The Many Manifestations of Castrum Peregrini

Historiography, heritage, and the possibility of representing the past.

Anaïs Van Ertvelde

Universiteit Utrecht, 2011-2012

The Many Manifestations of Castrum Peregrini

Historiography, heritage and the possibility of representing the past.

In order to obtain the degree of:

Master in Comparative Women's Studies in Culture and Politics

Anaïs Van Ertvelde

Student Number: 3728412

Supervisor:

Dr. Marta Zarzycka

Second Reader:

Lars Ebert

Acknowledgements.

My thanks go out to the entire Castrum Peregrini team: Lars, Michael, Frans (and Gisele!) for having me over and letting me roam about freely in their fascinating fortress. With some extra special thanks to Lars Ebert, who found time to point out all of my factual errors and dubious historical sources while on holiday.
I would also like to thank my supervisor Marta Zarzycka for challenging the disciplinary conventions I had acquired during my education as a historian.
Many thanks go out to Dennis Kerckhoffs, Roos Reijbroek, Lenneke de Ruijter, Remco Van Hauwermeiren, Heleen Debruyne, and Eef De Boeck for many inspirational all-night discussions about power, gender, history, and all that jazz.
To Rob Van Ertvelde and Annick Segal for their relentless material and emotional support.

And of course to Simon Menke. This is the last one, I promise!

Table of Contents.

Introduction.

Personal Introduction.

I would like to present this dissertation as an explicitly cross-disciplinary work. It has arisen from my own situatedness and testifies to the interactions, tensions, and overlaps between my education as a historian on one hand, and as a gender scholar on the other. Awareness about discourses and the manifestations of power, about how gender is implicated throughout, as well as a stance against essentialisms and binary oppositions form the backbone of my work. I concur with, and try to apply the guidelines for writing gender (and postcolonial) history laid out by Aurora Levins Morales in 'The Historian as Curandera' (1998, p.2-9). Some of her most important instructions include: Tell undertold stories. Make absences visible. Show agency. Embrace ambiguity, complexity, and contradiction. Reveal power relationships. Show connection and context. Cross borders. And last but not least, show yourself in your work. The choice of employing a non-objectifying, qualitative methodology goes past a purely evenemential way of writing history. Herein the author herself is implicated in herstory, fact and signification are not systematically pulled apart, and theoretical implications triggered by the primary source material aren't shied away from. It is still far from generally accepted to employ a methodology, in which ideas about representativity and validity are dealt with in a procedural, rather than a numerical fashion (Ribbens and Edwards, 1998). But as Michel Foucault's historical archeology of discontinuous discourses has suggested:

…analytical tools do not simply slip from a state of objectivity to which they can be returned, (…) the nature of objectivity itself rests on historical paradigms and strategies of human inquiry effective within a specific milieu. (Bell, 1992, p.13).

Where it is much easier for quantitative, positivist research to cover up behind a smokescreen of impartial objectivity, qualitative historical research with theoretical implications brings the circumstances of its own production (for whom, by whom, what for…) center stage. For it is impossible to neatly separate representing histories from making sense of them.

Institutional introduction.

On the 6th of February 2012 I first walked into the historical and cultural stronghold called Castrum Peregrini. I would pursue an internship in this 'intellectual playground' for over three months, functioning as researcher for some of the foundation's many heritage projects. I am thus clearly invested in my research topic in many ways. If not completely a fish in the water, I'm at least an outsider within Castrum Peregrini. The foundation's origins trace back to 1942 when Dutch painter Gisèle van Waterschoot van der Gracht opened up her apartment at the Herengracht 401 to take in German-Jewish students and teachers from the Quackerschool in Eerde. While this group of young men stayed locked up for years in their small hiding place to avoid Nazi persecution, Gisèle, together with German poet Wolfgang Frommel, tried to make their lives bearable. Not only by coming to their aid with the necessary material support but also by providing them with a psychological safety net consisting of literature, poetry, and fine arts. After WOII Gisèle managed to buy the entire premises and offered it to Frommel and the young men she had helped through the war. During the 1950s the group started to issue a literary magazine named after their former hiding place 'Castrum Peregrini.' The idea of establishing a publishing company began to take shape, and in 1957 the foundation Castrum Peregrini was formally set up at the Herengracht 401. The foundation was concerned with the magazine and the publishing company, but also with the creation of an archive and a library focused on Castrum's core values of friendship, freedom and culture.

Today Castrum Peregrini has moved away from being a magazine, and has developed towards being a centre for the intellectual and artistic exploration and expression of friendship, freedom, and culture. Castrum has its own unique profile combining a historical perspective with what it defines as the urgencies of our time. An interdisciplinary approach and an intergenerational manner of working are key to its activities. These activities can be placed under four main headings. 'Between Breakfast and Lunch' consists of invitation-only brunch meetings. They function as a think thank among members of Castrum's creative network. 'After Sunsets' entails

cultural evening salons such as 'Mythes' a series of lectures in which prominent invitees deconstruct contemporary myths in the style of Roland Barthes.
'For the Time Being' focuses on displaying contemporary culture through art exhibitions that touch upon themes such as authenticity, freedom and fanaticism. Finally, 'Central European Time' consists of border crossing European projects such as 'We are all fanatics' (2009-2011) and 'Mapping Future Heritage' (2011- ongoing). Castrum has maintained its tradition of assisting with the realisation of books and magazines that reflect on its current activities and on its history. In the past, such historical reflections often took the form of personal contributions to the Castrum Peregrini magazine, or the publication of memories by people who were closely involved with Castrum's past, such as the memoires by Castrum associate Claus Victor Bock (1985). In recent years Castrum's publications appear to have attained a more scholarly character. Examples include '*Gisèle en haar onderduikers'* (Giséle and her hiders) (Defuster and Somers, 2008) and the forthcoming 'Giséle en haar Bergense connecties' (Giséle and her connections in Bergen) by Maria Smook-Krikke.

All of this takes place under the watchful eye of Gisèle who, at 99 years old, still lives at the Herengracht 401, taken care of by the current Castrum generation. This underpins the intimate atmosphere that is so characteristic for Castrum's internal dynamics. Its core team consists of only three members: director Michael Defuster, programme co-ordinator Lars Ebert and communication manager Frans Damman. Keeping with the Castrum tradition the majority of its members also reside at Herengracht 401, generating a unique bridging of public and private spheres.

Development of the research question.

In this dissertation I will engage with the diverse historical representations of Castrum Peregrini. Representation has been defined by Stuart Hall (1997, p16) in the following manner: 'To represent something is to describe it, or depict it, to call it up in the mind by description or portrayal or imagination (…). To represent also means to symbolize, stand for, to be a specimen of, or to substitute for (…).'

The way in which I employ the concept of representation owes in particular to Foucault's discursive approach (Hall, 1997, p. 43-51). I am concerned with the production of meaning and knowledge and how they operate in the light of power for one thing, but I also refuse to limit historical representations to the purely linguistical. More specifically for historical research Ankersmit (1988, p.209) has argued that employing the vocabulary of representation can 'account not only for the details of the past but also for the way these details have been integrated within the totality of the historical narrative.' Looking into the processes of historical representation can help us to trace the coming into being of meaning out of fragmented historical information. Historical representation without signification is impossible, thus my interests lie in how signification is produced, and how it functions. As Anne Rigney (2001, p.4) has pointed out in 'Imperfect Histories,' representing the past (whether it be in the form of historical texts or via the establishment of heritage sites), is not only limited by the information available about the past, but also by 'the conceptual and discursive models we have developed for talking about the past.' Furthermore, I assess that these models are always partial and imperfect. Not every aspect, not every subject is as easily rendered visible through their idiosyncratic lenses. That's why there is a clear need to keep on developing alternative models.

The broader cultural relevance of this research thus lies in its attempt to (re)construct the complex history of a heritage site, while taking into account the problems of representation, discourses, knowledge and power on the level of the primary source material, on the level of its own historical narrative, and on the level of common academic discourses employed to look at history in general and heritage in particular. In other words, its relevance lies in its attempt to take seriously the (gendered) politics of history and heritage. Lorenz (2010, p. 93-94) has argued that such a thing can be done by taking into account (1) the politics of spatial demarcations and the connections between historiography and the nation state (2) the process of writing history itself and the disciplinary fields of history and heritage studies (3) the politics of time. Hence, these issues will receive ample attention in my analysis.

Many people have tried to make sense of Castrum's past and this has provided me with a series of historical representations to investigate: the development of Castrum's location at the Herengracht 401 as a heritage site, the publication of historical memoires and biographies by people closely involved with Castrum's past, the foundation's own historical reflections in its magazine and on its website, the contents of Castrum's archive, the formulation of academic critiques and historical overviews, and the staging of artistic interventions. I will try to bring together these different representations of Castrum's past and point out their partiality, how they work, and how they are made to fit certain models: from an activist gay rights rhetoric to the Dutch national history model of WOII resistance.
Inspired by Castrum's functioning as a heritage site I will also look into some of the relevant models -such as those of the palimpsest, the pastness of the past, and the predominance of meaning over matter- for talking about heritage. For as a gender historian trying to document the process of engaging with the heritage of Castrum Peregrini, the vocabulary I had available appeared to fall short. This became especially clear to me on the various occasions on which Castrum associate Lars Ebert let me explore the different parts of the house at the Herengracht 401. These explorations allowed me to grasp the complexity of Castrum, not merely as historically layered but also as spatially connected.

The central research question here is: 'Which different representations of Castrum's past can be discovered and how can I critically approach and explicate them while (re)constructing the history of Castrum Peregrini?' Sub-questions are: 'Which common heritage representations does Castrum affect through its functioning as a heritage site?' and 'Do these two levels of representation (historical discourses/heritage vocabulary) interact with each other, and if they do in which ways?

Ultimately, this means that I will be adding historical representations and significations of my own. Mine will explicitly attempt to bring out power dynamics, in particular where gender, migration and the circulation of cultural heritage are

concerned. Thus my inquiry will take place on two different levels: (1) on the level of historical research and historiographies (2) on the meta-level of heritage discourses. On both levels I will try to critically engage with the existing discursive models, and look for ways to advance aspects, which are currently not (or not very well) represented by the existing vocabulary on heritage, or by the historical discourses produced from within and outside of Castrum Peregrini.
This entails that my dissertation can be read in two different ways: (1) As a search for new ways of representing Castrum's history as it is constructed in historical research, and in the ways it can be read as a heritage site. (2) As my own historical research of Castrum, with critical attention for, among others, gender and migratory movements, embedded in a discussion of the broader discourses on heritage and history, whose conventions make it difficult to perceive Castrum in a different light.

This inquiry will be carried out in the following fashion:
First, I will present a critical survey of some of the recent literature on heritage and history. This chapter will lend the reader some perspective on current heritage debates. It will focus on a handful of topics, which are important for my further analysis, and will explicate some of the more and less conventional views at work.
In chapter 2 I will analyse the historical and contemporary manifestations of Castrum Peregrini. I will take into account the various discourses at play, how they are related to processes of identity- and group formation, and how they are marked by power dynamics. Then these different threads will be woven together. In chapter 3 the current and past manifestations of Castrum will be brought into conversation with the discourses on time, heritage and space, cultural memory, and processes of inclusion and exclusion discussed in chapter 1. To this conversation I will add a series of critical remarks, formulated by myself and by other thinkers, most of them well known within feminist philosophy, but virtually unheard of within the debates on heritage. Finally, these interactions will result in a set of points for reflection, and possibly some new additions to the heritage vocabulary that enable us to think of representing and making sense of the past in new ways.

1. A Preliminary Survey of the Current Discourse on Heritage.

Introduction.

In this chapter I will explore what has been written in the fields of historical research and heritage studies about the concepts that will recur in my further analysis. Since the field of heritage studies is an exceedingly broad one, I will focus on those themes that have emerged from my experiences with (re)constructing Castrum's history and being involved in Castrum's functioning as a heritage site. These themes are: (1) heritagization and time (2) heritage and space (3) how the relation between matter and meaning structures the discourses on heritage (4) migratory heritage and the circulation of cultural heritage (5) processes of inclusion/exclusion, with a special focus on gendered heritage. The selected texts are intended to give the reader a clear view of the various discourses -some less self-aware, others more critical- at work in these fields. They are meant to present to the reader my own situatedness by providing her or him with the academic context in which this thesis was written. Furthermore, the first three key themes will be used in chapter 3 as a springboard to start of a conversation about some of the cultural conventions in the fields of historical research and heritage studies. While the last two key themes will play an important role in my analysis of Castrum's historical representations as presented in chapter 2.

1.1 On Heritagization.

Since the 1980s Western Europe has witnessed a rapidly growing interest in all things considered heritage (Hartog, 2005). The pace at which academic publications concerning heritage are being published, is impossible to keep up with. But popular interest in heritage is also on the rise. Yearly 'heritage days' draw countless of visitors in the Netherlands and abroad, while tomes such as the four-piece 'Plaatsen van Herinnering' ('Places of Memory') (van den Doel, 2005; Bank and Mathijsen,

2006; Prak, 2006; Blockmans and Pleij 2007) become nationwide bestsellers. The public is actively encouraged to contribute to this heritage surge and locate places of interest with the help of websites such as www.geschiedenis24.nl/plaats-van-herinnering.html and www.xwashier.nl. A myriad of governmental and non-governmental organisations (from UNESCO over Heritage Europe to the Dutch Heritage Inspection) operate on national and international levels to preserve a past that is coming ever closer to the present. UNESCO now recognizes cultural heritage, monumental heritage, movable heritage, intangible heritage, world heritage, natural heritage, and even digital heritage (www.unesco.org). There are innumerable objects, practices, traditions, and sites from our past that we consider to be in urgent need of preservation

This surge in popular and academic interest has led some historians to investigate our current feelings of urgency and anxiety concerning the subject. It is precisely this sort of investigation that has brought the notion of time centre stage. Remarkable enough, time, as a philosophical and physical concept, has seldom been discussed within the science of history. While the temporal constitutes the very core of all historical research, it is most often taken for granted and remains chronically underanalyzed. However, in trying to deal with the current surge in heritage, a few historians have undertaken attempts to formulate a more theoretical outlook on time and its meaning for history, heritage and identity.

The initial impetus was given by historian Pierre Nora. In his work '*Les Lieux de Mémoire'* Nora (1984-1992) created a threefold (Eurocentric) chronology based on evolutions in the way people relate to the past. According to Nora, pre-modern times were characterized by an unselfconscious relation to the past, grounded in local communities. From the 19th century onwards, an evolution towards accelerated modern times took place. Elites began producing monuments and archives built around the notion of the nation state. During the 20th century the downfall of the nation state and the increase of media consumption have led to a postmodern era, where 'second order simulations of natural memory' (Kansteiner, 2002, p.183) have popped up. Nora's work problematized the rising concern with heritage. He linked

the need to keep everything safely packed away in archives, and the urge to turn all sites into *lieux de mémoire,* to a collective Western crisis of identity.
Meanwhile French historian François Hartog developed his 'regime of historicity', a concept describing the ways in which a society relates to its past and deals with it. Hartog (2005) connects the current heritagization of Western society to a change in the regime of historicity. He postulates that the Western world has lost its blind faith in progress from the 1960s onwards, becoming anxious and developing the desire to safeguard all of its accomplishments. Hartog (2005, p.10) reaffirms the idea that:

In this new configuration, heritage is linked to territory and memory which both operate as vectors of identity (…) However, it is less a question of an obvious, assertive identity, more a question of an uneasy identity that risks disappearing.

Historian Jay Winter has argued that the current heritage surge has its roots in globalisation and migration, two processes that upset the more conventional ways of (national) spatial organisation, as well as in the crumbling notion of linear time. He argues that this more conventional notion of time is under siege because of the traumatic after effects of the Holocaust (Winter, 2010 p.64). WOII, and the Holocaust in particular, have had a tremendous influence on the field of heritage and heritage studies, raising awareness of a past that does not seem to pass so easily. This theme has been taken up by the young Belgian historians Berber Bevernage and Koen Aerts. Using the examples of the Argentine *Madres de Plaza de Mayo* and the radical Flemish nationalists, they substantiate their claim that traumatic events can be utilized to contest the dominant regime of historicity, by developing an alternative one. In this alternative regime of historicity, the traumatic past is kept open and present. Here 'being past' cannot be equated with 'being absent' (Bevernage and Aerts, 2009, p.393). The authors model their argumentation on the distinction between the irreversible past (a fragile past that dissolves from the present) and the irrevocable past (a past that is stubborn and stuck in the present), made by the French philosopher Vladimir Jankélévitch. They point out that this existence of an alternative regime conflicts with ideas about the objective distance

of the past and the linear concept of time used by most historians (Bevernage and Aerts, 2009).

The theoretical ruminations listed in this chapter have emphasized the importance of exploring the possibility of different modes of experiencing time, of varying ways of relating to the past and being in the present. They have shown how heritage performs a crucial role in these configurations. Even more so, they have ensured our awareness of the fact that heritage itself has a history. Heritage does not consist of mere relicts but encompasses a cultural and social process, in which power dynamics play a crucial role. Keeping with this line of thought heritage has often been approached from the perspective of memory work or cultural memory.

1.2 Cultural Memory and the Canon.

Mieke Bal has defined the process of cultural memorization as follows:

An activity occurring in the present, in which the past is continuously modified and redescribed even as it continues to shape the future. Neither remnant, document, nor relic of the past, nor floating in a present cut of from the past, cultural memory, for better or for worse, links the past to the present and the future. (Bal, 1999, p. vii).

Among the most widely used schemes of cultural memory transmission are those developed by Jan and Aleida Assmann. Jan Assmann has highlighted the distinction between communicative memory and cultural memory. Communicative memory is characterized by a proximity to the everyday and by contemporary personal communications. Communicative memory has a limited temporal horizon of about a hundred years (Assmann, J. 1995, p.126-128). Cultural memory on the other hand, is characterized by a distance from everyday life. It consists of fixed points, 'figures of memory,' which transfer historical events via cultural texts (such as buildings, monuments, objects) and institutional practices (such as recitations, observances, rites) (Assmann, J. 1995, p.128-129). Aleida Assmann (2010, p.99-100) then

introduced a subdivision of cultural memory into working memory 'the Canon' and storage memory 'the Archive'. Where the Canon of a certain society consists of information, objects, and places from the past that are deemed meaningful in that society – the hundred masterpieces one finds in the central halls of the fine arts museum-, the Archive consists of historical relicts which are deemed rather useless– the countless drawings one can find in the basements of that same fine arts museum. Assmann reminds her readers that many cultural memories undergo transference from one category to the other, and that they often change meaning in the process. Moreover, she points out that the selection criteria for what is remembered and what is forgotten, are not neutral, straightforward or uncontested. (Assmann, A. 2010, p.102-105).

Mieke Bal (1999, p. xiii) therefore claims that: 'Acts of memory are performed by individuals in a cultural framework that encourages these acts.' During the second half of the 20th century, the Holocaust in particular has had an enormous impact upon our cultural frameworks. To deal with the extensive influence of its legacy on processes of cultural memorization, gender scholar Marianne Hirsch (2008) has developed the concept of 'postmemory.' The term was coined in an attempt to describe the relationship of the second generation to far-reaching traumatic events, such as the Holocaust. Hirsch argues that traditional schemes of memory transmission, such as those devised by Jan and Aleida Assmann are ruptured by such large-scale traumatic events. She argues that in these cases other forms of inter- and transgenerational transmissions are put to work, transmissions, which install a remarkable sense of living connection (Hirsch, 2008 p.103-107).

Through the perspective of cultural memory we are enabled to ask the questions: 'What kind of cultural work is heritage performing on this or that occasion?' and 'For whom is it performing this work?' For the gender scholar it is even more important to be aware of these processes. Cultural memory, heritage, communities, identities and subjectivities are no separate entities, which meet somewhere after their establishment. Rather, they are co-created and intricately intertwined. The critical appreciation of the internal and external workings of cultural memory can incite the

gender scholar to grapple with issues such as: What is remembered in public and what is remembered in private? Who is included in our histories and who is not? What has been forgotten and what has been made unthinkable all together?

1.3 Processes of Inclusion/Exclusion .

The processes of inclusion/exclusion have been extensively discussed by Ann Rigney, a literary scholar specialized in the study of cultural memory and the philosophy of history. She has argued that much of the scholarly work on cultural memory, and much of the memory work undertaken by previously excluded groups, has been based on a 'plenitude and loss model' (Rigney, 2005, p.12-13). This model assumes that all memories were there to start with, some of them just got lost or corroded over time. The plenitude model also supports the idea that the excluded memories from underrepresented groups can simply be excavated and recovered. Rigney (2005, p. 16-17) however, argues with Foucault that cultural memory is based on a fundamental principle of scarcity. She emphasizes that: 'The partiality of remembrance is not merely a shortcoming, then, but also one of the preconditions of its being meaningful for particular groups of people' (Rigney 2005, p. 18). She agrees with the idea that, for emergent groups such as women and immigrants, sharing collective memories is essential, but urges researchers to remain critical of these practices. Rigney advances the idea that these recently included memories are not merely recovered experiences, they are already based on existing memorial models. She points out that only when cultural memories are perceived as dynamic, they can be used to redraw and expand the social frameworks and imagined communities that supposedly preconditioned them (Rigney, 2005, p. 24-25).
In this same vein Michael Rothberg (2009, p.2-4) has introduced the concept of multidirectional memory in order to combat the common notion that practices of memory are always competitive: 'where there is a Holocaust museum, there is no room for an anti-slavery statue.' He suggests that, on the contrary, memory is a productive, cross-referencing and inter-cultural dynamic: 'Holocaust consciousness has helped to formulate anti-slavery commemorations.'

In-depth reflection on the processes of inclusion/exclusion, where gender and heritage are concerned, has been undertaken by feminist historians Sylvia Paletschek and Sylvia Schraut in 'The Gender of Memory. Cultures of remembrance in nineteenth and twentieth-century Europe'. Paletschek en Schraut focus on going beyond national frameworks of remembrance to ensure the integration of transnational evolutions and socially minoritarian positions. They argue that contemporary practices of remembrance in the Western world have been shaped by 19th century national memory culture; including a bourgeois gender model in which women's agency is marginalized. While these memory practices present themselves as inclusive and gender neutral, they are actually doubly caught up in gender: 'gender is a product of cultural remembrance, is called up by memory and social practices and is constantly reinscribed into the collective memory' (Paletschek and Schraut, 2008, p10). They also stress the importance of critically investigating *how* women are represented and remembered. Women are most often linked to the image of the mother, to social motherliness (especially in periods of war and crisis), thus turning women into anthropological constants. Allegories embodying timeless values rather than people linked to actual historical acts (Paletschek and Schraut, 2008, p. 24-26).

In (partially) rejecting national frameworks and emphasizing connectivity, their writings on gender and heritage have much in common with the existing academic work on migration and heritage. Buciek and Juul (2008, p. 105-107) elegantly capture the central thought of this field of research. They recount how migration and movement have always been key aspects in human history, and how, despite their far-reaching influence on Western countries, immigrants leave almost no traces in the form of official heritage. They seem to be on the losing end of struggles over identity and belonging. Buciek and Juul (2008, p. 115-117) attempt to conceive of heritage as a concept able to capture multiple cultural practices, a concept that focuses on crossings, movements and connections, one that is not only polyvocal but also polyspatial. Unfortunately, scholarship exploring the links between memory, heritage, migration and place is not that widespread. Some good recent examples include: 'Migration and Cultural Heritage' by Djasmadi, Hoefte and Mingoen (2010)

and ‘Cosmopolitan Europe’ by Western (2012). Examples of publications that take intersectionality into account are even more rare. A notable example is ‘Travelling Heritages’ a publication compiled by Aletta, the institute and archive for women’s history (Wieringa, 2008).

1.4 Heritage and Space.

In chapter 1.1 changes in the perception of time have been listed as one of the main contributing factors to the recent surge in heritage. The attentive reader might have noticed however, that in these theoretical ruminations the temporal was, more often than not, linked to the spatial. Nora (1989), for example, has argued that in premodern times heritage was connected to the local community, while in modern times heritage adhered itself to the notion of the nation state. Moreover, most of the authors discussed in this chapter seem to agree with the idea that we are currently in the midst of a process of space/time compression. Winter (2010) in particular has referred to globalization and migration as two processes that thwart the traditional schemes of spatial organisation and cause a general feeling of loss of place. A similar effect has been ascribed to the processes of digitalization. The assessments of these processes range from highly critical (Malpas, 2008, p.207-208) to fully optimistic (Badenoch, 2011, p. 311).

Although space already seems to take up a considerable place in the literature on heritage, it is sloppily theorized in its own right. It has proven to be a very popular topic for underpinning research, but also a deeply fragmented and ambiguous one (Warf and Arias, 2009, p.1-6). To begin with, it is difficult to come by one generally accepted definition of what space actually is. Most authors guilelessly employ terms like place, space, site and location as if they were interchangeable. In my survey of the extensive literature on space and heritage I have located only two recent theoretical explorations of the notion of space. Firstly, philosopher Jeff Malpas (2008, p.200) notes that the notions of space and place are often conflated, and suggests that we should investigate place as a distinct entity. Malpas (2008, p.200-

201) recognizes three different senses of place: (1) the sense in which something is there or is not there (2) the sense in which place refers to some specific site that has some significance (3) a sense of simple allocation, in *that* place. He then argues that the second sense of place is the one used most often in relation to heritage. Secondly, anthropologist Joy Sather-Wagstaff (2011) has developed working definitions of space and place based on the distinction made by philosopher Yi-Fu Tuan. She maintains that space is more abstract than place, and that space turns into place when we adhere meaning to it (Sather-Wagstaff, 2011, p.47).

One of the most common spatial tropes employed in the academic discourse on heritage is that of the palimpsest. Literary scholar Andreas Huyssen (2003, p.7) has been one of the most ardent advocates of applying the palimpsest, originally a literary trope,[1] to heritage sites. He argues that the trope offers an excellent tool for reading memory traces in (urban) landscapes, for perceiving transformations, erasures and heterotopias in monuments and buildings (Huyssen, 2003, p.7-8). The trope of the palimpsest has also been a major influence on artistic interventions, staged in heritage locations. Theatre studies scholar Cathy Turner emphasizes the fact that most in-situ performances and art interventions have been read through the lens of the palimpsest, as 'an aggregation of layered writings' (Turner, 2004, p.373). She suggests not only looking into temporal layering, but also paying attention to the co-constructive and relational aspects of in-situ interventions.

Remarkably enough, a variety of authors engaged with heritage and space have cautioned their fellow researchers not to be bedazzled by the sheer materiality of heritage sites. They point out that being embedded in place and matter makes heritage no less performative (Hoelscher and Alderman, 2004; Sather-Wagstaff, 2011) or socially constructed (Barthel, 1996). Here it seems that my exploration of the academic writings on heritage and space has picked up on an underlying tension

[1] According to the Oxford English Dictionary (1989); a palimpsest is originally 'A parchment or other writing surface on which the original text has been effaced or partially erased, and then overwritten by another; a manuscript in which later writing has been superimposed on earlier (effaced) writing.' Over time the term palimpsest has been used to refer to 'a thing likened to such writing surface, esp. in having been reused or altered while still retaining traces of its earlier form; a multi-layered record.'

in the discourse. The authors mentioned above struggle with the ways in which they can relate the material to the metaphorical. They are not alone however. When fleshing out the literature on heritage even further, questions about the relation between matter and meaning appear to be ubiquitous.

1.5 Staying with the Trouble: Of matter and meaning.

When applying Yi-Fu Tuan's definitions of place and space, the essential distinction between the two stems from the human capacity to endow meaning (Sather-Wagstaff, 2011, p.47). This view seems to represent the unspoken consensus on place and space (see also: De Certeau, 1984, p.117). Malpas' exploration of the three different senses of place brings him to diagnose the heritage discourse with 'the tendency to view culture as something that is additional to but also notionally separate from its materiality' (Malpas, 2008, p.204). Many of the authors listed in this chapter have shown to favour this inclination, and while others, such as Barthel (1996) and Sather-Wagstaff (2011), go some way in showing that historical meaning is not simply added to heritage sites or inscribed upon heritage objects, they can't articulate a vision in which meaning and matter are being co-constructed. These authors remain consistently within the framework of social constructivism. Even those who have tried to relate matter and meaning differently, in terms of performativity, still seem to imply that in the end meaning matters more than matter (Hoelscher and Alderman, 2004).

The feminist archaeologist Kim Christensen (2011) is one of the few heritage scholars, who, in her work on gendered artefacts, engages explicitly with the matter/meaning debate. Or as she calls it, referring to Foucault, the problem of things and ideas. This is not so surprising, given that the relation between meaning and matter has been a central issue in feminist thinking. This has been especially true for gender scholars working on the cusp between the alpha and the beta sciences, and within the field of technoscience. Starting with the publication of her infamous essay ' A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in

the Late Twentieth Century', biologist and feminist philosopher Donna Haraway has been at the forefront of this debate. Her writings underline the constructed nature of dichotomies such as those between the human and the animal, the virtual and the real, the natural and the cultural, the material and the semiotic. Haraway's cyborg was intended to deconstruct such dichotomies through collapsing the distinctions the cyborg is made out of, collapsing fact and fiction, the literal and the figurative, shifting the focus to both/and instead of either/or (Haraway, 1991). Highlighting the cyborgian nature of everyday life shows us precisely that it is impossible to sustain rigid dichotomies between nature and culture, matter and meaning. The cyborg purposefully calls for a feminist engagement with materiality, one that goes beyond the Cartesian subject. It is a first step towards changing ontologies by confusing boundaries (Asberg, 2009). A step taken even further by physicist and feminist philosopher Karen Barad, who has formulated a distinct vision on the mutual influence matter and meaning have on each other, as we will see in chapter 3.

2. Historical Case Study: the many manifestations of Castrum Peregrini.

Introduction.

In this chapter I present the second and main strand of my thesis. A case study exploring the past and present manifestations of heritage site Castrum Peregrini. This historical chapter has been embedded in two chapters that trace some of the current discourses on heritage, and which have the intention to induce reflections on a metalevel. But for now we will dwell on Castrum's past, (re)constructing its history in the form of a chronological overview, and critically examining the various discourses at play in the source material. To underpin this endeavour primary as well as secondary source material has been used. These sources include a limited number of academic publications, articles from newspapers and magazines, published memoires, oral inquiries, and various materials from Castrum's internal archive; such as brochures, memorial books, and issues of the Castrum Peregrini magazine. All in all there is plenty of material available to research Castrum's past, but most sources are distinctly fragmented, selective, and deeply marked by the situatedness and objectives of their respective authors. Many of whom were closely involved in the events described.

Furthermore, it is important to keep in mind that throughout Castrum Peregrini's history Castrum Peregrini's history has been actively put to work. It has been reformulated, reinterpreted, reshaped and reused by Castrum's own associates. To this day Castrum's statements and manifestations speak of the remarkable degree of reflexivity with which Castrum approaches its own history and its own historiography. Exercising control over Castum's past has been an explicit objective of its associates. This tendency manifests itself at two levels. On the level of the historical source material: Castrum has attempted to collect, safeguard and preserve its past by storing documents, creating an archive and a library. The question of who is granted access to these sources, and who isn't, has been a crucial consideration.

On the level of historical representations: the chronological overviews Castrum has published, the memoires its associates have written, the foundational stories Castrum tells about itself. They have been carefully edited with respect to how they are narrated, which events are emphasized, which themes are picked up, and who is featured in them. Processes of inclusion/exclusion (see chapter 1.3) and power dynamics concerning gender, sexuality, age, and migration are implicated throughout.

The processes of cultural memorization and circulation as described by Mieke Bal (see chapter 1.2) can be witnessed in Castrum Peregrini at two different levels:
(1) At the level of the German cultural heritage that informs an important part of Castrum Peregrini as an intellectual group and publishing house (2) At the level of Castrum's historiographical productions, perturbing testimonials from within and outside of the Castrum foundation. These levels interact dynamically and seem to correspond to Jan Assman's (see chapter 1.2) notions of communicative (short term, everyday) memory and cultural (long term, great cultural texts) memory.
Also of importance is Aleida Assman's (see chapter 1.2) division between memories, which are part of the canon, the ones that are deemed important and are recounted all the time, and memories, which are part of the archive, the ones that are preserved but not actively employed. Assman's reminder of the fact that cultural memories undergo transference from one category to the other is remarkably pertinent when looking into the evolving discourses concerning Castrum's history.

Many of the dynamics involving Castrum's historiographies can be linked to processes of self-representation, identity, group formation and legitimation.
They do not only serve associates of Castrum Peregrini but also people outside of this key group, for example gay rights scholars or George experts. And while I agree with Anne Rigney that: 'The partiality of remembrance is not merely a shortcoming, then, but also one of the preconditions of its being meaningful for particular groups of people' (see chapter 1.3), I will try and bring together these different partial perspectives. Not with the intention of subtracting them, and finding a neutral middle ground that represents the objective history behind the subjective narratives,

but in order to a gain critical awareness of how these narratives operate and for whom. I will try to trace the different threads that come together, twist and combine to shape Castrum, to point out the diverse people, objects, ideas, and cultural backgrounds that have affected Castrum as a place, a foundation and an idea throughout the years.

2.1 Castrum Peregrini: a chronological overview.

2.1.1 Starting the story: 1890/1902/1912-1942.

Choosing an adequate point in time to start a chronological overview of the history of Castrum Peregrini, is already a complex choice. One that is not a self-evident given, but a construction laden with meaning. Three different starting points seem to receive frequent mention in the literature on Castrum's history. Some accounts, such as prof. Michael Landmann's opening speech (1977) for the exposition '25 years of Castrum Peregrini Amsterdam', begin with the German poet Stefan George. Linking the establishment of Castrum Peregrini to the publication of George's first bundle of poetry in 1890 enrolls the foundation in a broader cultural tradition. Most accounts however, focus on one of the two people they consider to be essential for the actual founding of Castrum and its cultural legacy. Some identify this founder as the German poet Wolfgang Frommel, who was born in 1902 (Kluncker, 1977; Buri, 2009). Their perceptions of Castrum emphasize its function as a publishing house and a bearer of an elite German literary tradition. Others identify the Dutch painter Gisèle van Waterschoot van der Gracht, born in 1912, as the founding figure of the entire enterprise. This happens, in particular, in more recent publications such as '*Gisèle en haar onderduikers*' (Gisèle and her hiders) (Defuster and Somers, 2008).

A vast array of loose historical threads twist and combine to engender the establishment of Castrum Peregrini. Its exact inaugural moment is difficult to point out without falling into the trap of *hineininterpretierung*. This is why I have chosen to start this chronological overview with the pre-history of all the key players from

Castrum's earliest years. I've made the conscious choice not only to include Wolfgang Frommel and Gisèle van Waterschoot van der Gracht, who are often framed as the founders of Castrum Perergrini, but also the young people they helped to survive WOII. There is a tendency in the literature on Castrum to deny these young people their agency, oftentimes referring to them as 'onderduikertjes' (little hiders) (Lewin, 1983, p.230), while most of them were already grown men.
There seems to be a representational issue with age and victimhood at work here. It is not because these hiders were young and the victims of persecution, that they were passive and devoid of agency. They were not mere pawns being moved around on a game board, or recipients of esoteric knowledge. Although they had different roles, they too were shaping Castrum's history. Some clear examples of this discourse can be found among the historical explications on the Castrum Peregrini website. For instance: 'A group of youngsters survives nazi persecution in hiding on the 3rd floor Herengracht 401. (…) Gisèle van Waterschoot van der Gracht and Wolfgang Frommel took up the role of educators, protectors and friends. They were key to physical and spiritual protection of the group and any further developments of Castrum Peregrini.' (http://castrumperegrini.org/history).

By including the web of pre-histories of F.W. Buri, Claus Victor Bock, Peter and Manuel Goldschmidt, Wolfgang Frommel and Gisèle van Waterschoot van der Gracht, the core group of people living at the Herengracht 401 during the war years, I do not claim to produce a complete overview. My intention is to raise awareness about the implications of fixing one clear starting point, linked to only one of the figures involved.

F.W. Buri.

According to Buri's own memoires he was born as Adolf Friedrich Wongtschowski in Mainz, Germany, on the 18th of January 1919. In 1921 he moved with his family to Frankfurt, where he consecutively attended the *Volkschule* (1925-1929) and the *Gymnasium* (1929-1933). After the Nazi's assumption of power in 1933, he was forced to leave the *Gymnasium* and started training as a painter. In 1936 he became one of the last Jewish painters to be accepted as a member of the Frankfurter

painters guild. Wongtschowski first met Wolfgang Frommel in Frankfurt in the year 1933 (Buri, 2009, p.228). The use of soubriquets was widespread in the circle around Wolfgang Frommel, and Wongtschowski would later change his name to F. W. Buri. This name change signified his admittance into the circle (Keilson-Lauritz, 2006, p. 194) and represented the relations within the circle as well. The initials F. W. appear to refer to Friedrich Wongtschowski as well as to Wolfgang Frommel.

In 1937 Buri's entire family decided to move to Brazil. Buri however, stayed behind in Berlin. Apparently taking his cue from Wolfgang Frommel, Buri moved to the Netherlands in that same year (Buri, 2009, p. 197). At first he found shelter at the home of Kees Boeke, but the loneliness and the experience of being a migrant started to take their toll. In September 1937 he moved to Ommen, where he found employment as an arts and crafts teacher at the Quacker School Eerde. At Eerde he was reunited with his friend 'Billy' Cyril Hildesheimer, whom he had met in Berlin. Billy was born in London in 1911 and had grown up in Berlin, where he had met Wolfgang Frommel at the age of 13. He left Germany in 1935 to become a music teacher at the Quacker School Eerde (Bock, 2007, p.160). While Buri's mémoires (2009, p.91) imply that it was Frommel who arranged this teaching assignment for him, other sources indicate that it was on account of Buri and Cyril that Frommel came into contact with the Quacker School in the first place (Keilson-Lauritz, 2006, p.194; Haverkorn van Rijsewijk, 2008, p. 105). The Quacker School was internationally oriented and many of its pupils were Jewish-German expatriates, whose parents thought their children would be safe in the Netherlands. Buri developed an intense relationship with many of his fellow migrants; among them Billy and 'Enzio' Kurt Meyer Bochert (Buri, 2009, p.197), but also Claus Victor Bock, and Peter and Manuel Goldschmidt (Bock, 2007, p. 12).

In May 1940 the German forces entered the Netherlands, where Frommel was temporarily on holiday with Buri, Billy, the Goldschmidts and their mother (Bock, 2007, p.23). Frommel was forced to stay in the artist village of Bergen. Here Frommel, Buri and Billy met the Dutch painter and glazier Gisèle van Waterschoot van der Gracht (Defuster and Somers, 2009, p. 25). Buri and Billy were respectively

sixteen and nine years younger than Frommel. Keilson-Lauritz (2006, p.194) mentions that Frommel referred to them as 'my sons' or 'my children', while Bock (2007, p.38) describes the two younger men as Frommel's 'disciples'.
Soon after the invasion Cyril was interned on account of his English passport (Buri, 2009, p. 104). Frommel suggested that it would be better for Buri to leave Eerde as soon as possible, and to defy the school's explicit stance against going into hiding (Keilson-Lauritz, 2006, p. 199). In his mémoires Bock (2007, pp.40-42) recounts the story of how Wolfgang Frommel told Gisele van Waterschoot van der Gracht about his attempt to flee the Netherlands by crossing the North Sea, together with Billy and Buri. This failed attempt supposedly brought the three of them to the brink of suicide. Following this incident Gisele decided to help Buri find a hiding place. She found a safe haven for him with the painter couple Charles and Karin Eyck, where he stayed until 1942 (Buri, 2009, p. 104). But in the course of 1942 the razzias grew more intense, and Buri no longer seemed safe in the overt house of the Eycks. On the 8th of July 1942 Buri left his hosts with a suicide note and undertook a hazardous journey to Amsterdam. With the help of Vincent Weijand, Guido Teunissen and Wolfgang Frommel, Buri made it to Gisele's apartment at the Herengracht 401 (Buri, 2009, p.104).

Claus Victor Bock.

Claus Victor Bock was born in Hamburg on the 7th of May 1926. Together with his parents he left Germany for Brussels in 1938, one day before the Belgian border was closed for German citizens with a Czech passport. His parents left for India, where his father could get a job, but they were advised to leave their son behind because of the dangerous tropical climate. Although he was a practising Jew, he was brought to the prestigious Quacker School Eerde in Ommen (Bock, 2007, p.9-10). The Quacker School Eerde had been established in 1934 supported by Quacker communities in the US, who wanted to turn it into an international school with English as the main language. However, the school quickly turned into a German oriented one, as the Quackers charged themselves with the obligation to take care of all the refugees, pupils as well as teachers, coming from Germany (Haverkorn van Rijsewijk, 2008, p.99-101).

At the Quacker School Bock met a series of people who would be of great significance for his further development. Among them were the exiled teachers Billy and Buri, the latter in particular introduced Bock and his school friend Enzio to German writers such as Stefan George. He also met the half-Jewish brothers Manuel and Peter Goldschmidt, and the German poet Wolfgang Frommel (Bock, 2007, p.11-13). Frommel sometimes visited the school in the context of theatrical performances or to give lectures. Keilson-Lauritz (2006, p.198) states that Frommel's first visit to Eerde was probably in 1939, when he gave a lecture on Hölderlin at the school, but Bock's (2007, p.14) vaguely dated memoires seem to suggest that Frommel had been at the premises before the Hölderlin lecture. Bock and several other pupils from Eerde (including Peter and Manuel Goldschmidt, Enzio and, somewhat more distant, Clemens Brühl) became part of Frommel's circle of friends. With the exception of Enzio, they were all of Jewish descent (Keilson-Lauritz, 2006, p. 198). By the time Bock was fifteen he was completely captivated by Frommel. He recorded sharing an erotically charged encounter with him in 1941 (Bock, 2007, p.16).

When the war broke out in 1939 the Quacker School was faced with the rising responsibility over their Jewish pupils. Many parents lived abroad by now and could not be reached anymore (Haverkorn van Rijsewijk, 2008, p. 102). Curiously, several of the pupils, among them Bock, who were spending their summer holidays in the UK, were called upon by the school to return and spend the war years in the Netherlands (Bock, 2007, p.11). The school decided to cooperate with the German race policies in the hope that the situation would not get as bad as in Germany. They appointed a certain mister Kappers to negotiate on their behalf with the occupying forces in order to safeguard the children at Eerde. In September 1941 the Jewish children were secluded from the Arian ones. They were made to promise that they would not try to run and hide. The school feared that this would lead to retaliations (Haverkorn van Rijsewijk, 2008, p. 103-104).

Bock spent the summer of 1941 in Bergen, in the vicinity of Frommel. He returned to the artist village once more on the 31st of October to celebrate the birthday of Vincent Weijand. A young Dutch poet, who also lived in Bergen. Among the other

guests were Wolfgang Frommel, Wolfgang Cordan, Chris Dekker, Daniel Boeke and Peter Goldschmidt. Meanwhile, the situation in Eerde had deteriorated even further. The infamous transit camp Erica had opened close by (Bock, 2007, p. 43-46). In May 1942, when it became obliged to wear a star of David, the first Jewish pupil went into hiding. Tom Maretzki found refuge with another German poet living in Bergen, the above-mentioned Wolfgang Cordan. Eventually Johannes Piron and Liselotte Brinitzer, two other German-Jewish students from Eerde, would also end up in Cordan's care (Keilson-Lauritz, 2006, p.200). In July 1942 Chris Dekker, Vincent Weijand, and Manuel Goldschmidt conceived of a plan to feign Bock's suicide and move him to the Dekkers' house in Bergen, where Guido Theunissen had build him a hideout (Bock, 2007, p. 47-49). Other Jewish Eerde students who went into hiding were Clemens Brühl and Robert Wolf. Four students went back to their families and nine remained at the Quacker school. They were transported on the 10th of April 1944, none of them survived their stay in the camps (Haverkorn van Rijsewijk, 2008, p. 108-109).

In 1943 rumours about a possible evacuation of North Holland started to surface, and it became clear that Bock could no longer stay in Bergen. Plans were made to help him escape to the Herengracht 401, where Guido Theunissen was building yet another hiding place for him. In February 1943 Bock and Frommel, who wore a yellow *Schutztruppe* armband, managed to take the train to Amsterdam by choosing seats in the *Wehrmachtsabteil.* The only place where nobody would ask them for their identity cards.

Peter and Manuel Goldschmidt.

Peter Goldschmidt was born in Berlin in 1923, while his younger brother Rudolf first saw the light of day in that same city in 1926. Rudolf would later change his name to Manuel under the influence of the circle around Wolfgang Frommel (Buri, 2009, p. 242-243). Their father was a Jewish museum curator, their mother was from Poland. In 1938 the two brothers left Germany together with their mother and travelled to the Netherlands. They attended the Quacker School Eerde in Ommen for a limited period of time (Brusse, 2012, p.34). It remains unclear if the Goldschmidts and their

mother had already been acquainted with Wolfgang Frommel in Germany, or if they met him while staying in the Netherlands, presumably at the Quacker School. No further details about their encounter are provided in the memoires by Bock (2007) and Buri (2009). However, soon enough both Peter and Manuel are described as regulars in Frommel's circle of friends (Bock, 2007, p.13).

After the German invasion, the chronology of the Goldschmidts becomes less clear. Since the boys were only half-Jewish, and their mother had provided them with sound passports, they were not in any immediate danger (Buri, 2007, p.242). They seemed to live at different addresses, sometimes on their own, sometimes with their mother (Brusse, 2012, p. 34). Bock records Manuel's short stay at a school in Baarn (Bock, 2007, p. 161-162), as well as the Goldschmidts's residence in Bergen during the summer of 1941. There they were guests at the house of painter Etha Fles together with Wolfgang Frommel (Bock, 2007, p. 44). In 1942 Manuel moved to Amsterdam, according to Buri on the request of Frommel, to help out with the provisions for the hiders. In that same period of time Peter is also recorded as a frequent guest at the Herengracht in Amsterdam (Buri, p. 242-243).

Wolfgang Frommel

Wolfgang Frommel was born in Karlsruhe on the 8th of July 1902 as the son of a theology professor (Calis, 1989, p. 168; Keilson-Lauritz, 2006, p. 193). He studied at the university of Heidelberg, where he became fascinated by the German poet Stefan George. It was apparently Theo Haubach, the later Nazi resistance fighter, who first introduced him to George (Bock, 2007, p.49). Stefan George published his first bundle of symbolist poems '*Hymnen*' in 1890 (Kluncker, 1977, p. 2). His work most famously dealt with the hermetic vision of a new Germany '*Geheimes Deutschland*' that would be ruled by a spiritual elite. George gathered a circle of boys and men around him, the so-called *George Kreis,* with whom he lived according to this intellectual ideal. The circle was underpinned by a pedagogical eros inspired by Greek Antiquity: the formation of bonds of friendship between men and boys propelled by philosophical and poetical debate (Calis, 1989, p.186). George's circle of disciples was centred around the magazine '*Blätter für die Kunst*' (Lewin, 1983, p.

229). There is widespread consent that the *George Kreis* was not only elitist, esoteric and secluded, but also deeply andropocentric. The *Kreis* has been described as a '*Jüngerkreis*' (circle of young men), '*Männerbund*' (bond of men), and '*Homosoziale Vereinigung'* (homo-social association). George's writing on women, especially in '*Der Stern des Bundes'* and '*Das Neue Reich',* seems to be full of dichotomous clichés on femininity/matter vs. masculinity/mind, and casts aside female emancipation; banning women from the domains of state and science (Oelman and Raulff, 2010, p.7-12). Like Frommel would experience later in life, Stefan George also faced constant insinuations about his homosexuality, in particular about his preference for very young boys (Karlauf, 2011).

Frommel managed to get somewhat close to the *Meister,* Stefan George, through his friendship with Percy Gothein, a young Heidelbergian poet who, for a short period of time, was part of the *George Kreis*. While Wolfgang describes meeting the *Meister* one time in 1926, thus placing him directly in the lineage of George, some doubt has been cast over the authenticity of this encounter (Karlauf, 2011).
In 1930 Frommel, Percy Gothein, and Edwin Maria Landau started the publishing company '*Die Runde'* (The Circle.) The name referred to Frommel's (anonymous) circle of friends, who were all great George admirers. *Die Runde* focused on keeping the lineage of George going across the generations. This is illustrated in Frommel's poem '*Die Fackel'* (1937) with the phrase '*Ich gab dir die fackel im sprunge'* (I pass you the torch as I leap; also the title of Buri's mémoires). *Die Runde's* first publication '*Huldigung. Gedichte einer Runde'* (Homage. Poems of a Circle) was entirely dedicated to Stefan George. (Kluncker, 1977, p.2-3). A feat which those closest to George could not appreciate. They perceived Frommel and his associates as a couple of charlatans and usurpers (Karlauf, 2011).

The Nazi regime change in 1933 hindered the further operations of the publishing house, which managed to quietly survive until 1943. Frommel's own publications were forbidden (Kluncker, 1977, p. 4) and the Nazi's tried to incorporate George, who had died in 1933, in their *Kulturpolitik* (Lewin, 1983, p.229). Frommel found employment at a radio station in Frankfurt, where he subtly inserted oppositional

rhetorics into his late-night show (Phillipp, 1993). However, from 1935 onwards there was no room for resistory tactics anymore, and the circle around Frommel started to fall apart and leave the country. After being forced into the NS teacher's bond while holding a job as a lecturer at the university of Greifswald, Frommel also went into exile in 1937 (Kluncker, 1977, p. 5-6).
Keilson-Lauritz (2006, p.194) suggests that the exact timing of his departure might be linked to the threat of persecution on the grounds of homosexual contacts based on penal code article 175.

After residing in Switzerland, Italy, and France, Frommel got surprised by the incoming German invasion while on holiday in the Netherlands. He was forced to prolong his stay indefinitely. At first he found refuge with the Dutch poet Adriaan Roland Holst, who lived in the artist village Bergen. It was via Holst that he first met painter Gisèle van Waterschoot van der Gracht in the summer of 1940. In that same year Frommel decided to live with Etha Fles, a painter and maecenas who also resided in Bergen (Bock, 2007, p.23-26). In Bergen Frommel started to establish a new circle of friends. He found kindred spirits in Vincent Weijand and Chris Dekker, and in his two friends from Germany Billy and Buri. This circle was extended with their contacts at the Quacker School Eerde. Among these contacts were Claus Victor Bock, the Goldschmidts, Enzio Meyer-Bochert and Clemens Brühl (Keilson-Laurits, 2006, p.194). Influenced by George, Frommel himself seemingly had become a sort of artistic-intellectual tutor to these (often exiled) young men.

Considering the increasingly severe German race policies Frommel, who had become a frequent guest at the Quacker School, tried to push the school management to help the Jewish pupils to go into hiding. When the management remained reluctant, he decided to undertake action himself, in cooperation with the Bergen group and Gisèle (Bock, 2007, p.46-47). He subsequently assisted Buri and Bock to leave the school and find refuge in Amsterdam. Frommel himself was now staying at the Herengracht as well. As a result of this decision, Frommel did not have a real address any longer. The German poet tumbled into the semi-illegal underground as well (Buri 2009, p.104).

Gisèle van Waterschoot van der Gracht.

Gisèle van Waterschoot van der Gracht was born on the 11th of September 1912 in The Hague (*Gisèle*, 1993, p.8). Her father was the Dutch geologist Willem van Waterschoot van der Gracht, her mother the Austrian Josephine née baroness Hammer-Purgstall (Van Santen, 2008, p.11). In 1915 the family, including Gisèle's three older brothers, moved to Tulsa, Oklahoma, in the US where Gisèle's father was charged with locating oil for the Dutch Royal Oil Society. Gisèle and her parents definitely returned to Europe in 1929, her brothers stayed behind to study in the US. The family resided at *Schloss Hainfeld* in Austria, the home of her mother's brother.

When Gisèle was 18 years old she moved to Paris, where she was enrolled in drawing classes at the *Académie de la Grande Chaumière*. Subsequently she was an *élève libre* at the *Ecole Nationale des Beaux Arts* to prepare her for her painting study, but the stock market crash of 1929 prevented this venture. The funds for her study dried up and she moved to the Netherlands to live with her parents in Wijlre (*Gisèle*, 1993, p.11-14). Gisèle missed her contacts with other artists and soon a meeting was arranged with the glazier Joep Nicholaas, who lived close to Wijlre. The two became good friends and Gisèle learned the glazier trade from him. She established her own studio in Leeuwen-Maasniel, in Limburg. It was through Joep Nicholaas that Gisele visited the artist village Bergen and befriended many of the local artists, such as Adriaan Roland Holst, E. du Perron, Henri ten Holt and Charley Toorop. In 1939 the threat of war became imminent and Joep Nicholaas moved with his family to the US. Gisèle and her parents relocated to Bergen, which wasn't as close to the German border as Wijlre (*Gisèle*, 1993, p.15-18). After the war broke out in the Netherlands, on the 10th of May 1940, Gisèle continued her activities as an artist, alternating between Bergen and her studio in Leeuwen-Maasniel. She mostly worked on stained glass window assignments that she had taken over from Joep Nicholaas, but also continued painting. In February-March 1941 she held her first solo exhibition at *Kunstzaal Carel van Lier* in Amsterdam (Van Santen, 2008, p. 13-16). Further exhibitions followed, among them a solo exhibition in The Hague in October 1942, but the wartime conditions quickly deteriorated. Several commissions for stained glass windows fell through, and membership of the German

Kulturkammer became obligatory from April 1942 onwards. Gisèle refused to become a part of the *Kulturkammer* and turned to portrait painting in the private sphere. Something one was still allowed to do without a *Kulturkammer* membership (Van Santen, 2008, p. 18-23).

Already in September 1940 Gisèle had rented a *pied-a-terre* in Amsterdam, a small apartment at the Herengracht 401. In the apartment on the floor above lived a couple by the name of Miep and Guido Theunissen. They became good friends of Gisèle and were involved in the hiding activities (Keilson-Lauritz, 2006, p. 202). From 1941 onwards the apartment was already in use as a sojourn for Hans Piron, Edgar Fernhout and both Wolfgang Cordan and Wolfgang Frommel (Van Santen, 2008, p. 25-27). Gisèle had met Frommel in the summer of 1940 in Bergen. According to Bock (2007, p. 36-39) the two had spent some intense, enamored weeks together. Part of their bond was their shared German-artistic background (Van Santen, 2008, p.26). Gisele helped both Frommel's friend Buri, for whom she found shelter at the Eyck residence, and Billy, for whom she arranged weekly Red Cross food packages to be send to the internment camp (Bock, 2007, p. 42; Van Santen, 2008, p. 26). The first real hider to arrive at the Herengracht was Buri in July 1942. Neighbour Guido Theunissen, who was a skilled carpenter, had created a hiding place for him in a hollowed-out piano in Gisèle's apartment. In February 1943 Bock was also taken in. He stayed in the apartment of the Theunissens, where Guido had created a hiding place for him in a wardrobe (Bock, 2007, p. 42; Keilson, 2006, p. 201-202).

2.1.2 The War Years at Herengracht 401: 1943-1945.

From February 1943 until the liberation in May 1945 Buri, Bock, Frommel and Gisèle formed the core group living at the Herengracht 401. Remarkable for a group in hiding they were surrounded by a well-branched web of contacts. A broad range of people visited the building, which was known as *Castrum Peregrini*. This *nom de guerre* referred to a crusaders' citadel in Palestina and is often translated as

'Stronghold of the Pilgrims.' A different translation however, is also possible, and seems to suit the entire enterprise very well: 'Tower of Strangers.'
It is important to reflect about the migrant location Castrum's original inhabitants occupied. Frommel, Buri and Bock were refugees from Germany, while the geographical complexity of Gisèle's formative years ensured that her French, English, and German were better developed than her Dutch (*Gisèle*, 1993, p.8-14). Moreover, the cultural heritage that Frommel employed at Castrum in order to provide the hiders with the necessary psychological tools to handle their situation, and to offer them a view on an outside world they could no longer see, can be categorized as distinctly German. In line with the tradition of the *George Kreis* the group around Frommel focussed on reading, translating and writing –predominantly- German literature and poetry. They adapted these practices to safeguard their mental health and to keep emotional tensions among the group members in check. Or as art historian Bert Treffens (2008, p. 67) formulates it in his essay on the use of art as a survival strategy:

The German culture saved during the German occupation in the Netherlands, or also: saved by that German culture in a Geistigen Raum, a mental space, that was a space of freedom and friendship. That was what happened there (…) at Herengracht 401. (Translated by the author).

The German cultural heritage they so creatively employed to brace themselves against a political Germany that persecuted them, however, was often the same cultural heritage that was used by the Nazis in their *Kulturpolitik*. As mentioned before, even Stefan George himself was briefly incorporated into the Nazi canon. The group studied a classical all-male, predominantly German canon –think of Nietsche, Rilke, Hölderlin, Goethe and Schiller- and was deeply influenced by the notion of a connectedness within European cultural history dating back to Greek Antiquity. Buri and Bock spend countless of pages of their memoires relating the numerous poems they were working on. A revealing example of just how much of an impact this poetic labour made on both young men. Another member of Frommel's circle, Manuel Goldschmidt, recounted in an interview in 1983 (Lewin, p. 235):

*For me, it was the time of my life. I was introduced to poetry and literature. We read Goethe, Hofmannsthal, Hölderlin, Baudelaire and the Tachtigers. That's when I started to live. That is the world I still live in. (*Translated by the author).

Gisèle (1993, p. 22) has summarized Frommel's role in, and impact on, herself and the group in the following manner:

During those endless nights Wolfgang has given me and our friends insights into the cultural cohesion of the past centuries. In particular, he has revealed to us the riches of the Greek heritage. His treatises, the most ideal lectures, supplemented with mutual dialogue, poems and prose. For me, the Classics grew into a living possession. Ever since, seeing a Greek temple has become a latent dream. (Translated by the author).

As mentioned before, this core group of friends was surrounded by an impressive web of contacts:

(1) The first and foremost group that regularly visited the Herengracht consisted of friends who were part of Frommel's circle. The most important participants in Frommel's literary gatherings were Vincent Weijand, Chris Dekker and 'Reinout Vreijling' (a pseudonym for Jacob Gerhard van Rossum du Chatel) from Bergen, and Peter and Manuel Goldschmidt from the Quacker School Eerde. Other regular attendees were Liselotte Brinitzer and Clemens Brühl, two other Jewish Eerde students who had gone into hiding (Bock, 2007, p.62-64; Buri, 2009, p. 125). Frommel has been described by several sources as a *Menschenfische*r (Buselmeier, 2008; Karlauf 2009, p. 268) who was able to pick up young talented people from the streets. One of his 'finds' was Simon van Keulen, who was found to have a talent for drawing and was incorporated into the group (Bock, 2007, p.90-96). Some of Frommel's other additions to the group were 'Corrado' Conrad M. Stibbe and Gabriel Zeylmans van Emmichoven (Bock, 2007, p. 109-111).

(2) A second, more distant network of contacts emerged from Frommel's activities in the (underground) publishing world of Amsterdam. According to Lisette Lewin (1983, p. 227-228) only four percent of the illegal literature published in the Netherlands during WOII was German. A third of this illegal literature, or some 25 publications, can be linked to Wolfgang Frommel. He operated through three different affiliations: (A) His connection with the Hungarian Dr. K. Kollar at the publishing house Pantheon. Here he managed to stimulate publications of the work of George, Cordan, and Gothein. Frommel's own magnum opus '*Templer und Rosenkreuz, Ein Traktat zum Werk Stefan Georges'* was also published by Panteon in 1944 under the alias F.W. Ormeau (Lewin, 1983, p.228-229). It was Buri who helped Frommel realize this hermetic tractate, which links the Georgian tradition to the Rosicrucians and the Knights Templar (Buri, 2009, p. 138). (B) Together with Wolfgang Cordan and Adriaan Roland Holst he ran the illegal '*Kentaurdrucke*' (Callis, 1989, p. 167). (C) He also made use of his connection with the young graphic designer Martin Engelman, who had discovered a printing press in the monastery of Bemelen where his uncle was a monk (Lewin, 1983, p. 228).

(3) A third line of contacts consisted of Frommel's German acquaintances, who frequented the Herengracht. Two of his most noticeable visitors were Theo Haubach and Percy Gothein. The former, a SPD politician, George aficionado and militant anti-Nazi activist, visited Castrum Peregrini in June 1943. Haubach would later be put to death after being linked to the failed attempt on Hitler's life on the 20th of July 1944 (Bock, 2007, p.56). The latter was a German writer, with whom Frommel had established the publishing house *Die Runde* in the early 1930s. Gothein was also Frommel's direct link to Stefan George. According to Karlauf (2008b, p.546) he had been part of the George Kreis in the 1920s, but had fallen from grace because of the overt way in which he expressed his homosexuality. Gothein first visited the Herengracht in November 1943. He met many members of Frommel's circle, most of whom, stood in awe for him. Gothein granted the Herengracht 401 a second visit in the spring of 1944 (Bock, 2007, p. 97). Tragically, this time he was detained, together with Vincent Weijand en Simon van Keulen, when visiting these two friends in Ommen. The three of them were deported to the nearby camp Erica. As a

precaution the hiders at the Herengracht were moved to different safehouses. Just in case their captured friends were to give up any information concerning Castrum Peregrini (Bock, 2007, p. 115-120). Vincent Weijand, who was half Jewish, was first transported to Bergen-Belzen and then to Buchenwald, where he died at the age of 23 on the 22nd of February 1944. His last sign of life was a postcard he had thrown out of the train. According to Bock (2007, p. 129) that card read: 'I had imagined my first trip to Germany to be a completely different one', while Buri (2009, p. 151) claims that the card featured some lines from a poem by Üxküll Gyllenband:

'*Beweinst nicht völkertod und gibst kein haar.*
Für thron und schwert und stirbst für den geliebten.'

Percy Gothein perished in the concentration camp Neuengamme in December 1944 (Bock, 2007, p. 146). Simon Van Keulen, whom Gisèle had managed to visit in camp Erica with the help of a lot of bluff and bravado, succeeded against all odds in escaping. He jumped out of the train transporting him to Germany and managed to get back to the Herengracht 401, where he spend the remainder of the war years (Van Santen, 2008, p. 38).

4) An important series of contacts was provided through Gisèle and her network. First of all, Gisèle discovered some protégées of her own. She brought the young painter Haro op het Veld into the circle, and helped him to secure sufficient funds for his education at the art academy. She supported the young sculptor Jacques van Rhijn in a similar fashion (Van Santen, 2008, p.33). She also seemed to be connected with a wide network of artists and intellectuals, German migrants as well as those born in the Netherlands, who influenced the circle to a great extent. One of the most important figures in this respect was the *entartete* German painter-in-exile Max Beckman. The notion of the hiders at the Herengracht 401 being modern Argonauts became an important theme in his work (von Bormann, 2008, p.69-70, 76).
Gisèle's many interventions to help out friends, the ways in which she managed to keep on finding employment (and the necessary work material) throughout the war, and the ways in which she supplied the hiding community with food stamps and

other material necessities (especially during the famine winter of 1944-45) suggests that she was extremely well connected within many social circles. One of the names mentioned, is that of the wartime mayor of Amsterdam Edward Voûte (Van Santen, 2008, p. 46). However, her social networks have not been mapped out as clearly as those of Wolfgang Frommel, to whom many more pages are dedicated in the memoires of Bock (2007) and Buri (2009). Their writings do reveal many secondary clues about the richness of Gisele's network. Therefore it seems necessary for future research to flesh out Gisèle's web of contacts. For this endeavour, her personal archive might be a promising source of information.

In general, Gisèle has been largely written out of the classical historiographies produced by Castrum's hiders. Although this might be due to the influence of editors and translators, it is still striking that the memoires by Bock and Buri contain hardly any pictures of Gisèle, let alone of Gisèle together with the rest of the group. Although both books boast a decent amount of photographic material.
Bock (2008, p. 40) in particular describes Gisèle as an enterprising and artistic woman, but nevertheless relegates her to the material side of the hiding enterprise. He emphasizes her practical contributions to a certain extent, but diminishes her intellectual and artistic involvement in the group. Bock (2007, p.63) doesn't seem to count Gisèle (and Liselotte) among the key members of the artistic in-group: 'Wolfgang also found Gisèle and Liselotte, who enjoyed attending *our* lectures, to be receptive for this sort of format.' (Translated and italicized by the author). Here Bock rhetorically positions both women outside of the we-group, they seemingly inhibit the margins of the circle. Buri (2009, p. 137-139) revalues Gisèle's role to a certain extent. He describes their romantic relationship, something that Bock neglects to mention. He also points out that she was actively involved in the artistic gatherings, and that towards the end of the war the emphasis of the artistic activities even shifted from Frommel's poetry to Gisèle's visual arts, with Haro, Simon, and Buri taking up drawing and painting. It would be misleading though, to draw an insurmountable line within the hiding community, positioning the fine arts on one side and poetry on the other. The works produced at the Herengracht during the war period point towards a deep mutual influence and exchange. Examples include

paintings and drawings that were inspired by the poetry read at the Herengracht, such as Gisèle's rendition of Baudelaire's *Le Bateau Ivre*. Another indication consists of the metaphors and symbols, such as those of the argonaut and the acrobat, that started to circulate and show up in both the poetry and the visual artworks produced by the group at the time (Treffens, 2008, p.57-60).

2.1.3 Castrum Peregrini: 1945-1986

Immediately after the end of the war Buri (2009, p.153), as well as Bock (2007, p.176) record feelings of panic, trauma and despair. Buri compares his newfound freedom to seeing the sun again after a very long period of time. You have been longing for its light desperately, but when it finally shines upon you, it hurts your eyes and blinds you because you have grown so unaccustomed to it. The hiders both struggled to start anew and rebuild a normal everyday existence. These feelings were reinforced by another tragic event that occurred in the summer after the liberation. Fellow hider Liselotte Brinitzer drowned while swimming in the North Sea. The Herengracht circle buried here in the village of Catrijp, close to where her body washed ashore, on the 10th of August 1945. She was 24 years old (Bock, 2007, p. 153-154). Following this dramatic event the group published a memorial book under the sign of Castrum Peregrini. The monograph honoured the deceased Vincent Weijand, Percy Gothein and Liselotte Brinitzer (here referred to as Liselotte von Gandersheim) (Castrum Peregrini, 1945). The publication of this memorial book would form the initial impetus for the establishment of the Castrum Peregrini magazine (Kluncker, 1977, p.11).

After the first months of freedom Gisèle had to sublet the apartment at the Herengracht for financial reasons (Bock, 2007, p. 154), and everybody from the core group seemed to go their separate ways. Claus Bock left for India to meet up with his parents. He studied German language and literature at the University of Manchester, where he graduated with a thesis on Stefan George. Bock built a successful academic career. After obtaining a doctorate at the University of Basel in 1955, he became a

lecturer at the University of Manchester in 1956, and was made chair of German literature at Oxford in 1969. One of his most distinctive works was the '*Wort-Konkordanz zur Dichtung Stefan Georges'* (1964), which he had started to compile during his years in hiding (Friends of the Germanic Studies, 2008, p.27-29).
Buri (2007, p.177) articulated the desire to develop himself with Frommel at a distance. He started a graphology practice in Amsterdam, and in 1948 he married Jannie Strengholt, whom he had met via Frommel. The couple had one daughter; Renate. In 1953 Buri moved back to Eerde to work as a teacher. In 1969 he returned to Amsterdam, where he established an art school and exhibition space called 'Atelier Buri', situated in the premises of Castrum Peregrini. In the meantime he never ceased to publish poetry bundles, such as 'Eisenhans' (1947), 'Die Brücken' (1947) and 'Anheimfal' (1967) (Buri, 2009, p. 229). These were all published at Castrum Peregrini Press.
Frommel toyed with the idea of establishing a pedagogical graduate school in Schleswig-Holstein (Bock, 2007, p. 154). He returned to Germany to travel the country. Buri (2009, p. 185) describes Frommel's state-of-mind after the war as being torn between his desire to help with the reconstruction of Germany, and his desire to return to his sheltered spot in Amsterdam. Buri suggests that in the end it was Frommel's grief over Vincent Weijand's death that made him decide not to return to the country that killed his young friend.
Gisèle travelled to the US on the request of the '*Nederland-Amerika Vereniging'* to give a series of lectures on the artistic underground in Amsterdam during WOII. She also opened the first American Max Beckman exposition after the war, and exhibited the works that she and Simon van Keulen, Haro op het Veld and Peter Goldschmidt had produced at the Herengracht during the war. To pay of her wartime debts Gisèle took on a job designing the interiors for the American embassies in The Hague, Copenhagen, Oslo, Stockholm, Brussels, and Luxemburg. Hereafter, she returned to her studio in Amsterdam. In 1956 she established weaving mill '*De Uil'* together with Joke Haverkorn van Rijsewijk, and in 1959 she married Arnold d'Ailly, the former mayor of Amsterdam. The couple started exploring Greece together and began renovating an old monastery on the island of Paros. After d'Ailly's death in 1967 Gisèle kept residing on Paros during the summer months. In the wintertime she

visited relatives or sojourned in Amsterdam (Gisèle, 1993, p. 28-44). Her artistic work remained the subject of several exhibitions, such as those at art gallery De Boer in Amsterdam (Exhibition flyer, 1973) and the Singer Museum Laren (Exhibition Catalogue, 1979). In 1982 she moved back to the Netherlands where she lived, together with Frommel, Bock, and Manuel Goldschmidt, and with many of Castrum's new associates such as Thomas Karlauf, Marita Keilson-Lauritz, Ineke Schierenberg, Gregor Langfeld, Hartwig Otto, Michael Defuster and Lars Ebert, at the Herengracht 401 (Interview Lars Ebert, 2012).

However, in the first years after the war the bigger circle surrounding the Herengracht kept coming together in Amsterdam to read poetry, and gradually plans to fix the spirit of Castrum in a more permanent form started to well up (Buri, 2009, p.186). In 1950 a magazine in the German language, not such a self-evident venture in post-war Amsterdam, was founded. It was the twenty-year-old poet and member of Frommel's circle Gabriel Zeylmans van Emmichoven who established Castrum Peregrini as a 'magazine for literature, art, and intellectual history' (Kluncker, 1977, p. 12). The magazine's editorial principles hardly changed over the years. They were founded on showcasing '*Dichtung neben Malerei, Eigenes und Verwandtes, Werke der primären wie der sekundären Literatur, Bekanntes neben Verborgenem*.' (Kluncker, 1977, p.12). (Paintings in addition to poetry, the group's own work and kindred works, primary as well as secondary literature, the well-known and the esoteric.). Frommel's reflections (1971, p.144) on the magazine's orientation, written on the occasion of the publication of Castrum's hundredth issue, testify to the magazine's ceaseless focus on engaging new, young artists. Castrum Peregrini also featured work from multiple members of Frommel's circle. Poems by Gabriel himself, Buri and Bock were included, as well as drawings by Peter Goldschmidt and Simon van Keulen (Friends of the Germanic Studies, 2008, p. 30; Kluncker, 1977, p. 12). As writer and publicist Baal Müller enumerated in 2008:

Castrum's topics ranged from correspondences and memories of George adherents to translations of the Persian Sufi's, from the ancient polis via the Hohenstaufen dynasty and the Renaissance to the poetry of young, contemporary authors. At first glance this may seem to be a very disparate range of topics, but it is the socio-cultural constant of friendship (between men) that holds it all together. (Translated by the author).

Most of the articles in Castrum Peregrini however, can be linked, in more or less obvious ways, to Stefan George. Frommel intelligently positioned the magazine in the Georgian tradition by mentioning that other people have compared it to the publications produced by the circles around Goethe and George. He also made sure to point out that one of their mentors was Carl August Klein, one of George's earliest followers and mentor of George's magazine *Blätter für die Kunst*. Though not without humbly adding the statement that Castrum naturally does not pretend to be a direct successor of *Blätter*. (Frommel, 1971, p.144). Another one of the magazine's explicit aims was to represent the continuity of European intellectual history caught between the poles of classicism and a mystic world experience (Kluncker, 1977, p.25). This is clearly reflected by Castrum Peregrini's seal, which consists of the Classical symbol of the tripod caught within the Mystical symbol of the five-leaved rose. The tripod had already been used by Frommel as the seal of his first publishing house *Die Runde.* It is noteworthy that this specific representation of the tripod is only a swirl away from being a swastika, the logo Stefan George used to award to publications he approved of (Interview Lars Ebert, 2012). In addition to the content, the magazine's formal aspects were also of great importance. A significant amount of attention was paid to the magazine's typographical design (Siegel, 1993, p. 383).

In 1955 Gabriel left the magazine's position of editor-in-chief. He was succeeded by Manuel Goldschmidt, who appointed several of his wartime friends as members of the editorial staff. In 1958 Gisèle managed to buy the entire house at the Herengracht 401, and the Castrum Peregrini Foundation was officially established. The building not only became a home to the magazine and its staff, but also to the Castrum Peregrini publishing house, its archive and library, and to the many artistically gifted youngsters who were allowed to use it as a work space.

Among these young people were Marita Keilson-Lauritz (2006, p.191) and Thomas Karlauf (2011), who later in life published extensively about both Castrum Peregrini and Stefan George. According to Lars Ebert (Interview, 2012) the glory days of Castrum Peregrini, in its manifestation as magazine and publishing house, should be situated during the period 1958-1980. In these years Castrum produced over 10.000 magazine pages and over 60 publications, which granted more than 500 reviews in academic and popular publications alike. The magazine had close to 1000 subscriptions in more than 30 countries, two thirds of which consisted of German speaking ones. In 1966 Goldschmidt received the Cross of Merit by the Dutch queen because of his achievements with Castrum Peregrini in the field of European and Dutch-German self-reflection (Kluncker, 1977, p. 14-15). Castrum often stressed its European, even international orientation (Kluncker, 1977, p.25), but its main influence should be located in Germany. As is apparent from a notebook (Castrum Archive, 1978) listing the reviews of the exposition on 25 years of Castrum Peregrini. All of the articles mentioned stem from German newspapers.

In the beginning of the eighties Gisèle, who had returned from Greece in 1982, became more involved with the magazine. Although Lars Ebert (Interview, 2012) stresses the fact that, in a more informal matter, she had always been engaged with the magazine, the editors and their thought processes. Van Santen (2008, p. 47) deems her to be the patroness of the magazine. In 1985 Castrum published one of its most successful monographs '*Untergetaucht unter Freunden'*, the original German version of Bock's memoires. During the more than thirty years of its existence, Castrum Peregrini remained an intellectual fortress, but it had always been a very productive and lively one, mainly thanks to Frommel's broad network and his skills as *Menschenfischer*. Thus Ebert (Interview, 2012) argues that Frommel's death in 1986 marked the end of an era.

2.1.4 More manifestations: 1986-2012.

After the death of Frommel, Manuel Goldschmidt and Claus Bock became key actors in Castrum Peregrini. They focused on keeping the publishing house and the magazine exactly the way Frommel had left them, and thus ushered in a phase of conservation. Castrum Peregrini became fixed on Germany, poetry, and Stefan George even more. A tendency towards secrecy and seclusion breached (Lars Ebert, Interview, 2012). The apparent disconnect between Castrum's different manifestations was actively encouraged. While the publishing house and magazine were still estimated highly in Germany, they were hardly known in the Netherlands. Here, Castrum Peregrini was perceived first as a literary commune, surrounded by gossip about the male inhabitants' possible homosexuality and Gisèle's affaire with the former mayor of Amsterdam (Karlauf, 2009, p.265). Most subscribers to the magazine didn't even know there was a distinct link between Castrum Peregrini and the Herengracht 401. Indeed, the explicit choice had been made to feature no address on Castrum's publications, only an anonymous mailbox (Lars Ebert, 2012).

I can make the educated guess that on one hand this tendency towards secrecy was inspired by the Georgian tradition of secretiveness and small secluded groups, where chosen men of the intellectual elite could meet. On the other hand the group's traumatic war experiences of hiding, isolation and compulsory secretiveness probably underpinned these evolutions as well. They were further stimulated by Castrum's unadaptive approach to the rumours concerning the perceived homosexuality of some of its members. In particular, they encumbered themselves with the task of protecting Frommel, whom they revered as a tutor and pater familias. They struggled to keep control over the intellectual and spiritual heritage of Frommel, and tried to determine which narratives about Castrum could freely circulate, and which ones couldn't. This is particularly evident in the way in which Castrum's archive was approached in this period. Access to the archives was rendered very difficult for outsiders, and many important historical documents disappeared behind lock and key (Lars Ebert, Interview, 2012).

A major factor in these attempts at historiographical control can be brought back to Castrum Peregrini's disputed position as an heir of the *George Kreis*. From the 1920s onwards Frommel was perceived as an usurper by many members of the circle around Stefan George. His encounter with the *Meister* has been disputed several times (Karlauf, 2011). After WOII a clear rivalry between two camps of George successors, Frommel in Amsterdam and George's official heir Robert Boehringer in Geneva, surfaced. While the group around Boehringer based its claims on the close monitoring of the George tradition, Frommel's circle claimed to adapt and rejuvenate the George tradition all the way into the 21st century: '*Bei uns geht es weiter.*' ('With us, the story continues.') (Translated by the author) (Karlauf, 2011).
In 1951 Ludwig Thormaehlen, a renowned member of the *George Kreis*, wrote a hateful and anti-Semitic pamphlet against both Frommel and Gothein, whom he deemed to be serial pederasts, despised by the Meister (Karlauf, 2011). These tensions about George's successors still exist up to this day. In 2009 the German historian and director of the prestigious *Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach/Schiller-Nationalmuseum* Ulrich Raulff published '*Kreis ohne Meister*', a tome about George's successors that did not include a specific chapter on Castrum Peregrini.
From the early 2000s onwards a new gust of wind blew through the Herengracht 401. Goldschmidt ended his commitment as director of the Castrum Peregrini foundation in 1998 (Brusse, 2012, p. 34), Buri passed away in 1999 (Buri, 2009, p. 230), and Bock left Castrum's editorial board in 2005 (Friends of the Germanic Studies, 2008, p.31). The younger generation of Castrum associates decided to stop publishing the magazine in 2007. A new series of publications was initiated under the name *Castrum Peregrini. Neue Folge,* and was passed on to the Walstein publishing house in Göttingen (Keilson-Lauritz, 2008). These decisions were met with much resistance, especially in the German press (see chapter 2.2.2).

However, Castrum's new director Michael Defuster and his team were determined to transform Castrum Peregrini from an intellectual fortress into an intellectual playground. They shifted Castrum's focus to all forms of contemporary artistic expression, to cross-disciplinarity, to Gisèle's role as a patroness, painter and maecenas, to the actual building at the Herengracht 401, and to opening up to the

outside world. In 2009 they opened a project space, accessible by the general public, in their building at the Herengracht. Interacting with, and generating critical awareness about Castrum's historical context remained one of the foundation's key objectives. As shown by Lars Ebert and Ute Oelman in their foreword to the last issue of Castrum Peregrini magazine (2007, p. 8) Castrum's contemporary values of freedom, friendship, and culture are firmly rooted in its rich and complex past: 'Es ist ein Leben aus der Dichtung im Kreis der Freunde, in jemen 'kreis den liebe schliesst'.'

2.2 Castrum Peregrini: Interacting Manifestations and Discourses.

2.2.1 Many Manifestations.

Weaving together the existing historical narratives concerning Castrum Peregrini into a chronological overview elucidates just how many manifestations Castrum Peregrini has assumed over the years. We can at least distinguish seven different roles, with which Castrum Peregrini has been identified:

1. Castrum Peregrini as a WOII hiding place.
2. Castrum Peregrini as a George Kreis centred around the figure of Frommel.
3. Castrum Peregrini as a German focused publishing house and magazine.
4. Castrum Peregrini as Herengracht 401; Gisèle's house and working space.
5. Castrum Peregrini as an intellectual-artistic living community.
6. Castrum Peregrini as a heritage site and *gesamtkunstwerk*.
7. Castrum Peregrini as an intellectual playground and project space.

These manifestations are generated through, and interact with, the diverse discourses employed by both associates of Castrum Peregrini and outsiders. They are marked by age, generation, national orientation, migratory experiences, intimate relationships, sexual orientation, gendered ideals, awareness of historical and cultural heritage, and even economical motivations.

Castrum's many manifestations also seem to bear a striking resemblance to the traditional heritage trope of the palimpsest (see chapter 1.5). Indeed, Castrum, both as a concept and as an actual building, consists of different temporal layers, some of which (partially) remain, while others are changed, overwritten, recycled or reinterpreted over time. However, looking at Castrum through the lens of the palimpsest only threatens to collapse Castrum in on itself, to limit its spatial and material manifestations to the grounds of the Herengracht 401. It might be more productive to conceive of Castrum not only as a palimpsest, but also as a rhizome. To actively investigate Castrum's extensive networks, which allow people, ideas, and objects to circulate. This line of thought will be further developed in chapter 3.1

2.2.2 Different Discourses.

Internal Discourses.

I will first look into Castrum's internal discourses, into the ways Castrum's closest associates have represented Castrum, its history, and its main functions to the outside world. It is important to stress the fact that Castrum, since its inception, has been preoccupied with relating itself to cultural heritage, and positioning itself in historical traditions. (1) This happened on the more general level of a European literary and intellectual tradition, which supposedly dates back to ancient Greece. Prime examples include Wolfgang Frommel's '*Templer und Rosenkreuz'* (1940), which links the George tradition back to the Rosicrucians and the Knights Templar, and Bock's claim (2007, p. 81) that Frommel's own lineage goes back to the protestant mysticism of Jacob Boehme, to Meister Eckhart and Joachim de Fiori, and even further back to the tradition of syncretism, to Dionysius the Areopagite and Philo of Alexandria. (2) On a more specific level, Castrum has attempted to embed itself firmly into the tradition of George, his circle and his magazine. A prime example of this discourse can be found in reflective pieces by Frommel such as '*Der Dichter. Ein Bericht*.' (1950) and '*Der geometrische Ort*.' (1977), in which he underlines his personal bond with Stefan George and/or the people close to Stefan George.

Moreover, Castrum soon got involved in shaping the historical narratives concerning its own legacy and that of Wolfgang Frommel. A distinctive degree of control was exercised over archival access, over which historical narratives are actively circulated, are given a strong sense of meaningfulness, and which ones have to stay in, or are even deleted from, the archive. This is evident in the memoires of Bock and Buri, which differ from each other in several ways. For instance, while Bock (2007) turns George's '*Der Stern des Bundes*' (and by extension George himself) into a recurring and central theme in the group's wartime experiences, Buri (2009) barely mentions the book. Another primary example can be found among the competing discourses surrounding the cause of Percy Gothein's arrest. While narratives stemming from Castrum have only ever mentioned that Gothein was detained because of his supposed ties with the resistance group *Kreisauer Kreis* (Bock, 2007, p. 101-102; Buri, 2009, p. 150-153; Van Santen, 2008, p. 35-37), other sources, such as the German poet Wolfgang Cordan and the George adherent Ludwig Thormaehlen have claimed that his arrest was most likely linked to his homosexuality (Cordan, 2003, p. 13; Karlauf, 2011; Keilson-Lauritz, 2006, p. 207-208).

Castrum's complex relationship with history, historiography and cultural heritage continues up to this day. On one hand Castrum employs a meta-perspective; reflecting on its history and heritage and how they can be used to benefit contemporary issues. They critically work with themes and patterns, which have been meaningful in Castrum's past, and stage their return. For example, by inviting artists such as Amie Dicke to create art which is inspired by, reflective about, and intervening in Castrum's heritage (see chapter 3.2). On the other hand, Castrum's current generation has tried to deskew certain historical narratives, which they perceived to be too one-dimensional. '*Gisèle en haar onderduikers*.' (2008, p. 11)[2]

[2] Note that the title 'Gisèle and her hiders' seems to indicate, with its possessive pronoun, that there is a struggle about whose hiders they really were (Gisèle's or Frommel's?), while rendering the hiders themselves passive.

was for example published as a pendant of Bock's memoires, in which Gisèle's role remained underdeveloped.

Castrum's internal discourses are linked to, and interact with, specific manifestations of Castrum, which are deemed to be important in a specific era and/or by a specific person. Is Castrum foremost a historical hiding place? A living community in Amsterdam? A publishing company propagating the intellectual tradition of a better Germany? A circle of George devotees led by Frommel? An artistic and intellectual project space with Gisèle as its patroness? The ways in which these diverse aspects have been emphasized, deemphasized and reemphasized throughout the years are reminiscent of Aleida Assman's processes of canonization and archiving (see chapter 1.2). With its diverse historical narratives consciously being made part of the canon, being returned to the archive, or vice versa, Castrum seems to be a textbook example of the formation of cultural memories and heritage, and the ways in which power runs through these processes.

Castrum's current generation has represented Castrum as a space for visual arts and critical reflection, and has shifted the focus to Gisèle and her role as a painter and maecenas, to Castrum's presence in the Netherlands, and to its inclusive European orientation. They have steered Castrum towards a position of relative openness, and do not merely accept Castrum's legacy and history but try to investigate its current potential. Castrum's past generation has always emphasized Frommel as a poet and a mentor. They were oriented more strongly towards Germany and advanced mostly Castrum's literary aspects. They were strongly influenced by the traumatic experiences of WOII and living in exile, and chose a more private, elitist approach. Both these representational tendencies are also present in the external discourses about Castrum Peregrini.

External Discourses.

First we need to insert a cautionary note. Of course, there is no such thing as a completely external discourse. Even a distant newspaper article has been thoroughly influenced by what associates of Castrum decide to bring into the limelight. This is

especially true in the case of Castrum Peregrini, since many people who have written about it, have been intimately connected to the foundation or its members. Joke Harverkorn van Rijsewijk for instance, who has written an essay about the Quacker School Eerde in '*Gisèle en haar onderduikers'* (Defuster and Somers, 2008), established weaving mill *De Uil* together with Gisèle in the 1950s. While both Marita Keilson-Lauritz and Thomas Karlauf have lived and worked in Castrum for a substantial period of time.

A first notable trend in the external discourses emerges from the diverse array of newspaper and magazine articles published about Castrum Peregrini. I have chosen to focus on articles from the period 2007-2011, published in Dutch newspapers on one hand, and in German newspapers and literary magazines on the other. This four year period has been a time of great change for Castrum: the death of Bock, the end of the magazine, the opening of the project space, and the honouring of Gisèle's achievements by the mayor of Amsterdam. This eventful period of time does not only guarantee sufficient press attention, but also magnifies the existing trends. This list of articles was compiled with the help of the press folders, which are preserved in the Castrum Peregrini archive. An overview of the articles used can be found in the bibliographical section 5.3.

It is remarkable how articles from German newspapers and magazines define Castrum first and foremost as a publishing house and magazine. The termination of Castrum's publishing activities is therefore equated with the end of Castrum Peregrini itself. This is apparent in articles such as '*Die Pilgerburg schliesst ihre Tore.'* (Müller, 2008). It is clear that it is Castrum's connection with Stefan George that renders the foundation unique for many a German journalist and critic, as is shown in '*Georges Erbe.*' (2008), and '*Meister des Endens. George und mehr.'* (Kissler, 2008). All of the articles mentioned above solely focus on Castrum's literary activities, and on the foundation's role as a lively heir of, and successor to, George. This is also the reason why the end of the magazine is perceived as such a heavy loss in Germany, see for example: '*Ende einer Epoche*.' (Keilson-Lauritz, 2008) or '*Eines solche Zeitschrift wird es nicht wieder geben*.' (Karlauf, 2008a). The decision to stop

publishing Castrum magazine seems especially incomprehensible to most authors seeing the recent Stefan George revival, caused by the success of Karlauf's biography (Buselmeier, 2008). All of the articles mentioned above emphasize the role of Wolfgang Frommel, Castrum's German orientation, and its impact on the field of German literature and intellectual history. They highlight the exile experiences of Castrum's members (Karlauf, 2008a), and even define Castrum as an '*Exilzeitschrift*' (Der Untergetauchte, 2008, p.14). Older articles prove that these representational tendencies are not a recent development either (Untergertaucht bei Freunden, 1989).

Meanwhile, articles in Dutch newspapers frame Castrum as WOII hiding place on one hand, and an arts space on the other. They focus on Gisèle's role in both these enterprises, and on Castrum's location in Amsterdam. Gisèle is often described separately from the rest of the Castrum group, and is defined as a painter and maecenas. Examples of these representational tendencies include: 'Een levenlang kunstmecenas aan de gracht.' (2011), 'Verrijk uzelf door gul te geven.' (2011) and 'De erfenis van een onderduik.' (2009). A subcategory of Dutch articles also seems to focus on Gisèle as an eccentric artist with eccentric tastes and an eccentric house. These articles often refer to Gisèle's relationship with the former mayor of Amsterdam, and address her as 'the widow of d'Ailly.' This is evident from titles such as '*Kleine expositie over Herengracht 401, het huis van de weduwe van burgemeester d'Ailly*.' (2007), and '*Gisèle kiest haar schilderijen.*' (2009).

Apart from all these striking differences, I need to point out an important similarity between the German and the Dutch articles on Castrum Peregrini as well. They both recuperate Castrum as a part of their respective national histories, as a meaningful part of Germany's well-known literary heritage, or as a meaningful part of the illustrious Dutch history of WOII resistance. The, often unconscious, imposition of these national perspectives prevents the circulation of other definitions of Castrum. Definitions with the potential to frame Castrum Peregrini as part of a history marked by movement and displacement, as a site of migratory heritage. As I have argued with Buciek and Juul in chapter 1.3; it is apparently very difficult to conceive of

heritage as a concept that focuses not on national canons, but on movement and connection, to conceive of heritage as polyspatial.

Another important line of external discourses consists of the recuperation of Castrum's historical narratives by scholars involved with gay activism. Keilson-Lauritz (2008) has touched upon this theme. She has pointed out that 'friendship', the key theme for Castrum both in the past and the present, has been a covert term for homosexuality in the Netherlands. Here she refers to 'de vriendschap die liefde heet' (the friendship called love), a concept introduced by the Dutch poet Albert Verwey, a friend of Stefan George.

In a part of the public consciousness, in Germany, and most of all in the Netherlands, Castrum Peregrini was a magazine and a foundation invested in male eroticism and its related literature (from George via Michelangelo and Kafavis to Thomas Böhme). Something which has been a curious taboo within the magazine and the publishing house.
(Keilson-Lauritz, 2008) (Translated by the author).

However, Keilson-Lauritz is very nuanced about the topic, and doesn't force the externally constructed identity category of 'homosexual' on Castrum, whose associates clearly do not self-identify in this way. She points out that the scientific term 'homosexuality', which became popular by the turn of the 20th century, wasn't appreciated by the group around Stefan George either. They committed to ideals from Greek antiquity, which they believed to encompass more fully the complexity of erotic and emotional ties between men (Keilson-Lauritz, 2006, p.193). Personally, I would add to Keilson-Lauritz's remarks that most of the people living and working at Castrum just do not see why their sexual orientation should infringe upon or contribute to their engagement with Castrum. This is especially true for its current generation. But Gisèle's perspective has also been fuelled by a similar attitude of '*moet kunnen, et alors?*' People should be able to organize their personal lives devoid of restrictive bourgeois ideals of gender and sexuality, but also devoid of the obligation of activist liberation (Interview Ebert, 2012).

For within this discourse there is also a subcurrent, that asks Castrum Peregrini to 'come out of hiding' in a more imperative fashion. It urges Castrum to define itself as a gay heritage site, thus enriching the annals of homosexual history. This calls back to the process described by Anne Rigney in chapter 1.3, in which she suggests that underrepresented groups will try to recover histories previously denied to them. They will try to create a meaningful, collective history for their particular group in order to reinforce the foundations of their own (imagined) community.
An example of this discourse is the article 'Gay underground location in the heart of Amsterdam.' (2000), written by sociologist Mattias Duyves. In this piece Duyves describes Castrum as the gay Anne Frank house, and while he tries to be tolerant about Castrum's need to conceal their 'evident' homosexuality, he can barely conceal his annoyance about the situation. As is apparent from his aim to out several of Castrum's members as homosexual himself. However, the many factual errors in Duyves' story seem to indicate his limited knowledge about Castrum's history.
Another example in this regard is sociologist Gert Hekma's 2004 article in Gay News, called '*Twee Wolfgangs – Castrum Peregrini.*' Striking enough, the article is yet again riddled with factual errors. Hekma goes even further than Duyves in outing Castrum for 'what they really are.' With no eye whatsoever for complex historical processes of identity formation, Hekma (2004) stages an attempt to pierce through Castrum's alleged superficial appearance of spiritually elevated Platonism:

'And at Castrum they continue to deny that their friend of young boys Frommel was a homosexual. It is very strange that they still make such a fuss about the love between men in the heart of a city, where in cultural circles gay sex can hardly be called a problem anymore.' (Translated by the author.)

2.2.3 Manifestations of Power.

As I have pointed out in the last two chapters, power runs through the different manifestations of, and discourses on, Castrum Peregrini. A wide array of power differentials is present: the notion of class operates at Castrum, which is clearly

marked by elitist dynamics. Moreover, class is often intersected with age, as both Gisèle and especially Frommel, presented themselves as tutors. They plucked young people from the streets, brought them into Castrum, and provided them with an artistic and intellectual education according to the platonic model. Sexuality is of importance as well, in the form of intimate relations, which often bridge the significant age gaps present at Castrum. However, given the scale of my thesis and for the sake of my analysis, I have chosen to focus primarily on the gendered manifestations of power, and the interactions of cultural heritage, trauma, and migration.

Gendered historiographies.

Castrum's historiographies are gendered in interesting and complex ways. Because of her multiple atypical positionings, Gisèle evidently captures the attention of the gender scholar in me.

First of all, she is atypically positioned in relation to contemporary gender role expectations because of the fact that she remained unmarried for a long period of time, because she had no children, because of her self-supporting artistic pursuits, and because of her role as a maecenas.

A second atypical positioning concerns the way her actions during the WOII are described. Defuster and Somers (2008, p.8) assign her a triple role: (1) She acquired the apartment at the Herengracht 401 and hid Jewish and German refugees there. (2) Through her vast network of (artistic) acquaintances she was able to obtain work assignments and provide the necessary material support for the hiding enterprise. (3) She looked after the mental wellbeing and artistic development of the circle of refugees and hiders. She is thus represented as a historical actor and not as a timeless trope, something which is not such a self-evident matter according to Paletschek and Schraut (2009, p.24-26) the authors of 'The Gender of Memory' (see chapter 1.4, p. ?). Especially in times of war women are often reduced to the figures of mothers, martyrs, or victims, all of them tropes that cannot be adapted to describe Gisèle's wartime pursuits. Moreover, her activities with Castrum Peregrini during WOII can be framed as a temporary collapse of the public and the private spheres. Men, traditionally linked to the public domain, were chained to the private

realm, while a woman, normally perceived as bound to the domestic domain, became an important link to the public sphere. Gisele's role of actively earning the bread on the table, while her group of hiding men were locked inside a tiny apartment, seems to trigger a remarkable reversal of the stereotypical bourgeois gender dichotomies, associating the feminine with domestic chores and the masculine with public action.

Finally, a third atypical positioning is related to Gisèle's embeddedness in a living and working community of men, inspired by homo-social traditions, ties, and literature, without her occupying a space of motherly care.

Despite the fact that Gisèle's actions, bravado, and material accomplishments during WOII are praised by all –including Bock, who in general has the tendency to efface her role-, it is important to point out that she is most often linked to the material side of the hiding enterprise. Her share in the psychological, intellectual, and artistic support of the hiders -the third aspect mentioned by Defuster and Somers (2008, p.8)- is often deemphasized. The similarities with the gender discourse employed by Stefan George are striking. Women, who were bound to the material, were excluded from George's circle, since only men had a privileged relationship with the mind.

In George's ideal circle, as well as in his ideal state, women took care of the material side of everyday life, so that men could devote themselves to tasks from an altogether higher plane (Oelman and Raulff, 2010, p. 8-9). However, as with Castrum, the monosexual self-image that the *George Kreis* held up to the rest of the world did not always correspond to lived reality. As described extensively by Oelman and Raulff (2010) numerous women, many of whom were important artistic-intellectual figures themselves, were crucial to the development of George's poetry and his circle. In line with this idealized Georgian narrative of men forming a strong intellectual centre and women living on the outskirts of this circle, ensuring the material preconditions for male community, Bock positions Gisèle –and any other woman for that matter- in the margins of the all male in-group.

These power dynamics are also reflected in the ways names are used throughout the memoires of Bock and Buri. Most of the women, who figure in their respective stories, don't get a name at all. See for instance upstairs neighbour Miep Theunissen

who is never mentioned by name, while her husband is (Bock, 2007, p.55; Buri, 2009, p. 161). Gisèle in turn, is usually called by her first name while all the male members of the group, especially the older one such as Frommel, are most often referred to by their last name. Although this also might have happened, as is the case with my own historiography, because of practical reasons, given the length of Gisèle's surname.

The link to Stefan George and his evident discourses on masculinity, community and age urges us not to forget that 'gender' is not a synonym of 'female.' The definition and protection of male gender roles has been just as important, if not more important, in Castrum's historiographies. Strictly formulated ideals of masculinity and relationships between men, modelled on late 19th century and classical Greek concepts, had to be negotiated with evolutions in this respect in society at large. These ideals of masculinity are, for instance, reflected by Castrum's name. A homo-social trope modelled on a longstanding male European tradition with roots in Classical Antiquity. The exact same can be said about the trope of the Argonauts, which both members of Castrum and painter Max Beckmann have used to describe the hiders at the Herengracht. Or about the virtually all-male, often homo-erotically inspired, Western literary canon most of Castrum's members preferred to engage with. Another point in case is the infamous picture portraying the most frequent male members of Frommel's literary circle, taken at Castrum Peregrini in 1943.

Migratory historiographies.

Castrum's first generation in particular has been deeply marked by the experiences of exile and migration. This applies to Gisèle because of the geographical complexity of her youth and the remoteness of her familial connections. Most of her relatives were either deceased or lived abroad. Evidently, this also applies to the German and German-Jewish refugees connected to the Herengracht 401, who were forced to leave their country of birth in the course of the 1930s. It is significant that almost no-one connected to the original hiders' community returned to Germany. Peter Goldschmidt remained in the Netherlands and moved to Tuscany in the 1970s (Buri, 2009, p. 243), Claus Bock alternated between the UK and Amsterdam, Manuel

Goldschmidt and Wolfgang Frommel stayed at the Herengracht 401, and Buri spent most of his life in the Netherlands, only returning to Germany after the death of Frommel (Buri, 2009, p. 230). The fact that they never returned to Germany does not only testify to the deep bonds of friendship and congeniality that were formed during WOII, but also tells tales of psychological trauma and the fairly ambiguous relationship with regards to their *Heimat*. Their uneasy dealings with the past and present socio-political manifestations of Germany rendered them lifelong migrants. Buri (2009, p. 154-155) in particular repeatedly reflects about the group's feelings of being *heimatlos*. His descriptions hint at the emerging emotional and ethical conflicts conjured up by a *heimat* whose citizens and cultural canon saved his own life, while that same *heimat* exterminated his friends.

Although most of the former hiders never resided in Germany afterwards, they did negotiate an intimate relationship with Germanness. Frommel for instance, returned to Germany several times a year to maintain his networks, keep in touch with intellectual and artistic developments, and procure new members for Castrum (Karlauf, 2008). In this manner he stimulated the migratory connections between Germany and the Netherlands, and seemingly recreated Castrum's migratory experiences for ever more young people. This still rings true for Castrum's current members, the majority of whom originally moved to the Netherlands from another country. Another indication is the fact that Frommel never learned to speak Dutch fluently and kept on speaking German during the remainder of his years in the Netherlands. Even Manuel Goldschmidt apparently still spoke Dutch with a thick German accent, as late as the 1980s (Lewin, 1983, p. 240). Castrum's intimate relationship with Germanness is further evidenced by both the magazine's and the publishing house's orientation on the German language and canon. Karlauf (2008) even suggests that German migrants, once part of one big spiritual family and now scattered across the globe by war, were Castrum Peregrini's magazine target audience.

But Castrum Peregrini has not only been deeply marked by the wartime trauma of displacement. It has also been thoroughly influenced by the wartime experience of compulsory seclusion. The idea of seclusion, if possible among likeminded friends, turned into an enduring *idée fixe* among the members of Castrum. Something they perceived to be a precondition for artistic and intellectual excellence. For a long time these circumstances were recreated at the Herengracht 401, but also elsewhere. In a 1979 exhibition catalogue displaying the paintings from her Greek period, Gisèle endorses the idea that most artists function best in seclusion. Residing at the island of Paros was then revealed to be her personal form of artistic seclusion.
These two interconnected but differing lines of trauma, the trauma of displacement and the trauma of seclusion, seem to have formed Castrum's unique disposition. They have triggered Castrum's development as both a highbrow intellectual fortress, seeped in the traditions of a specific national canon, and Castrum's development as a vast network for connecting and circulating people, objects and ideas far past stable national boundaries.

At the heart of these traumatic experiences resides what I would like to call 'the conflict of the two Germanies.' This conflict is based on the fact that the German-Jewish hiders at the Herengracht were helped through the war via an in-depth engagement with an artistic canon, that can be described as classical and German. Many of the young men involved with Frommel's circle even devoted the rest of their lives to this endeavour. Their wartime activities were adequately described by Klaus Siegel (1993, p. 379) in 1968:

This day-to-day interaction with literature was not merely a flight from reality. The reality was that, despite of fascism, there also was a Germany of Goethe, Novalis, Hölderlin, Rilke and George. (Translated by the author).

References to this 'conflict of the two Germanies' can be found throughout the memoires of Bock and Buri. But it is Reinout van Rossum du Chatel (Bock, 2007, p. 147), who describes these tensions in a surprisingly explicit manner:

Germany is my second homeland, and I have been suffering under the contradictory feelings it evokes in me for a long time now. I can feel the injustice Germany inflicts on the Netherlands twice: on one hand as the injustices we experience, and on the other as the injustices we inflict. It has become difficult for me to contain what I am. (Translated by the author).

Bock himself will only reflect on this problematic duality later in life. Referring to his choice to pursue a career in Germanic studies (but not to work in Germany) he says:

If I had been convinced that there was a direct line from Luther via Goethe to Hitler, I wouldn't have done it. I wanted to get to know the other, better Germany. ('Zoon van het betere Duitsland', 2008+) (Translated by the author).

But, this perceived distinction between two separate Germanies was also partly based on the group's acceptance of the notion that art and politics do not belong to the same realm. They maintained that it was possible to draw a well-defined boundary between a socio-political Germany and an artistic-intellectual one. Given the ambiguous use of the German cultural canon itself, it seems rather impossible to sustain this rigid distinction any longer. Germany's literary and philosophical superstars, often framed within a long European tradition dating back to Classical Greece, have been put to work for countless of projects, including that of the Nazis. To cite an example: according to Bock (2007, p. 70) Frommel was able to publish so many books during the war thanks to the German *Kulturpolitik*, which stimulated the circulation of German books in the Netherlands. It is precisely this separation between culture and politics, mainly constructed as an act of self-defence, which only recently has been torn down by Castrum Peregrini's current generation.

3. Castrum Peregrini and the current discourse on heritage: starting a conversation.

Introduction.

In the first chapter of this thesis I have introduced ideas that have been widely or less widely circulated in academic discourses on heritage and history. I have pointed out several cultural conventions in these discourses, as well as some more critical perspectives. The focus of chapter 1 was directed at three areas in particular: heritagization and time, heritage and space, and the troublesome relation between meaning and matter. Now, these three areas will be investigated even further by bringing them into conversation with the second chapter of my thesis; the historical case study of heritage site Castrum Peregrini. I will diagnose where the current models don't fully work for Castrum and introduce new ones that I haven't yet encountered in the literature on heritage. By engaging with Castrum on the level of historical inquiry, as well as on the level of its day-to-day interactions, I have encountered intriguing ways in which Castrum transgresses many of said cultural conventions concerning heritage.

My awareness about these inconsistencies was raised especially so by the interventions artist Amie Dicke was staging at the Herengracht 401 during the period of my internship there. Therefore, Amie's art, which is inspired by, reflective about, and intervening in Castrum's heritage, will take on an important role in this conversation as well. By intertwining these diverse influences, I hope to open up possibilities for enriching the existing vocabulary on heritage, for diversifying the ways in which we think about time, space, matter and meaning. All of these are themes that are crucial to the enterprise of establishing and analysing heritage sites, and all of these are themes that are often taken for granted. Precisely because they are rarely investigated in this field, many of the mainstream approaches to time, space, matter and meaning are just that, unarticulated mainstream approaches.

3.1 Crossing Spacetime.

As I have described in chapter 1.4 space is a widely used concept within the field of heritage studies, but also a largely undertheorized one. Two main tendencies concerning the discourses on space and heritage stand out. First of all, heritage is generally tied to space in the sense of a specific site or locale (Malpas, 2008, p. 200-201). Secondly, a specific site is then considered to be significant because of the meaning people have endowed it with (Sather-Wagstaff, 2011). Thus, in discourses on heritage the concept of space has become linked to a site-specific approach, and to the notion that heritage = place + the meaning given to that particular place.
The popular trope of the palimpsest aligns very well with these two tendencies. It is particularly useful for describing how, in a specific locale, temporal layers of matter and meaning have been added, reused, reinterpreted and removed. At first sight the palimpsest seems to do a good job at fathoming heritage site Castrum Peregrini. It can be successfully applied to the actual premises at the Herengracht 401: describing the different architectural alterations the building has been subjected to, pointing out the material traces its diverse inhabitants have left behind, and clarifying feelings of liminality. It can also be successfully applied to Castrum's many manifestations, which I have explicated in chapter 2.3.1. These different manifestations with which Castrum has been (self-)identified or represented also fit the mold of the overlapping, disappearing, and remaining temporal layers of the palimpsest.

However, although the trope of the palimpsest has definitely helped me to grasp several aspects of Castrum's heritage, it also lacks explanatory power where other aspects are concerned. Apparently, the palimpsest cannot fully contain Castrum, even Castrum cannot fully contain Castrum. For Castrum's current and past manifestation testify to a striking spatial interrelatedness. I cannot simply relegate Castrum Peregrini to its location at the Herengracht 401. No, to grasp the innumerable threads running through Castrum, to grasp how all of its stories link to bigger stories, how all of its objects resonate other objects, and how all of its visitors and inhabitants are connected to other people, I have to conceive of Castrum as an entangled web as well. Castrum, like any other heritage site, is not a self-enclosed

entity. The objects, which can be found at the Herengracht 401, are marked by geographical locations as diverse as the Austrian *Schloss Hainfeld*, the *Académie de la Grande Chaumière* in Paris, or the island of Paros. Not to mention the imagined cultural geography that tinges the inner arrangements of Castrum Peregrini, and ranges from Greek antiquity over German 19th century intellectual circles to the contemporary Amsterdam art scene. On a meta-level, it is also important to note that heritage does not work in isolation. The tendency to look at just one heritage site at a time prohibits the researcher from perceiving heritage's cultural functions, in which heritage is always tied to other sites and to broader narratives. Therefore, I propose adding a second trope to the common heritage vocabulary. One that has been widely used within feminist philosophy.

While palimpsests blur the boundaries between temporalities to a certain extent, they leave space largely isolated. A web, with its multiple threads interweaving and giving rise to new nodes, shoots and connections, seems to be a more adequate image of thought to describe the spatial multiplicitousness of Castrum Peregrini. More specifically, I would like to propose thinking about Castrum's heritage in the form of a rhizome. The rhizome is a philosophical concept outlined by French philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari in their seminal work 'A Thousand Plateaus.' Based on the stems of plants such as ginger, of which al pieces can give rise to new shoots, the rhizome emphasizes the non-hierarchal, non-vertical nature, and multiple entry and exit points of knowledge and culture.

A rhizome has no beginning or end; it is always in the middle, between things, interbeing, intermezzo. The tree is filiation, but the rhizome is alliance, uniquely alliance. The tree imposes the verb "to be," but the fabric of the rhizome is the conjunction, "and. . . and.. . and. . ." (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p.25).

In a more practical manner the trope of the rhizome also helps the interested researcher to envisage Castrum Peregrini as something more than a strand in the narrative of national heritage, its essence captured in one demarcated space. It helped me to be not so overwhelmed by the intriguing palimpsest of the building

itself, by how the Herengracht 401 seemed to be bigger on the inside than it was on the outside. The analytical power of the rhizome lies in the way it shows Castrum's space to be interlaced with so many others. Thus opening the way for conceiving of Castrum's heritage as consisting, to a significant extent, of stories of mobility, adaptation and migration, of broad social and material networks, and of intra-European influences. The rhizome argues against national, static and self-contained notions of heritage, and for an increased emphasis on migratory heritage. As a trope it helps us to conceive of heritage sites, which convey the polyspatial qualities that Buciek and Juul (2008) have hinted at.

When analysing Castrum's history I have noticed two interconnected but differing lines of trauma: the trauma of displacement and the trauma of seclusion. Both lines seem to have formed Castrum's unique disposition. On one hand they have triggered Castrum's development as a highbrow intellectual fortress, steeped in the traditions of a specific national canon. These aspects are rendered clear and visible when Castrum is read through the lens of the palimpsest. On the other hand, both lines of trauma have triggered Castrum's development as a vast network for connecting and circulating people, objects and ideas far past stable national boundaries. These are also pivotal aspects of Castrum's heritage, and they stand out much more when reading Castrum through the lens of the rhizome. It seems an adequate move to try to capture both the ways in which heritage is layered temporally and connected spatially, to grasp its role in a national canon, as well as in circulatory transnational networks. My suggestion in this respect is that, by adding the trope of the rhizome to the heritage vocabulary, heritage researchers will be enabled to grasp the phenomenon more fully, and to highlight previously underexposed aspects.

As I have argued throughout this dissertation historical representations and the models that shape them always allow the researcher to grasp only part of the picture. Therefore it would be rather short-sighted to advise the complete abandonment of the palimpsest and its replacement with a new metaphor. Rather, I am arguing for an increased awareness about the fact that the palimpsest elucidates certain historical aspects -in casu Castrum Peregrini as a temporally layered fortress situated within national historical canons-, while an alternative model such as the

rhizome elucidates others –in casu Castrum Peregrini as a spatially connected web marked by migratory histories.

3.2 The Effects of Time.

Intrigued by interiors, by Bachelard's 'The Poetics of Space' (1969) and Benjamin's 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' (1936) artist Amie Dicke staged a threefold intervention in Castrum Peregrini (Interview Amie Dicke, 2012). In 2009 she presented the installation 'Claustrophobic' as part of the Aura exhibition. After the death of Castrum member Claus Bock she tried to visualize the aura of his working space by outlining the room's former interior in plastic wrappings. In April 2012 she intervened in the historical living space of recently deceased Castrum member Manuel Goldschmidt. In his fully furbished apartment, which still bears the remnants of the years of hiding during WOII, Amie had to consider a different approach to insert herself into a space that was already, materially and metaphorically, full. She carefully transgressed the frozen-in-time qualities of heritage by inserting gold insulation material into cracks and folds, tracing the fragile points, and focusing on the spaces in between. A third intervention was called 'After Aura.' It consisted of the exchange of a chair from Castrum, used by Percy Gothein during the period of hiding in WOII, with a chair from Munich's '*Haus der Kunst*,' designed by Hitler's architect *du jour* Paul Ludwig Troost. Amie's work explicitly shifted my focus towards the realization of how, at Castrum, different ways of experiencing time are practiced. Her artistic interventions highlighted different, affective ways of relating to the past.

As I have described in chapter 1.1 'On Heritagization' the past has been objectified by mainstream historical research, while different perceptions of temporality have been left unexplored. As Agamben (1993) has argued; in Western history time has been thought of as linear and as a continuum of fleeting moments. Therefore time has been perceived as being destructive of the present. Only in the margins of historical research, a few voices have tried to theorize subjective temporal

experiences on an individual as well as on a collective level. For instance, historian François Hartog has explored the concept 'regime of historicity' to analyze the ways in which societies deal with their pasts. While archaeologist Christina Hodge has proposed looking into archaeological time 'as an antidote to the linear time of historicism, alternatively proposing human time as non-linear, multi-temporal, conflated, flattened, cyclical and/or embedded.' (Hodge, 2011, p. 119).

An important trigger for reflections on different temporal perceptions has been the influence of the ever-expanding research on memory and trauma. Research on collective trauma in general, and on the Holocaust in particular, cannot shy away from the observation that the experience of trauma seems to affect the ways in which people remember and relate to the past in a profound manner. Moreover, this does not only apply to the people who actually lived through this trauma, but also so to subsequent generations, as Hirsch (2008) has shown with her concept of 'postmemory'. To fully grasp the remarkable ways in which the different generations at Castrum have dealt with their own past/heritage, I will take cue from the historians Bevernage and Aerts (2009). They have researched groups of people, that have been able to keep a burdened past open for several decades despite their reasonably minoritarian positions in society. The authors emphasize that these groups engage in different regimes of historicity and that this might cause problems when they collide with the socially dominant regime of historicity. The socially dominant regime of historicity equates being past with being absent, looks for closure, and is founded on a temporal distance to that past, on irreversibility. However, Bevernage and Aerts emphasize that human beings do not always experience the past as irreversible but also as irrevocable: as persistent, enduring and vitally present. The irrevocable rejects the notion of a temporal distance separating past and present. The authors point out that debates about heritage and traumatic history are not merely about contradictions between advocates of remembrance and advocates of forgetting, but about the existence of completely different perceptions of time. I would like to add to this discussion that the establishment of a final cut between the present and the past also serves feelings of

alterity. The inevitable pastness of the past turns our forebears into radical others, who play their part in a search for self-definition based on what 'we' are not.

This seems to have important implications for my understanding of the heritage of Castrum Peregrini. Castrum –Amie's artistic interventions clearly highlight this- has to deal not only with an inbetweenness and relationality of space, but also of time. Therefore Castrum seems to act on the cusp between history and present, focusing on intergenerationality and the recurrence of certain themes, instead of neatly closing off the past and reflecting about its otherness. It becomes clear that Castrum engages with a different regime of historicity. Its dealings with heritage and history indicate that temporal distances are perceived differently, that the past is not contained frozen in time. To the contrary, certain aspects of that past can be opened up and reused. Castrum self-consciously uses its foundational stories to steer the values it currently wants to represent, in a fashion that is both critical and market savvy.

Being engaged in a divergent regime of historicity, however, is not always easy. The mainstream discourse on heritage does not yet widely recognize that there are different ways of dealing with time. Thus, colliding with more generally accepted regimes that do not regard the past as a continuity, can cause uncertainty, doubt and struggle. Especially since the classic regime, based on the notion of irreversibility, is often preferred at other, comparable heritage sites. I postulate here that is useful to accommodate all kinds of regimes of historicity at play in similar heritage contexts, mainstream or other. They signal intriguing ways of dealing with the past and should not be subjected to an either/or approach. However, it is important that more marginalised ways of being in time, such as the one represented by Castrum, are made visible and are recognized as viable alternatives.

3.3 The Essence of Heritage: matter or meaning.

Amie Dicke's artistic interventions also hint at another tensed aspect visible in a substantial part of the current discourses on heritage. Her works draw attention to the prominent position given to aura, authenticity, and the intersubjective production of matter and space. Underlying all of these themes, there seems to be a central conflict at work, a conflict that plays off meaning against matter.
From the very start, my day-to-day interactions at Castrum revealed that one of the foundation's main preoccupations in dealing with Castrum as a heritage site lay in the question: 'Wherein can Castrum Peregrini be found?' 'Can we find Castrum's essence in its objects, its spaces, its atmosphere?' 'Or does Castrum live by virtue of its ideas, its narratives, and its thematics?' It is clear that Castrum deals with and consists of heritage-in-motion. The question 'It's Heritage! So now what?' resonated through al of its manifestations, exhibitions and publications. Is heritage *an sich* enough? Should we just safeguard it from time and keep it under a bell jar? Or should we try and keep it alive even after all people initially involved have left the building permanently? Can we add new layers of meaning to the existing ones, and how can we do that without shattering Castrum's core, without losing something fundamental in the process? Is it possible to allow those layers of meaning to communicate with each other, regardless of space and time? Can Castrum be reproduced in numerous fragmentary forms, from photographs and artwork over books and documentaries, without a crucial loss of aura? Is authenticity a major issue when establishing and preserving a heritage site? And where do we find that authenticity? In objects or in words, in matter or in meaning? (Mapping Future Heritage, 2011-present). As evidenced by the salon evening on artistic interventions and heritage Amie Dicke hosted at Castrum Peregrini on the 16th of April 2012, these dilemmas do not only present themselves to Castrum. An important part of the Dutch heritage sector was present and seemed preoccupied with these exact same issues.

Tensions concerning the ways in which to relate matter and meaning also return repeatedly in the academic literature on heritage. An article written by

anthropologist Kim Christensen (2011) convinced me of a more general trend towards uneasy relationships between 'things and ideas' in heritage sites in general, and in historic houses in particular. Christensen observes that, over the past several decades, there has been a shift in the purpose of historic house museums towards linking history with present-day concerns, towards emphasizing the current usefulness of their historical narratives. This has led to vacillations on what to do with material culture, on how to step away from representing gendered domesticity as nostalgic and a-political. Christensen warns us though that we should be careful not to cast the material aside completely in favor of narrative, ideas and metaphors. And as I have described in chapter 1.5, many authors seem to overemphasize the narrative side of heritage sites. See for instance the works by Barthel (1996) or Sather-Wagstaff (2011). Even those who have tried to relate matter and meaning differently, in terms of performativity, still seem to imply that in the end meaning matters more than matter (Hoelscher and Alderman, 2004). Many articles allocate all power to the narrative, while the material remains a passive surface. One that is mute unless culture inscribes it with meaning. When the actual materiality of a heritage space is something people seem to relate to, this relation is often dismissed as solely meaningful because of the cultural baggage it evokes. Such reasoning is made possible by a firm belief in rigid binaries and essentialisms, and a good way of dealing with those is to bring in insights from feminist technoscience. Starting with the publication of Haraway's infamous essay ' A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century' (see chapter 1.5), feminist technoscience has demonstrated that it is impossible to sustain rigid dichotomies between nature and culture, matter and meaning, words and things. Calling for a feminist engagement with materiality has been one of its central issues.

Maybe I should cease to think about heritage in terms of the material and the ideational, framed as binary oppositions. Instead of conceiving of both as completely different things, separated by a chasm difficult to bridge, I should rather see them as entangled in a dynamic relationality. To look for indications on how to envision such a new way of reading heritage I take cue from Karen Barad (2007), a professor in feminist theory, who also holds a PhD. in theoretical particle physics. She has

proposed to implement insights from quantum physics to look at the world not as a sequence of detached things but as phenomena, which are made through the interaction of the social and natural, of things and ideas, of matter and meaning. She works with the notion of 'intra-activity,' an inexhaustible dynamism that configures and reconfigures relations of space-time-matter to reveal that most contemporary questions about the gap between nature and culture are fundamentally misguided. Her account refuses the representationalist fixation on the gap between words and things, advocating instead a causal relationship between exclusionary practices, embodied as specific material configurations of the world ((con)figurations rather than words) and specific material phenomena (relations rather than things). According to Barad, matter is never a fixed essence, never just a thing but rather a doing, a relation, a congealing of agency.

There is an important sense in which practices of knowing cannot be fully claimed as human practices, not simply because we use nonhuman elements in our practices but because knowing is a matter of part of the world making itself intelligible to another part. Practices of knowing and being are not isolatable, but rather they are mutually implicated. We do not obtain knowledge by standing outside of the world; we know because "we" are of the world. We are part of the world in its differential becoming. (Barad, 2003, p. 829).

Applying Barad's notion of intra-action, has triggered my awareness that Castrum's heritage-in-motion is in the process of bridging even more apparent oppositions than the one between ideas and things. Amongst others I have recollected in these pages crossings between the personal and the political, the individual and the collective, the local and the international, the micro- and the macro-scale, the public and the private, and, most important of all, the past and the present.

4. Conclusion.

The overarching idea that has propelled this dissertation forward is that of representation, of how to represent the past, whether it be in the form of heritage or historical research, or somewhere between these interacting notions.
More specifically, my research has been underpinned by the thesis that 'the conceptual and discursive models we have developed for talking about the past' (Rigney, 2001, p.4) are always imperfect and partial. They will always advance certain aspects, certain perspectives more than others.

In chapter 2 I have (re)constructed a historical representation of the many manifestations of Castrum Peregrini. In order to deal with my main research question I have taken into account the various existing discourses concerning Castrum Peregrini, and the ways in which they are caught up with processes of group formation, cultural memorization and manifestations of power. In response to my main research question, I will enumerate the various discourses I have identified in my historical research, and the ways in which they are made to fit certain models of historical representation:

Internal Discourses.

- Memoires and historical recollections produced by the first generation of Castrum associates. The main representatives of this current are Claus Bock, F. W. Buri, and also Wolfgang Frommel. To a greater or lesser extent, they have all shaped their narratives to put the focus on Castrum Peregrini as a largely andropocentric and German oriented literary circle, magazine, and publishing house. In the context of processes of self-representation and group formation, their writings and doings have tried to model Castrum after larger cultural traditions. A European cultural and intellectual tradition dating back to classical Greece in general, and the tradition of the *George Kreis* in particular.

- Historical representations produced by the current generation of Castrum associates. They have shifted their focus to the role of Gisèle, to graphic arts, and to the building at the Herengracht 401 as a heritage site and project space. They have also highlighted intergenerationality, the recurrence of historical themes, and ways to open up the past for present and future use. This is evidenced by another distinct yet related form of commentary on Castrum's past; artistic interventions such as those staged by Amie Dicke. These representational changes have been triggered by Castrum's growing awareness about previously underrepresented aspects of its past, but also by a model of market-oriented self-branding.

- Critical analyses produced by people who have been closely involved with Castrum in the past, and later in life have produced (scholarly) work that touches upon the subject of Castrum. They often strive to demonstrate that they are not averse to adding a critical note to the existing representations. An example in this case is Marita Keilson-Lauritz, who has highlighted what she perceives to be previously underrepresented aspects of Castrum: the influence of homosexuality and the foundation's link to Wolfgang Cordan. Another example is that of Thomas Karlauf, who has written critical analyses about Castrum's historical tendencies to secrecy, and its involvement in a struggle about the follow-up to Stefan George.

External Discourses.

- A discourse emerging from the perspective of scholars involved with gay activism, as advocated by Mattias Duyves and Gert Hekma in their articles for 'Gay News'. Both authors try to incorporate Castrum into a historical narrative of gay emancipation, with which Castrum itself does not feel connected. Hekma and Duyves feel the need to incite Castrum to come out of the closet and recover a part of gay history, while Castrum's associates are of the opinion that they are not in a closet at all.

- Representations common in newspapers and magazines: (1) Dutch newspaper articles that focus on Castrum as a historical hiding place, as a heritage site and project space in Amsterdam, and that frame Gisèle as the main historical figure. (2) German newspaper articles that focus on Castrum as a German-oriented magazine and publishing house, unique because of its link to Stefan George and its positioning-in-exile, and that deem Frommel to be the main historical figure. These different focuses are linked to the different generations at Castrum and what they choose to emphasize, but also to the different models of national history in which Castrum gets incorporated. Both strands of newspaper articles try to recuperate Castrum as a part of their respective national histories: as a meaningful part of Germany's well-known literary heritage, or as a meaningful part of the illustrious Dutch history of WOII resistance.

- My own historical representation of Castrum -marked by my educations as a historian and a gender scholar-, which has focused on highlighting some previously invisible aspects: gender, migratory dynamics, discursive analysis, inclusion/exclusion, agency, trauma, processes of circulating and adapting cultural heritage, and processes of archiving and canonization.

In chapter 1 I have compiled a preliminary overview of some of the common discourses on heritage. In chapter 3 I have brought these discourses into conversation with the past and current manifestations of Castrum Peregrini, with the artistic interventions taking place at Castrum, with my own critical remarks, and with those of thinkers often used within feminist philosophy. My intention was to critically examine and open up the existing vocabulary. Thus engaging with my first sub-question: 'Which common heritage representations does Castrum affect through its functioning as a heritage site?' In chapters 1 and 3 I have managed to identify certain mainstream models for talking about heritage, and I have raised awareness about certain taken for granted assumptions. In a next step I have suggested additions to the existing vocabulary, alternatives that manage to highlight previously underrepresented aspects:

- Heritage and Time: First of all I have identified a widespread lack of thought concerning the concept of time within the field of history. While the temporal constitutes the very core of all historical research, it is most often taken for granted and remains chronically underanalyzed. Therefore most historians and people active in the heritage sector employ a notion of the temporal that is dominant in Western culture. One that is based on the objectivity of the temporal, on its linearity, on the notion that the past has been closed off, and on the fact that the past and the present are separated from each other by an obvious spatial distance. Here, I have inserted the idea of the regime of historicity (Hartog, 2005) that looks into the different ways in which people can relate to the past and how this affects their being in the present. I have pointed out that this idea has been further developed by Bevernage and Aerts who emphasize that, especially where there is trauma involved, groups of people can engage in different regimes of historicity. The past can also be experienced as irrevocable: persistent, enduring and vitally present. This line of thinking has enabled me to change my perception of heritage sites. It has allowed me to perceive of them as locations where the past is not just kept frozen in time, but where certain aspects of that past can be opened up and reused.

- Heritage and Space: I have detected that space is a widely used concept in the literature on heritage, but that is sloppily theorized in its own right. Most authors guilelessly employ terms like place, space, site and location as if they were interchangeable. I have pointed out that space has become linked to a site-specific approach, and to the notion that heritage = place + the meaning given to that particular place. I have also identified the trope of the palimpsest as a widely used conceptual heritage model that perfectly conveys both the tendencies described above. Then I have suggested to add a new concept to the existing heritage vocabulary: Deleuze's and Guattari's rhizome. The rhizome might help to conceive of heritage sites as not only temporally layered but also spatially connected. It argues against national, self-contained notions of heritage, and for an increased emphasis on

migratory heritage. As a model it helps us to conceive of heritage sites, which are poly-spatial.

- Heritage, Matter and Meaning: Many of the authors described in chapter 1 display a tendency to tuck away the material aspects of heritage. They define the cultural as something separate from and additive to the material. Even those who have tried to relate matter and meaning differently, still seem to imply that in the end meaning matters more than matter. I have pointed out similar dilemmas in the heritage sector. One of its central questions appears to be: 'Wherein lies the authenticity of our heritage site?' 'In its objects, its spaces, its atmosphere?' 'Or in its ideas, its narratives, and its thematics?' As a response to this I have proposed to cease looking at heritage through a conceptual model that favours the pulling apart of matter and meaning. In looking for different ways of relating the material to the ideational, in trying to see them as an entangled, dynamic relationality, I have brought Barad's concept of intra-activity into the discourses on heritage. I have argued that reading heritage through the lens of intra-activity can help to stop conceiving of matter as a mute and passive substance, but rather frame it as a doing, a relation, a congealing of agency.

In the course of these three chapters it has become clear that my second sub-question can be answered affirmatively. Discursive models developed on the level of historical discourses, and on the level of heritage are intertwined to a certain extent and intra-act in interesting ways. For example, inserting the trope of the rhizome into the heritage discourse helps to demonstrate how Castrum's space is interlaced with so many others. Thus opening the way for conceiving of Castrum's heritage as consisting, to a significant extent, of stories of mobility, adaptation and migration, of broad social and material networks, and of intra-European influences. As a conceptual model the rhizome helps to envision heritage sites that go past the borders of national history and convey the polyspatial qualities that Buciek and Juul (2008) have hinted at. This can be linked to the discourses employed by newspaper articles, which seem to frame Castrum within two different strands of national

history. The, often unconscious, imposition of these national perspectives prevents the circulation of other definitions of Castrum. Definitions with the potential to frame Castrum Peregrini as part of a history marked by movement and displacement, as a site of migratory heritage. I can only imagine how looking at and talking about heritage with the help of an alternative model might help to change representations on the level of historiography as well. A striking example of this process has presented itself in my own dissertation. After introducing the rhizome as an additional heritage model, this concept unintentionally started to influence my historical analysis. Castrum's historical narrative did not take on the form of a linear chronology following a key figure, as I had initially planned. The different threads that twist and combine to shape Castrum throughout the years now came to the fore and caught my eye. I started tracing those threads, those networks of people, ideas, objects, art works, and diverse cultural backgrounds that have shaped Castrum as a foundation, a place, and an idea. Deleuze and Guattari's metaphor seeped through from the level of discursive heritage models to the level of historical analysis with ease.

In the end one must come to terms with the realization that all representations of the past are partial, that they are always embedded in broader material/cultural contexts. However, an increased awareness of the many partial threads that form the framework of historical representations, enables the researcher to write histories that allow for an increased degree of sophistication and complexity. As Castrum's historiographies, as well as its functioning as a heritage site, have shown: it is truly insightful to look at historical representations in all their imperfection and partiality, to raise awareness about the models they adhere to, to look into the (cultural) work they perform. I would even dare to say, infinitely more insightful than the objectifying attempts to subtract divergent historical representations from each other, in an attempt to locate a neutral, emotionless middle ground from where to represent history.

However, my dissertation leaves me with several pressing questions, gaps, and opportunities that can open the gates to further research.

Where the compilation of Castrum's history is concerned, there is still a substantial need for a book-length historical research project on Castrum that takes into account manifestations of power, processes of inclusion/exclusion and critical engagement with the existing discourses. A research project that touches upon Castrum's manifold connections, that traces the adaptations and recurrences of its cultural themes, and that investigates Castrum's complex relation to art and artistic interventions. With respect to poetry and visual arts, historical research has been undertaken, but only for the earliest period of Castrum's existence. It would be an interesting route of investigation to follow the artistic evolutions up to this day.
In general the existing historical material on Castrum Peregrini is marked by a tendency to overemphasize the period of Castrum's emergence and the years of WOII. The period from the 1960s onwards has received little attention. The use of oral history could be a complementary method that would bring forward helpful information regarding this era. Moreover, it would be interesting to engage more thoroughly with the point of view of people who were temporarily or laterally involved with Castrum. Lars Ebert's project to interview all housekeepers that have been employed at the Herengracht 401 is a good example in case. Last but not least, further research into the Castrum archive is indispensable. It is a treasure trove of immense historical value that is in dire need of professional archiving to accommodate further in-depth research.

On the level of theoretical implications it is mainly the relation between matter and meaning that resonates and casts an uneasy light over history as a disciplinary field. My ruminations on matter and meaning have shown that the logocentric approach of most Western historians, in which written texts remain the most important and often only tool, might be insufficient. It calls into question the strict divide between archaeological and historical research. A divide that largely relegates the material side of the enterprise to archaeologists –who might engage with historical representation by using Piercian semiotics-, while historians largely focus on the

written word and often use a Foucauldian discursive approach or Barthes' semiotics to come to terms with historical representation.

I argue for the establishment of alternative ways of writing history, for a more interdisciplinary historical methodology, in which the material and the discursive are not as frequently torn apart. I encourage historians educated within the current Western disciplinary field to engage, if possible, with material remnants as well as with textual remnants. The development of a framework that carries the discipline of history across the oppositional divide between matter and meaning is still in its very early infancy. Although some more recent developments, such as the addition of ecological history courses to university curricula, seem to point towards an increasing awareness, the fact of the matter is that individual historical research still rarely looks at historical materiality. There is a lot of ground that needs to be covered until historians can investigate historical representations that do not only take on the form of texts or images, but also cover material manifestations such as those presented by heritage sites. To take cue from feminist technoscience, and uncover a way to encourage the interaction of the material and the discursive is a truly new and groundbreaking line of research in the field of history.

5. Bibliography.

5.1 Secondary Literature.

- **Agamben**, G. 'Time and History. Critique of the Instant and the Continuum.' In: Agamben, G. *Infancy and History. The Destruction of Experience*. Verso Books, London/New York, 1993.
- **Ankersmit,** F. 'Historical Representation.' In: *History and Theory*. 27(1988)3.
- **Asberg**, C. 'The arena of the body: The cyborg and feminist views on biology.' In: R. Buikema, and I. van der Tuin (eds.). *Doing Gender in Media, Art and Culture.* Routledge, Abingdon/New York, 2009.
- **Assmann**, A. 'Canon and Archive' in Erll A. and Nünning A. (eds.) *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2010.
- **Assmann,** J. 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity.' In: *New German Critique*. 65(1995).
- **Bachelard**, G. *The Poetics of Space*. Beacon Press, Boston, 1969.
- **Badenoch**, A. 'Harmonized Spaces, Dissonant Objects, Inventing Europe? Mobilizing digital heritage.' In: *Culture Unbound. The Journal of Current Cultural Research*. (2011)3.
- **Bal,** M. 'Introduction.' In: Bal, M, Crewe, J. and Spitzer L. (eds.). *Acts of Memory. Cultural recall in the present*. University Press of New England, Hannover, 1999.
- **Bank**, J. and Mathijsen, M. (eds.). *Plaatsen van Herinnering vol. 2. Nederland in de negentiende eeuw.* Bakker, Amsterdam, 2006.
- **Barad**, K. *Meeting the Universe halfway. Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke University Press, Durham/London, 2007.
- **Barad**, K. 'Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter.' In *Signs*. 28(2003)3.
- **Barthel**, D. 'Getting in touch with History. The role of historic preservation in shaping collective memories.' In: *Qualitative Sociology*. 19(1996)3.

- **Bell,** C. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. Oxford University Press, New York, 1992.
- **Benjamin,** W. *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.* Penguin Books, London, 2008 (1936).
- **Bevernage,** B. and Aerts, K. 'Haunting Pasts: time and historicity as constructed by the Argentine *Madres de Plaza de Mayo* and radical Flemish Nationalists.' In: *Social History*. 34(2009)4.
- **Blockmans**, W. and Pleij, H. (eds.). *Plaatsen van Herinnering vol. 4. Nederland van Prehistorie tot Beeldenstorm.* Bakker, Amsterdam, 2007.
- **Buciek**, K. and Juul, K. 'We are here yet we are not here. The heritage of excluded groups.' In: Graham, B. and Howard, P. (eds.). *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity.* Ashgate Publishing, Hampshire / Burlington, 2008.
- **Calis,** P. *Het ondergronds verwachten. Schrijvers en tijdschriften tussen 1941 en 1945*. Meulenhoff, Amsterdam, 1989.
- **Certeau** de, M. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of California Press, 1984.
- **Christensen**, K. 'Ideas vs. Things: the balancing act of interpreting historic house museums.' In: *The International Journal of Heritage Studies.* 17(2011)2.
- **Deleuze**, G. and Guattari, F. *A Thousand Plateaus*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis/London, 1987.
- **Derrida**, J. *Archive Fever. A Freudian Impression*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1998.
- **Djasmadi**, L, Hoefte, R. and Mingoen, H. *Migration and Cultural Heritage: Stories of Javanese in Suriname, Indonesia and the Netherlands*. KITLV Uitgeverij, Leiden, 2010.
- **Doel** van den, W. (ed.). *Plaatsen van Herinnering vol. 1. Nederland in de twintigste eeuw*. Bakker, Amsterdam, 2005.
- **Hall,** S. (ed.). *Representation. Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices.* Sage Publications, London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi, 1997.

- **Haraway**, D. J. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women. The Reinvention of Nature*. New York, Routledge, 1991.
- **Hartog,** F. 'Time and Heritage.' In: *Museum International*. 57(2005)3.
- **Hirsch,** M. 'The generation of postmemory.' In: *Poetics Today.* 29(2008)1.
- **Hodge,** C. J. . 'A new model for memory work: nostalgic discourse at a historic home.' In: *The International Journal of Heritage Studies.* 17(2011)2.
- **Hoelscher**, S. and Alderman, D. H. 'Memory and place: geographies of a critical relationship.' In: *Social and Cultural Geography*. 5(2004)3.
- **Huyssen**, A. *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, 2003.
- **Kansteiner**, W. 'Finding Meaning in Memory: A methodological critique of collective memory studies." In: *History and Theory*. 41(2002)2.
- **Levins Morales,** A. 'The Historian as Curandera.' Institute for Cultural Activism, Berkeley, 1998(40).
- **Lewin,** L. *Het Clandestiene Boek 1940-1945*. Van Gennep, Amsterdam, 1983.
- **Lorenz,** C. 'Unstuck in Time. Or: the sudden presence of the past.' In: Tilmans, K. van Vree, F. and Winter, J. (eds.). *Performing the Past. Memory, History, and Identity in Modern Europe*. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, 2010.
- **Malpas,** J. 'New Media, Cultural Heritage and the Sense of Place: Mapping the Conceptual Ground.' In: *The International Journal of Heritage Studies.* 14(2008)3.
- **Nora**, P. *Les Lieux de Mémoire*. *3 vols.* Galimard, Paris, 1984-1992.
- *Oxford English Dictionary.* Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989.
- **Oelman,** U. and Raulff, U. (eds.). *Frauen um Stefan George*. Wallstein, Götingen, 2010.
- **Paletschek**, S. and Schraut, S. (eds.). *The Gender of Memory. Cultures of remembrance in nineteenth and twentieth-century Europe*. Campus, Frankfurt, 2008.
- **Prak**, M. (ed.). *Plaatsen van Herinnering vol. 3. Nederland in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw.* Bakker, Amsterdam, 2006.

- **Ribbens,** J. and Edwards, R. (eds.). *Feminist dilemmas in Qualitative Research. Public Knowlege and Private Lives*. Sage Publications, London, 1998.
- **Rigney,** A. *Imperfect histories. The elusive past and the legacy of romantic historicism*. Cornell University, New York, 2001.
- **Rigney**, A. 'Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation of Cultural Memory.' In: *Journal of European Studies*. 35(2005)1.
- **Rothberg,** M. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, 2009.
- **Sather-Wagstaff**, J. *Heritage that hurts. Tourists in the memoryscapes of September 11*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, 2011.
- **Turner**, C. 'Palimpest or potential Space? Finding a vocabulary for site-specific performance.' In: *New Theatre Quarterly*. 20(2004)4.
- **Warf,** B. And Arias, S. (eds). *The Spatial Turn. Interdisciplinary perspectives*. Routledge, Abingdon/New York, 2009.
- **Western**, J. *Cosmopolitan Europe: A Strasbourg Self-Portrait*. Ashgate, Farnham, 2012.
- **Wieringa**, S. (ed.). *Travelling Heritages: New perspectives on collecting, preserving and sharing women's history*. Aksant, Amsterdam, 2008.
- **Winter**, J. 'The performance of the past: memory, history, identity.' In: Tilmans, K. Van Vree, F. and Winter, J. (eds.) *Performing the Past. Memory, history and identity in Modern Europe*. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, 2010.

5.2 Primary Literature: Historical Sources.

- **Bock,** C. V. *Wort-Konkordanz zur Dichtung Stefan Georges.* Castrum Peregrini, Amsterdam, 1964.
- **Bock,** C. V. *Untergetaucht unter Freunden*. Castrum Peregrini, Amsterdam, 1985.

- **Bock,** C. V. *Zolang wij gedichten schrijven kan ons niets gebeuren*. Castrum Peregrini Press, Amsterdam, 2007.
- **Buri,** F. W. *Anheimfall*. Castrum Peregrini, Amsterdam, 1967.
- **Buri,** F. W**.** *Die Brücken*. Castrum Peregrini, Amsterdam, 1947.
- **Buri,** F. W. *Eisenhans.* Castrum Peregrini, Amsterdam, 1947.
- **Buri**, F. W. *Ich gab dir die Fackel im Sprunge. Ein Erinnerungsbericht von Friedrich W. Buri.* Verlag fur Berlin-Brandenburg, Berlin, 2009.
- **Castrum Peregrini.** *In memoriam Percy Gothein, Vincent Weijand and Liselotte von Gandersheim*. Van Rossum du Chatel, Leiden, 1945.
- **Cordan,** W. 'Drei Tagebucheinträge zu Percy Gothein 1944-1945.' In: *Capri.* (2003)34.
- **Defuster**, M and Somers, E. (eds). *Gisèle en haar onderduikers*. Castrum Peregrini Press, Amsterdam, 2008.
- **Duyves,** M. ''Gay underground location in the heart of Amsterdam.' In: *Gay News*. (2000)105.
- **Ebert,** L. and Oelman, U. 'Foreword.' In: *Castrum Peregrini*. (2007)278-279.
- *Exhibition Catalogue Gisèle*, Singer Museum, Laren, 1979.
- *Exhibition Flyer Gisèle,* Art Gallery De Boer, Amsterdam, 1973.
- **Frommel,** W. 'Der Dichter. Ein Bericht.' In: *Castrum Peregrini.* (1950)7.
- **Frommel,** W. 'Der geometrische Ort. Besinnung zum 100. Heft.' In: *Castrum Peregrini*. (1971)99-100.
- **Frommel,** W. *Gedichte*. Holten, Berlin, 1937.
- **Frommel,** W. (F.W. l'Ormeau). *Templer und Rozenkreuz. Ein Traktat zum Werk Stefan Georges.* Pantheon, Amsterdam, 1940.
- **Friends of Germanic Studies at the IGRS**. *Newsletter*, 2008.
- *Gisèle.* Snoeck-Ducaju & Zoon, Gent, 1993.
- **Haverkorn van Rijsewijk,** J. 'Quackerschool Eerde: een serie dillema's?' In: Defuster, M and Somers, E. (eds). *Gisèle en haar onderduikers*. Castrum Peregrini Press, Amsterdam, 2008.
- **Hekma,** G. 'Castrum Peregrini – Twee Wolfgangs.' In: *Gay News*. (2004)151.
- **Karlauf,** T. 'Meine Jahre im Elfenbeinturm.' In: *Sinn und Form*. (2009)2.

- **Karlauf,** T. 'Meister mit eigenem Kreis. Wolfgang Frommels George-Nachfolge.' In: *Sinn und Form*. (2011)2.
- **Karlauf,** T. *Stefan George. Die Entdeckung des Charisma*. Pantheon, Munchen, 2008b.
- **Keilson-Lauritz,** M. 'Centaurenliefde.' Duits verzet in Nederland rondom de schuilplaats Castrum Peregrini.' In: Müller, K. and Schuyf, J. (eds.). *Het begint met nee zeggen. Biografieën rond verzet en homoseksualiteit 1940-1945*. Schorer Boeken, Amsterdam, 2006.
- **Kluncker**, K. '25 Jahre Castrum Peregrini Amsterdam. Dokumentation einer Runde.' Exhibition catalogue, Hamburg, 1977.
- **Landmann**, M. 'Deutsche Literatur im Untergrund nach dem Krieg in Holland**.**' Castrum Peregrini Archive, clippings folder, 1977.
- *Mapping Future Heritage*, Castrum Peregrini Working Archive, 2011-present.
- *Notebook,* Castrum Peregrini Archive, 1978.
- **Philipp,** M. 'Wolfgang Frommels oppositionelle Rundfunkarbeit in den Jahren 1933-1935.' In: *Castrum Peregrini.* (1993)219/220.
- **Raulff,** U. *Kreis ohne Meister. Stefan Georges Nachleben*. C. H. Beck, München, 2009.
- **Siegel,** K. 'Een schreefloze letter.' In: *De Gids*. (1993)156.
- **Treffens,** B. 'Zolang wij dichten en schrijven gebeurt er ons niets: beeldende kunst en poëzie als vorm van verzet en overlevingsstrategie aan de Herengracht 401, 1940-1945.' In*:* In: Defuster, M and Somers, E. (eds). *Gisèle en haar onderduikers*. Castrum Peregrini Press, Amsterdam, 2008.
- **Van Santen,** L. 'Het leven van de kunstenares Gisèle van Waterschoot van der Gracht in de oorlogsjaren 1940-1945.' In: Defuster, M and Somers, E. (eds). *Gisèle en haar onderduikers*. Castrum Peregrini Press, Amsterdam, 2008.
- **Von Bormann,** E. 'Argonauten in Amsterdam. Max Beckmann's vriendschap met Gisèle en haar kringen*.'* In: Defuster, M and Somers, E. (eds). *Gisèle en haar onderduikers*. Castrum Peregrini Press, Amsterdam, 2008.
- 'Zoon van het betere Duitsland.' Castrum Peregrini Archive, clippings folder, 2008+.

5.3 Newspaper Articles.

- **Brusse,** P. 'Op zoek naar kennis en kunst.' In: *Vrij Nederland*. 24-03-2012.
- **Buselmeier,** M. 'Zeitschriftenlesen.' In: *Poetenladen.* 05-2012.
- 'De Erfenis van een Onderduik.' In: *Het Parool*. 22-05-2009.
- 'Der Untergetauchte.' In: *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. 16-01-2008.
- 'Een levenlang kunstmecenas aan de gracht.' In: *NRC Handelsblad*. 07-01-2011.
- 'Georges Erbe.' In: *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. 16-01-2008.
- 'Gisèle kiest haar eigen schilderijen.' In: *NRC Handelsblad.* 04-11-2009.
- **Karlauf,** T. 'Eine Solche Zeitschrift wird es nicht wieder geben.' In: *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung.* 17-04-2008a.
- **Keilson-Lauritz,** M. 'Ende einer Epoche.' In: *Die Welt*. 25-04-2008.
- **Kissler,** A. 'Meister des Endens. George und mehr: Zur Einstellung der Zeitschrift "Castrum Peregrini."' In: *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. 18-04-2008.
- 'Kleine expositie over Herengracht 401, het huis van de weduwe van burgemeester d'Ailly.' In: *Het Parool.* 28-04-2007.
- **Müller,** B. 'Die Pilgerburg schliesst ihre Tore.' In: *Junge Freiheit*. 22-04-2008.
- 'Untergetaucht bei Freunden.' In: *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*. 16-03-1989.
- 'Verrijk uzelf door gul te geven.' In: *De Volkskrant*. 29-01-2011.

5.4 Oral Sources.

- Interview Amie Dicke, Amsterdam, 28-03-2012.
- Interview Lars Ebert, Amsterdam, 10-06-2012.

5.5 Digital Sources.

- http://castrumperegrini.org/gisele-d%E2%80%99ailly-van-waterschoot-van-der-gracht, visited at 27-06-2012.
- http://castrumperegrini.org/history, visited at 27-06-2012.
- www.geschiedenis24.nl/plaats-van-herinnering.html, visited at 06-06-2012.
- www.unesco.org, visited at 06-06-2012.
- www.xwashier.nl, visited at 06-06-2012.