research is the insistence on the inter-subjective relationships between women from the four countries, especially between those who are labelled as 'migrant' and those who are called 'recipient', the former having moved in a literal sense and the latter having stayed locally but being involved in the vast processes of mobility that have been taking place through Europe recently.

Women from Bulgaria and Hungary who have come to live in Italy or the Netherlands—as well as several return migrants from these countries—were interviewed by native speakers. An average of 17 women from each of Bulgaria and Hungary were interviewed in Italy and the Netherlands. These migrant women display a large range of ages (some are in their 20s or 70s, but most are in the middle range, 30s and 40s), of educational levels (from high-school diploma to MA) and of jobs, from manual to intellectual (among them dancer, student, employee, translator, engineer, worker, housewife, violinist, painter, teacher); as regards religious affiliations, they range from a Christian Orthodox majority to Protestant or not religious. Similar numbers of 'recipient' women were also interviewed in Italy and the Netherlands, selected for their diverse relationships to migrant women—as employers, colleagues, friends, acquaintances, or in contact with one another through voluntary associations.

Given the limitations of this lecture and the fact that the research is still under way (and the processes of transcription and translation are ongoing), I will consider here only

some of the interviews, mostly those with Bulgarian, Italian and Dutch women, and to a lesser degree those with Hungarians, some of them still being translated.<sup>4</sup>

The issue of the sense of belonging to Europe emerged spontaneously only in a few cases, and therefore we sometimes went back specifically in order to get reactions on this topic. As regards the Bulgarian interviewees, direct questions on what Europe meant to them, what attitude they had towards Europe and whether they felt European at first elicited slight reactions of some discomfort; this may partly be due to our difficulty in finding the right words to express our inquiries. However, after this initial uncertainty, the replies were rather articulated and significant.

The same woman who was at first perplexed: ‘Oh my god! Well, attitude to Europe? I don’t know [...]’, when asked ‘Do you feel European?’, replied: ‘Of course I feel European. No doubt!’ (Mina, Bu). Ana (Bu), when asked ‘What is Europe for you?’ reacted laughing: ‘Oh you’re killing me with this question’. But, again, from her following replies a sense of belonging to Europe emerged that was strongly based upon being Bulgarian: ‘It’s rather coming from the fact that I’m Bulgarian that I feel European. Because I’m like that! I’m like that. As a Bulgarian I feel European’.

Mina explained that Bulgarian women ‘abroad even make themselves known as ‘Bulgarian-Europeans’, that is to say, there is no difference between being a Bulgarian and being a European’. From other interviews too, Bulgaria appears to be considered by Bulgarians to be European *par excellence* among other nations, due to its central location in the continent and its ‘inbetweenness’ between East and West.

Similar reactions came from the Hungarian women. As far as they are concerned, one must remember that our questions were posed in the context of Hungary’s accession to the European Union, and therefore included a question on the meaning of enlargement for the interviewee. In spite of this context, which should have made the questions more concrete, fewer replies came from the Hungarians. One explanation is perhaps that a Hungarian tradition considers their country to have been a bastion of Europe against the Turks, and Hungarians consider themselves European without question, so that posing this question might have created a short circuit, in which they were trying to understand how to relate to the interlocutor. In other words, the hypothesis could be that precisely because of a very loaded—overdetermined—context, the replies could not be easily articulated.

Here too we find the feeling of being ‘naturally European’, expressed for instance by Teri (Hu): ‘I find it natural that I am European’, and the attitude of being ‘central’ to Europe in the double sense, geographical and cultural, therefore to be ‘needed’ in order to redefine Europe (Noemi, Hu). Hilda (Hu) includes among the reasons that make her feel European that she ‘can freely move among countries and speak a few European languages’; diversity in languages and food, and tolerance, democracy, freedom of speech are for Brigi (Hu) all indicators of Europeanness.

In the statements by women from both countries, one frequently finds an oscillation of meaning between the European Union and Europe, the former being more directly political, with its social and economic implications, the latter being understood in cultural terms. The images of Europe that emerge from the Bulgarian interviews provide good examples of both: Europe can be seen as a home counterposed to ‘overseas, so far away I

don't want to go, the thought was frightening. I didn't want America, nor Australia, nothing like that, do you understand? I wanted to stay in Europe' (Jelisaveta), coming close to the latter meaning of 'Europe'. On the contrary, when Europe is presented as a place advantageous for women, in order for them to have better opportunities for professional realisation and more social privileges, it is transparent that it is the EU and the possible accession to it these women are thinking of (Victoria, Bu; Ralica, Bu), i.e. 'Europe' in the former meaning.

However, as has been observed in other situations (Passerini 2003), some women are hesitant at a Europeanisation that might not guarantee their gains in emancipation. Victoria:

With reference to women's situation, I claimed, and still do, that in the recent past Bulgarian women had better opportunities for professional realisation and more social privileges which enabled them to develop professionally, in spite of the general lower standard of living [...] although I see this Europeanisation as a very positive factor of development, which opens new opportunities ahead.

As regards the Dutch and Italian women, let us remember that theirs are different and special interviews, in that the questions to them were mainly, although not only, related to attitudes towards the 'other' women, the ones coming into their countries from Bulgaria and Hungary. Many Dutch and some Italian women proved to be aware of the issues concerning the European Union and its enlargement to the East. Giovanna (It), a teacher, said that she was induced to look at a map and find out where Moldavia is after she met a woman from there. In this case, the contact with a migrant from Eastern Europe contributed to enlarging and deepening her vision of Europe (Capussotti 2003). The construction of a 'new other European woman' as Central or Eastern European (Regulska) is being challenged by the possible exchanges between women in Europe that such an attitude seems to imply for the future.

The Italian interviewees seem to understand Europeaness as the combination of wide diversity and tolerance towards this diversity; loyal to this ideal, they state that there is no difference between Western and Eastern Europeans, or there is only a temporal difference, in the sense that on certain matters the West is some twenty or thirty years 'ahead' of the East, because certain processes have taken place earlier, but that the East will no doubt catch up with rapid integration (Roberta, Silvana, Anna, all Italians). This attitude is also shared by some Dutch, for instance Inge.

A real difference perceived by all the women from the four countries is the one between European and American women (meaning the United States): the images of US women are highly stereotyped and mediated from TV and cinema. Some Italians also rather strongly stress the observation that the difference uniting Western and Eastern Europeans, in comparison with other women, is marked not only with North America but even more with Africa and South America. The difference is sometimes expressed not in geographical terms, on the basis of continents, but of religious culture: Islam being the site of the deepest difference (Carla, It). This attitude is shared by some Dutch women (for instance Hanneke). This sharing is important because, although the national differences are quite important in structuring the testimonies, the nation is by no means the only form of cohesion among these women: age and class appear to be grounds for collective recognition as well as self-recognition.

The Dutch women display a much more sophisticated notion of Europe than the Italian ones, showing awareness of the problems posed to migrants by 'Fortress Europe' (Barbara) or of the possible hierarchies between national and European identities, but also of the sense of belonging to a communal civilisation (Ellen) and of the relativity of the sense of belonging to Europe, depending on whether one finds herself in Morocco or in Turkey or in Germany (Maaïke). They also insist on the variedness of European languages and cultures (Wilma), and on the sense of women's freedom contrasted with men's attitudes in South American countries (Jantina). This difference in awareness between Dutch and Italians reflects the level of the public debate in their respective countries: in Holland, parties, press and TV have posed the question of Europe and migrants with much more insistence and seriousness than in Italy.

Altogether, the perceptions of Europe presented by the 'recipient' women are widespread and varied, but associated with the theme of love only occasionally. This may be due to the type of narrative that is coherent with their situation; many of them have moved much less than the 'migrants', and have been faced less frequently, and most of the time not directly, with the possibility of establishing love relationships with foreigners. On the other hand, what is most interesting in relation to the topic of this lecture is the link that some of the migrant women establish between Europe and love in their narratives, implicitly or explicitly.

In the Bulgarian interviews, meaningful replies to the questions on Europe are given in correspondence with contemporary political events (such as the Chirac/Schroeder axis against the war in Iraq), but also on the basis of personal bonds. For instance Boyana, whose husband is French: 'I feel European more than ever especially now, when France is against the war with Iraq, and I feel sad because my own country supports the war'.

The private is present in the new sense of belonging that can be evinced from some replies, either in the form of allegiances linked with love—as in the preceding example—or on the basis of the ancient self-representations of woman as mother that seem to solve or overcome the problematic nature of the European rhetoric of unity. Ivaïla (Bu):

- What do you understand as Europe?
- I see now! The most beautiful continent.
- And when the question is about East and West?
- I accept them in different ways, not one unity.
- And do you feel European?
- I do feel, yes. That I am a female ancestor of the first European civilisation.

Love is very present in the narratives of the Bulgarian women as a reason for migration, either with a husband, as for Alena: 'my love to my husband is what brought me here' (to The Hague), or with a boyfriend, as for Vesela, who sells homeless newspapers in Holland: 'it was the beginning of our relationship, when my boyfriend left, and it was somehow nasty to be separated at the beginning of the relationship—love brought me here'.

Other times love is introduced as the consequence of migrating and a reason for staying on; Joanna, who married a Dutchman on the basis of deep love, explains her choice of a place to stay in the following way: 'because Mark has an emotional

attachment exactly to this house and to this village, because he used to come here very often as a child and so on, and yes it is beginning to become my own’.

Jelisaveta, who married an Italian, neatly summarises the complex relationships between decisions and love ties:

I came here for one year. Nine months later I fell in love with an Italian and I decided one year was not enough. Five years later I decided to change my job [...] we broke up with my boyfriend and I just needed a complete change in my life. I met my husband [...] now we get along nicely [...] I think that in the beginning he felt sharply the cultural differences between us.

It should be noticed that in this context, love and marriage are linked with the question of citizenship, because the authorities in the Netherlands try by various procedures to ascertain and counteract the possibility of ‘fake marriages’ entered into in order to obtain citizenship. Mónica (Hu) tells how after many difficulties with getting a visa because of the procedures, she finally married the Dutch man with whom she was in love, and now lives in Amsterdam. It is all too consistent with this life narrative that she claims a cosmopolitan identity rather than a European one, a narrative step that allows her to jump over the limitations that bureaucracy tried to impose on her, preventing her from becoming a ‘European’.

The discourse on love emerges as a constant element of these narratives even through declarations *ex negativo* that presuppose an expectation in this sense. Julia (Bu): ‘My goal was obviously to see, to learn, to visit. I haven’t met my great love’, as if the imagery around migration included love in one way or other. In real life, sometimes migration induces a break-up, as happened to Mina, even if her Bulgarian boyfriend tried to follow her when she migrated to Italy; he went to Nice but could not adjust there and so after two years they broke up.

In these narratives, nationalities are very present, even if love changes the role of boundaries. Continuous comparisons are made by the interviewees between the men of various countries, and usually Bulgarians are portrayed negatively (as are Hungarians: Mónica) as jealous and oppressive, while Dutch and Italians seem to be ‘way ahead’. However, this is not always true; for instance, Mina again: ‘look, although it might sound rude, I think Italians are dull’; and Kremena: ‘the younger Italians are mummies’ boys (*mammoni*) and completely disoriented until 30-35’.

Both on love and on Europe the interviewees show a remarkable lack of ideology. Especially as regards love, there are no general declarations; instead, a flexible attitude emerges, in the sense of a flexibility to move around intertwined with love relationships, and at the same time to learn languages, find new jobs, bridge cultural differences. Love appears in a certain sense to be a European force, although often linked with nationality. Most interestingly, we fairly often encounter a refusal to typify the beloved one. Christina (Hu) says of her man: ‘I do not think he is a typical Dutchman’ (she had migrated to Holland ‘for love’, and now both of them live in Hungary). Wilma (NL): ‘my husband would say that I am not a typical Dutch woman, because he could never have endured that’. Love individualises each person, making her/him unique, and therefore it contrasts some of the stereotypes presiding over national divides.

In the first Ursula Hirschmann Lecture, given here in 2001, Braidotti prefigured a love of this kind:

What I have in mind is a post-romantic involvement, something after the fall of illusions and delusions. A new virtual love that targets less what we have been than what we are, at last, capable of becoming. The liberatory potential of this is equally proportional to the imaginary and political efforts it requires of us all. The recognition of the new marginality of Europe in this case would only be the premise to the collective development of a new sense of accountability for the specific slice of world periphery that we happen to inhabit (Braidotti 2002).

As far as Europe goes, these women seem to reconfirm at a simpler level of expression what the experience of *Femmes pour l'Europe* had suggested: that they are looking for tentative new ways of feeling European, in large part linked with new developments in their emotional lives, bringing the contribution of the private into the public. The interviews offer many instances of a love that is a driving force in overcoming or bridging cultural differences, but rather realistically oriented. This love is one of the forces that move people towards changing, but at the same time it is informed by previous and new loyalties. It requires a redefinition of Europe and Europeanness, and it is already redesigning the European space by gendering it and its paths.

The approach many of these women show seems fitted to such a changing situation: pragmatic but not without principles, thoughtful, attentive to personal feelings and to cultural traditions of different countries. In other words, they are already building new forms of Europeanness, understood as new forms of intersubjectivity.

### **Some Final Remarks**

There can be no triumphal tones at this moment, when Europe is re-uniting and yet appears deeply divided on the questions of governing itself and finding ways of common defence, of establishing transatlantic alliances and creating a common foreign policy. However, there are some points at the cultural level that seem rather promising in the complex and multifarious processes that are going on.

First of all, it is clear that the most important questions no longer concern the presumed exclusive Europeanness of courtly love, but rather the nature of the construction whereby European culture has considered this love a central core of its identity. Privileging this form of love—or better a particular interpretation of it as male, Eurocentric and non-physical—resulted in ignoring the plurality of European traditions of love or subjecting them to a rigid hierarchy. Therefore it favoured a conception of life where emotions were extolled but not integrated with intellectual values, where women and men were only formally equal, and the fulfilment of a relationship was either confused with the sexual act or completely detached from it. The concept of identity related to this vision was monolithic and hierarchical, subordinating the richness of psychic life to a pyramidal system of values. Conceptualising European identity in this way was part of a tradition of dogmatic ethnocentrism which isolated Europe and privileged its dominating role over its other contributions. However, the connection between European identity and courtly love also contained some positive points, inasmuch as this kind of love, at least in its original form, stressed the sense that lovers

are always two distinct beings and can never reach complete fusion, that desire and fulfilment remain in a complex relationship, that the expression of love has an independent existence from the sentiment.

Secondly, while on the one hand Europe is in the process of becoming, at least in certain respects, a gendered space, on the other hand it seems by now established that there is and can be no 'woman's way' of loving or of being European. The multiplicity of women's forms of subjectivity is paralleled by the recognition of the multiple ways of combining the public and the private, a novelty in women's lives. We can recognise as antecedents on this road the women who were part of the group *Femmes pour l'Europe*. For them Europe was something mediated by private emotions and prompted by their frustration as wives, something yet to be constructed, which could go in different directions. What was becoming clear for them was that Europe was not a mere sum of nationalities, nor simply a framework for bi- or tri-lateral relationships, but a reality in process that included everybody who came in contact with it. What remains as a problem is the extent to which the connection between the public and the private should be pushed. While the connection is indispensable, in order to avoid the split between the personal and the political, it should be envisaged as establishing a series of bridges, not as flattening together the two types of love, the one of the couple and the one that keeps a community together. In other words, to establish new links between private and public loves does not mean to model the latter upon the former, but to find new ways of combining the love for a *patria Europa* with private loves.

Thirdly, the subjectivities that are being formed in this way no longer lay claim to being superior to any other one, although saving the specificity which derives from place and tradition, and in the end that of the individual. The path leading to becoming a citizen of the world may for some go through the stage of being a European citizen—and politically this opens heavy questions about 'which Europe'—but it must follow the itinerary pertinent to each biography, not only through one's own social, cultural and gender belonging, but also through the unique trajectory of one's own life.

All this strengthens my conviction that it is useful to distinguish between cultural and political allegiances to Europe and to use the concept of identification rather than identity. For this allows us to deal with an idea of Europeanness in which the women we have encountered can be seen as contributing to the construction of feelings rather than as negotiating objectified identities; in this light, we can understand better their potential contribution to developing and spreading feelings of belonging to Europe, not without criticisms and problematising this sense of belonging—certainly distancing themselves from any conception of Europe as a fortress. A new type of Europeanness can be seen as a new form of subjectivity, a subjectivity that includes emotions and solidarity, not without ambivalences that only patient collective work can hope to clarify.

In this perspective, the dialogue between European women from various parts of Europe should never become an obstacle to relationships with other women of the world, whether the North American women whose contribution to our own European movement was so great in the 1960s and 1970s or the women of the other continents to whom we wish to listen with renewed interest. A new sense of unity among European women is to be understood not as a way of differentiating ourselves from 'other' women, but rather as a basis for a wider sense of unity.

## Notes

1. All translations from Italian and French are by the author.
2. The research project GRINE—Gender relationships in Europe at the turn of the millennium: Women as subjects in migration and marriage—connects five universities, with the EUI as co-ordinator, and the team is made up as follows: Nadejda Alexandrova (Sofia), Rosi Braidotti (Utrecht), Enrica Capussotti (EUI), Inger Marie Conradsen (Copenhagen), Borbala Juhasz (ELTE, Hungary), Annette Kronborg (Copenhagen), Ioanna Laliotou (EUI), Dawn Lyon (EUI), Miglena Nikolchina (Sofia), Luisa Passerini (EUI; KWI, Essen; & Torino), Hanne Petersen (Copenhagen), Andrea Peto (ELTE, Hungary), Esther Vonk (Utrecht). The project is funded by the European Commission's Fifth Framework Programme 'Improving Human Potential and the Socio-Economic Knowledge Base', contract number: HPSE-CT2001-00087. We gratefully acknowledge the support of the European Commission for this work.
3. I should like to thank Dawn Lyon for her work and her suggestions in this field.
4. I express my gratitude to Nadejda Alexandrova who did the Bulgarian interviews, Borbala Juhasz who did the Hungarian ones, Enrica Capussotti who did the Italian ones, and Esther Vonk who did the Dutch.



## References

- BABINI, Valeria P., Fernanda Minuz, Annamaria Tagliavini, 1989. *La donna nelle scienze dell'uomo*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- BARTHES, Roland, 1990. *A Lover's Discourse. Fragments*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- BERTIN, Célia, 1999. *Louise Weiss*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- BESS, Michael, 1993. *Realism, Utopia, and the Mushroom Cloud. Four Activist Intellectuals and Their Strategies for Peace, 1945-1989*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- BLANCHOT, Maurice, 1969. *L'entretien infini*. Paris: Gallimard.
- BRAH, Avtar, 1993. 'Re-Framing Europe: En-gendered Racisms, Ethnicities and Nationalisms in Contemporary Western Europe', *Feminist Review*, 45.
- BRAIDOTTI, Rosi, 2002. *Gender, Identity and Multiculturalism in Europe*. First Ursula Hirschmann Annual Lecture on 'Gender and Europe', 8 May 2001, European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, Gender Studies Programme, EUI, Florence
- CAINE, Barbara and Glenda Sluga, 2000. *Gendering European History*. London and New York: Leicester University Press.
- CAPUSSOTTI, Enrica, 2003. Paper presented at the Budapest Conference. July.
- COUDENHOVE-KALERGI, Richard N., 1927. *Held oder Heiliger*. Wien, Paris and Leipzig: Pan-Europa Verlag.
- DAUPHIN, Cécile and Arlette Farge, (eds.), 2001. *Séduction et sociétés. Approches historiques*. Paris: Seuil.
- DOLZA, Delfina, 1990. *Essere figlie di Lombroso. Due donne intellettuali tra '800 e '900*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- ESSED, Philomena, 1995. 'Gender, Migration and Cross-Ethnic Coalition Building', in: Helma Lutz, Ann Phoenix, Nira Yuval-Davis (eds.), *Crossfires. Nationalism, Racism and Gender in Europe*. London and East Haven: Pluto Press.
- L'Europa di Altiero Spinelli. Sessant'anni di battaglie politiche: dall'antifascismo all'azione federalista*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 1994.
- FILIPPA, Marcella, 1990. *Avrei capovolto le montagne. Giorgina Levi in Bolivia, 1939-1946*. Firenze: Giunti-Astrea.
- FIRESTONE, Shulamith, 1970. *The Dialectic of Sex. The Case for Feminist Revolution*. New York: Morrow.
- FRAISSE, Geneviève, 1993. 'Sur l'incompatibilité supposée de l'amour et du féminisme', *Esprit*, 5, mai, pp. 71-77.
- GREER, Germaine, 1970. *The Female Eunuch*. London: McGibbon & Kee.
- GRIFFIN, Gabriele with Rosi Braidotti, 2003. 'Whiteness and European Situatedness', in: Gabriele Griffin and Rosi Braidotti, (eds.), *Thinking Differently. A Reader in European Women's Studies*. London: Zed.

- HIRSCHMANN, Ursula, 1993. *Noi senza patria*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- JAMESON, Margaret Storm, 1984. *Journey from the North, Vol. I*. London: Virago.
- MILLETTI, Nerina, 1994. 'Analoghe sconcezze. Tribadi, saffiste, invertite e omosessuali: categorie e sistemi sesso/genere nella rivista di antropologia criminale fondata da Cesare Lombroso (1880-1949)', *DWF*, 4 (24), pp. 50-122.
- MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGERES, DU COMMERCE EXTERIEUR ET DE LA COOPERATION AU DEVELOPPEMENT, 1979. *Des européennes parlent de l'Europe. Réflexions rassemblées par le groupe 'Femmes pour l'Europe'*. Bruxelles.
- MITCHELL, Juliet, 1984. *Women: the Longest Revolution. Essays on Feminism, Literature and Psychoanalysis*. London: Virago.
- PASSERINI, Luisa, 1990. 'Quale memoria storica per il movimento delle donne in Italia?', in: Società Italiana delle Storiche, (ed.), *Discutendo di storia. Soggettività, ricerca, biografia*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- PASSERINI, Luisa, 1999. *Europe in Love, Love in Europe. Imagination and Politics between the Wars*. London: Tauris.
- PASSERINI, Luisa, 2003. *Memoria e utopia. Il primato dell'intersoggettività*. Torino: Bollati Boringhieri.
- PREVITI ALLAIRE, Catherine, 2003. 'Femmes d'Europe': un nouveau fonds aux AHCE', *EUI Review*, spring, pp. 13-15.
- REGULSKA, Joanna, 1998. 'The New 'Other' European Woman', in: Virginia Ferreira, Teresa Tavares and Silvia Portugal, *Shifting Bonds, Shifting Bounds. Women, Mobility and Citizenship in Europe*. Oeiras: Celta.
- ROCHEFORT, Florence, 2001. 'La séduction résiste-t-elle au féminisme?', in: Cécile Dauphin and Arlette Farge, (eds.), *Séduction et sociétés. Approches historiques*. Paris: Seuil.
- WILSON, Elizabeth, 1984. 'Forbidden Love', *Feminist Studies*, 10 (2), pp. 213-26.



## TITLES IN THE SERIES

**Peter Mandelson**

*The British Presidency of the European Union*  
(Welcome Address by Patrick Masterson), 30 January 1998

**Patrick Masterson, Lamberto Dini and Ghassan Salamé**

Inaugurazione del Programma Mediterraneo, 15 gennaio 1999

**H.E. Seyed Mohammad Khatami**

(Benvenuto del Dott. Patrick Masterson), 10 marzo 1999  
Mediterranean Programme, 1999

**H. E. Miguel Ángel Moratinos Cayaubé**

*European Union – Middle East: Developing Societies for Peace*  
Opening Lecture of the First Mediterranean Social and Political Research Meeting, 23 March 2000  
[http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-Texts/2000\\_Moratinos.pdf](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-Texts/2000_Moratinos.pdf)

**Ismail A. Sirageldin**

*Sustainable Human Development in the 21st Century in the Middle East and North Africa: An Evolutionary Perspective*  
Mediterranean Programme Annual Lecture, 24 March 2000  
[http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-Texts/2000\\_Sirageldin.pdf](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-Texts/2000_Sirageldin.pdf)

**Sir John Browne**

*The Transatlantic Relationship: The New Agenda*  
Inaugural Lecture of the Transatlantic Programme, 2000  
(e-speech no longer available)

**Kernal Dervis**

Inauguration of the Political Economy Chair of the Mediterranean Programme, 1st June 2001  
[http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-Texts/2001\\_Dervis.pdf](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-Texts/2001_Dervis.pdf)

**Roger Owen**

*The Eastern Mediterranean during the First Wave of Globalisation, 1870-1914*  
Mediterranean Programme Annual Lecture, 23 March 2001  
[http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-Texts/2001\\_Owen.pdf](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-Texts/2001_Owen.pdf)

**Romano Prodi**

*The New Europe in the Transatlantic Partnership*  
Annual Lecture of the BP Chair in Transatlantic Relations, 09 May 2001  
(e-speech no longer available)

**Rosi Braidotti**

*Gender, Identity and Multiculturalism in Europe*  
Ursula Hirschmann Annual Lecture on 'Gender and Europe', 08 May 2001  
[http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/e-texts/20010508\\_braidotti.pdf](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/e-texts/20010508_braidotti.pdf)

**Mustapha K. Nabli**

*After Argentina: Was MENA Right to Be Cautious?*  
Opening Lecture of the Third Mediterranean Social and Political Research Meeting, 20 March 2002  
[http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-Texts/2002\\_Nabli.pdf](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-Texts/2002_Nabli.pdf)

**John Ruggie**

*The United States, the United Nations  
and the Transatlantic Rift*

Annual Lecture of the Transatlantic  
Programme, 12 May 2003

[http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-  
Texts/DL20030512\\_ruggie.pdf](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-<br/>Texts/DL20030512_ruggie.pdf)

**Peter Sutherland**

*The Future of the  
World Trade Organisation*

Annual Lecture of the Transatlantic  
Programme, 2 July 2004

[http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-  
Texts/DL20040207\\_Sutherland.pdf](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-<br/>Texts/DL20040207_Sutherland.pdf)

**Barbara Duden**

*The Euro and the Gene - Perceived by a  
Historian of the Unborn*

Ursula Hirschmann Annual Lecture on  
'Gender and Europe', 7 May 2002

[http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-  
Texts/200504-UHL\\_Duden.pdf](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-<br/>Texts/200504-UHL_Duden.pdf)

**Luisa Passerini**

*Women in Europe, Women in Love:  
Searching for New Forms of Subjectivity*

Ursula Hirschmann Annual Lecture on  
'Gender and Europe', 20 May 2003

[http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-  
Texts/200504-UHL\\_Passerini.pdf](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-<br/>Texts/200504-UHL_Passerini.pdf)

**Laura Balbo**

*Making a European Quilt. 'Doing  
Gender' in the European Social  
Sciences*

Ursula Hirschmann Annual Lecture on  
'Gender and Europe', 20 April 2004

[http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-  
Texts/200504-UHL\\_Balbo.pdf](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-<br/>Texts/200504-UHL_Balbo.pdf)

€ 8.00 (Europe)  
€ 10.00 (other destinations)  
[forinfo@iue.it](mailto:forinfo@iue.it)  
[www.iue.it/RSCAS/Publications](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/Publications)