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Introduction

The purpose of this dissertation is to enhance the understanding of the role of women in the French Resistance by examining their portrayal in Anglo-American popular culture. It is undeniable that the German occupation of northern France in June 1940 and southern France in November 1942 changed the French national character forever. The Occupation has received much scholarly attention which has focused predominantly on whether the French nation resisted or collaborated with the enemy.¹ Women were excluded from the immediate post-Liberation resistance narrative as a result of actors such as Charles de Gaulle, head of the Provisional Government of France in 1944, seeking to rebuild the French nation as one of unity. An essential part of this national reconstruction was the masculinisation of the French Resistance. This is illustrated by the fact that out of 1059 individuals to receive the Compagnon de Libération, the ‘highest honour awarded a French citizen for resistance activities’, only six were women of whom four received their award posthumously.² Claire Gorrara underlines this masculinisation, concluding that de Gaulle ‘came to personify the resistance struggle as the head of an elite band of mostly male freedom fighters’.³

The fragility of this resistance narrative however was exposed during the 1970s when de Gaulle’s departure from French politics as president of the Fifth Republic in 1969 coincided with an influx of academics, such as Robert Paxton, convincingly challenging the resistance ‘myth’ with a collaborationist narrative which portrayed Vichy France as supporting Nazi

policy under its Chief of State Marshal Philippe Pétain. Whilst Henry Rousso subsequently strengthened the collaborationist line of argument in 1987, concluding that ‘Vichy antisemitism… was not inspired by Nazism but by French antisemitic traditions’, his most compelling argument was that France suffers from a ‘Vichy Syndrome’. This is ultimately ‘a diverse set of symptoms whereby the trauma of the Occupation… reveals itself in political, social and cultural life’, suggesting that there is an obsession with the Occupation and Vichy France which is exploited by French actors in various ways to suit contemporary needs. It is therefore necessary to identify de Gaulle as using the French Resistance narrative to ‘repress’ the memory of Vichy’s collaboration after the Liberation in order to reconstruct a united French nation.

Whilst academics such as Paula Schwarz working within a feminist framework began to recognise the contribution of women to the French Resistance in the 1970s and 1980s, there is an established argument in the academic community that the role of female resisters during the Occupation was merely temporary. Margaret Collins Weitz concludes that ‘the war provided all [women] with the chance to play different roles but those roles were of limited length’. Margaret Higonnet however frames women’s temporary wartime status within a cultural context, stating that their contribution needs to be analysed using ‘the image of a double helix’ which concludes that the ‘position on the female strand is subordinate to [the] position on the male strand’ and that ‘the social activity is not as critical as the cultural

---

4 Paxton, *Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order*.
6 Ibid., p.10.
perception of its relative value’. It is important therefore to understand the ‘cultural perception’ of women in France during the Occupation as being underpinned by Vichy’s ‘national revolution’ which ‘assigned women responsibility for family harmony’ by restricting divorce and redesigning the education of young girls to prepare them for marriage rather than a profession. Claire Duchen identifies however that this did not change at the Liberation, as demonstrated by the appointment of a ‘Minister specifically responsible for family affairs’, due to ‘postwar demographic anxiety’ motivated by a declining birth rate. Although French women received the vote in 1944, their ‘cultural perception’ remained firmly attached to motherhood in the private sphere which denied them recognition for their resistance activity in the public sphere. The cultural perception of resistance in France is therefore far behind that of the academic community in terms of the recognition of the contribution of women.

The memory of former resister Jean Moulin, who was tortured and killed by the infamous Gestapo agent Klaus Barbie, epitomises the exalted cultural recognition that male resisters received in comparison to their female counterparts in the post-Liberation period. Moulin, who refused to divulge any information about the resistance networks under torture, is idolised as a martyr in French history. This was emphasised in 1964 when his ashes were transferred to the Panthéon, a mausoleum in Paris which contains the remains of iconic French citizens, in a ceremony attended by de Gaulle. Whilst President François Hollande announced that two female resisters, Germaine Tillion and Genevieve de Gaulle-Anthonioz

who were deported to the Ravensbruck concentration camp during the Occupation because of their resistance activity, would have their ashes transferred to the Panthéon in May 2015, it is important to note the elitist status of these women. Tillion was a French ethnologist who conducted work in Algeria for the French government in the 1950s; de Gaulle-Anthonioz was a niece of Charles de Gaulle and president of ATD Fourth World, an international human rights based organisation working to eradicate poverty. Although Hollande justified his selection on the grounds that it would ‘remember the contribution of all those women most often anonymous who were part of those years in the shadows’, the recognition of Tillion and de Gaulle-Anthonioz is arguably a product of their privileged status in French society. It is also significant that, despite Tillion and de Gaulle-Anthonioz passing away in 2008 and 2002 respectively, the decision to transfer their ashes to the Panthéon was not made until 2014. This illustrates the delayed recognition of female resisters in France. Whilst Claire Andrieu argues that this is a result of ‘French singularity’, the notion that French feminism is less prominent than its British and American counterparts because French women regard themselves as ‘free and equal’ despite their limited participation in political life, this seemingly lacks conviction. The belated cultural recognition of only elitist female resisters in France can in fact be regarded as a direct product of the ‘Vichy Syndrome’; any prior acknowledgement of their distinct gendered contribution would have threatened the post-Liberation narrative of a united French Resistance.

This is not however an exclusively contemporary phenomenon. The appearance of autobiographical material by French female resisters such as Lucie Aubrac in the 1970s and 1980s was perceived merely as a response to collaborationist accounts which, as discussed

---


above, sought to depict France as collaborating with the Germans rather than resisting them during the Occupation.\(^\text{15}\) Gorrara identifies the prominence of the collaborationist narrative as motivating women, such as Aubrac, artificially to ‘promote a positive and unified image’ of the French Resistance at the expense of outlining their specific contribution as female resisters.\(^\text{16}\) Aubrac’s autobiography must however be considered a response to claims made by Barbie during his 1987 trial that her husband, Raymond Aubrac, was in fact an informant whose information led to the arrest of Moulin in 1943. The controversy surrounding Aubrac was strengthened in 2009 when Laurent Douzou, who published a biography of the female resister, ‘uncovered a number of distortions of fact in [Aubrac’s]… memoir including information about her birth and childhood as well as events in her past that she seemingly misremembered or made up to lend more drama to her story’.\(^\text{17}\) It is also significant that Aubrac served on the consultative committee of the French Republic Provisional Government in 1944 which reinforces the notion that the cultural recognition of women’s contribution to the French Resistance has been confined to an elitist group of female resisters. The politicised reception of accounts produced by female resisters in France amply demonstrates the limitations inherent in popular culture produced within a society inhibited by cultural and political forces subconsciously constrained by the ‘Vichy Syndrome’.

It is necessary therefore to recognise the utility of Anglo-American produced popular culture when analysing the contemporary cultural perception of women in the French Resistance. Whilst Great Britain and America were both allies of France during World War Two, the utility of their popular culture derives from its relative isolation from the constraints of the

---

‘Vichy Syndrome’. This dissertation will analyse a corpus of Anglo-American produced memoirs, novels and films to establish the contemporary popular portrayal of female resisters and seek to determine the extent to which the cultural recognition of women in the French Resistance is aligned with that proposed by the academic community since the birth of feminism in the 1970s. It is hoped thereby to enhance academic understanding of women’s contribution to the French Resistance. Analysis of this Anglo-American corpus is particularly important because eight of the twelve sources were published after the turn of the twenty-first century and five after 2010. This highlights a recent trend among Anglo-American authors and editors seeking to provide female resisters with a greater agency than has been afforded them by either the academic community or popular French culture.

Chapter One will analyse a number of sources within this Anglo-American corpus and seek to establish how women’s motivations for joining the resistance and their roles in the various networks are portrayed. This will then be used to identify the contemporary cultural definition of resistance and conclude whether it is aligned with that promoted by members of the academic community such as Schwarz. Chapter Two will analyse the portrayal in this corpus of relationships between women in the French Resistance. Whilst academics such as Rod Kedward have concluded that relationships in the resistance were ‘political affinities’, relationships exclusively between women have received little attention from the academic

---


19 Schwarz, *Partisans and Gender Politics*. 
community. The purpose of this chapter therefore will be to identify the portrayal of any divisions between women in the resistance and how these were overcome. Chapter Three will evaluate how the Anglo-American corpus portrays relationships between men and women in the resistance. Although historians such as Margaret Rossiter argue that resistance responsibility was divided by gender, analysis of memoirs in this corpus will be of assistance in revealing whether female resisters could enter the traditionally masculine space of armed combat and yet retain their femininity. Chapter Four finally will analyse how female collaborators are portrayed in this corpus. Historians such as Fabrice Virgili have extensively examined the treatment of the ‘tondues’, women who had their heads shaved in public at the Liberation because they had sexually collaborated with the Germans during the Occupation. Females who collaborated in other ways have received limited attention from academics. The purpose of this chapter will be to identify whether Anglo-American popular culture portrays female collaborators outside of a sexual context.

Chapter One: The Contemporary Cultural Definition of Resistance

The exclusion of women from the cultural resistance narrative is indisputably a byproduct of the post-Liberation Gaullist masculinisation. It has also been suggested however that the omission of women was a result of a tendency by contemporary academics and cultural actors to equate the resistance with armed combat by the *maquis*, rural guerrilla bands which included male resistance fighters called maquisards. Women were excluded from this activity to avoid any sexual distraction of the maquisards. Robert Gildea supports this notion, concluding in *A New History of the French Resistance* (2015) that ‘only military activity was properly recognised as resistance’ after the Liberation.\(^{23}\) This is not however a new recognition as Schwarz identified in 1987 that there was a need for resistance to be redefined to accommodate the contribution of women which was often overlooked because of their exclusion from armed combat.\(^{24}\) Although produced twenty-eight years apart, Gildea’s and Schwarz’s arguments are typical of a late twentieth century and contemporary academic community working within a feminist framework which has sought to establish the contribution of women to the French Resistance by redefining resistance accordingly. Nevertheless, as noted in the Introduction, the French cultural perception of resistance is not as far advanced as that of the academic community in recognising the contribution of women. The purpose of this chapter is to analyse this Anglo-American corpus with a gendered gaze in order to establish how women’s motivations for joining the resistance and their roles in the various networks are portrayed. This analysis will therefore reveal how resistance is defined within a contemporary cultural context and whether this is aligned with that promoted by the academic community.


\(^{24}\) Schwarz, *Redefining Resistance*, pp. 143-152.
Collins Weitz’s *Sisters in the Resistance: How Women Fought to Free France, 1940-1945* (1995), a collection of interviews with surviving female resisters, and Caroline Moorehead’s *A Train in Winter: An Extraordinary Story of Women, Friendship and Resistance in Occupied France* (2011), an account of 230 female resisters deported to Auschwitz-Birkenau, were identified by *The New York Jewish Week* in 2011 as being the only two English non-fiction books to deal exclusively with French female resisters.²⁵ This statement is still accurate today which makes their analysis integral to identifying the contemporary cultural definition of resistance. It is evident from Collins Weitz’s and Moorehead’s studies that there was not an overriding profile which constituted the female resister. Cécile Charua, one of the deportees in Moorehead’s study, had been a member of the French Communist Party (PCF) since 1935 and actively volunteered her services to the communist resistance in Paris due to her political objection to fascism.²⁶ One of Cécile’s fellow deportees, Simone Jacob, was however emotionally coerced into the resistance following the unexpected execution of her father in a barracks in December 1941, claiming that her ‘father’s death had made her more resolute than ever to fight Vichy and the Germans’.²⁷ Danielle Casanova, like Cécile, was a member of the PCF but identified with and garnered the support of French mothers in ration queues. Moorehead portrays how Danielle exploited mothers’ ‘sympathies for hungry children [and]… persuaded them to contribute articles to her clandestine paper – *La Voix des Femmes*’ which demonstrates how mothers were often coerced into the resistance through their maternal need to provide for their children.²⁸

---

²⁶ Moorehead, p.27.
²⁷ Ibid., p.82.
²⁸ Ibid., p.47.
A similar diversity of motivations amongst female resisters is portrayed in Collins Weitz’s *Sisters in the Resistance*. Marie Granet, a former resister and historian, juxtaposes her resistance profile and those of her female counterparts, stating that ‘in my case, I was a young girl, unmarried. I had only my life to worry about… yet I had resistance comrades who were married and had… very young children’.²⁹ This is reflected in Cécile’s account, particularly when she recalls her decision to send her daughter to live ‘with a foster family outside the city’ because she did not want her growing up in a fascist occupied France.³⁰ It is therefore evident that a culture of sacrifice existed amongst mothers in the resistance, a notion which Moorehead acknowledged after conducting interviews with four survivors and their children, concluding that ‘to me it’s extraordinary that they would put their children at risk to join the resistance’.³¹ Whilst this notion of sacrifice has been acknowledged by academics such as Karen Adler who, after analysing clandestine material produced for women, identified that mothers were always instructed to ‘act on the behalf of others’, the first-hand accounts of Cécile, Marie and Danielle offer a more intimate and revealing representation of this sacrifice which is often lost in formal analysis conducted by academics.³² *Sisters in the Resistance* and *A Train in Winter* are therefore significant in revealing that the emotional strain placed upon mothers who had to sacrifice being present during their offspring’s childhood is part of the contemporary cultural definition of resistance.

Anglo-American produced popular culture is also significant in representing women in the French Resistance as performing activities which directly countered the conservative and patriarchal constraints of Vichy culture. This is evident in Bobbie Ann Mason’s *The Girl in the Blue Beret* (2011), a novel based on the former resister, Michèle Möet-Agniel, who as a

³⁰ Moorehead, p.29.
³¹ Herschthal, *The New York Jewish Week*.
teenage girl guided Mason’s father-in-law, an American downed airman, out of Paris during the Occupation. Annette, the fictional character based on Möet-Agniel, claims that ‘during the war, my parents released me… during the Occupation, when no one was free, I was freed!’ Annette’s emancipation is perhaps most significantly portrayed by her sexual relationship with Robert, a male counterpart in her resistance network, which results in her falling pregnant and suffering a miscarriage during her deportation to a concentration camp. Whilst this frames women’s emancipation within a sexual context, it is significant that Mason fabricated Annette’s relationship with Robert in order to fulfil the fictional purpose of the novel. This could suggest that authors, such as Mason, seek to romanticise the experience of female resisters in order to engage a popular audience prone to associating resistance activity with masculine armed resistance.

Despite this, a similar form of sexual emancipation is documented in Antonia Hunt’s memoir Little Resistance: A Teenage English Girl’s Adventures in Occupied France (1982) which renders Mason’s fictional creation of Annette and Robert’s relationship as more typical of women’s experiences in the resistance. Antonia, whose father served in the British Expeditionary Force and was accidentally left behind with her cousin in Brittany when war was declared in 1940, states that before the war ‘no one ever discussed war, politics, money, religion, sex or any grown-up subjects with me’. Similar to Annette, Antonia is emancipated during the Occupation through her interaction with men. This is demonstrated by her unorthodox pursuit of several men simultaneously when she states that ‘I was only too happy to be taken out by this handsome young man, Gérard Lourdelet. I was still very much...

33 Mason, The Girl in the Blue Beret.
36 Mason, The New Yorker.
37 Hunt, Little Resistance.
38 Ibid., p.13.
in love with Daniel but I presumed that a lighthearted flirtation would hurt no one’. \(^{39}\) Whilst Annette’s and Antonia’s sexual emancipation is not directly linked to their resistance activity, it is a result of the conditions forced upon them by the Occupation and their exposure to the resistance. Although produced twenty-nine years apart, *The Girl in the Blue Beret* and *Little Resistance* both demonstrate the importance of recognising female resisters’ rejection of Vichy’s patriarchal constraints as a form of resistance in itself which is evidently an important aspect of both the late twentieth century and contemporary cultural definition of resistance.

In order fully to identify the contemporary definition of resistance presented by this Anglo-American corpus, it is necessary to establish the roles that women played in the French Resistance. Whilst this has been extensively addressed in academic literature, it has only recently been acknowledged by Anglo-American popular culture which illustrates the difference between the rates at which academic and cultural perceptions of resistance have developed. Anglo-American produced popular culture portrays women as having played diverse roles within the French Resistance, including liaison work, which involved couriering messages between resistance members and networks, the distribution of clandestine material and the sourcing of arms and food for the *maquis*. It is perhaps this part of the chapter which reveals just how short-sighted and problematic the post-Liberation combat definition of resistance was.

Collins Weitz’s *Sisters in the Resistance* for instance underlines the importance of clandestine material to the French Resistance, identifying that circulation of *Combat*, a French clandestine newspaper, increased from 40,000 copies in 1942 to 200,000 in 1944.\(^ {40}\) Women, such as the co-director of *Combat* Berty Albrecht, had a number of roles within the clandestine industry including typing, editing, writing and distributing material.\(^ {41}\) This diverse contribution is

\(^{39}\) Ibid., p.85.
\(^{40}\) Collins Weitz, *Sisters in the Resistance*, p.3.
\(^{41}\) Ibid., p.71.
accurately reflected in Anglo-American novels such as Kristin Hannah’s *The Nightingale* (2015) which positions the fictional character Isabelle, the rebellious younger sister of Vianne, as integral to the dissemination of clandestine material produced by the local communist resistance group in Carriveau. Whilst Isabelle is eager to help distribute the tracts, Henri, a prominent member of the network, reminds her that the distribution of clandestine material ‘is punishable by death’. It is clear that this danger was gendered and exclusive to women who were used extensively for such distribution work. Female resisters were less prone to searches and questioning by German authorities than male resisters, many of whom were between the ages of eighteen and fifty and therefore liable for labour service in Germany. Whilst this may lead to an assumption that women were exempt from scrutiny because of their gender, Betty Langlois, a former resister, described as ‘slender, fearless [and] elegant with her red nails and tailored suits’, was often ‘stopped and searched’ whilst she had ‘money hidden in the false bottom of her suitcase and papers’. This assumption is directly challenged by the first-hand accounts of Berty and Betty and the fictional character of Isabelle and displays a short-sightedness similar to that of de Gaulle’s post-Liberation masculine resistance narrative.

Kate Mosse’s *Citadel* (2012) similarly demonstrates the centrality of women to the production and dissemination of clandestine material. Sandrine, a prominent resister in the fictional *Citadel* network, is portrayed as founding the weekly newspaper *Libertat* which involves her writing ‘the editorials, articles on atrocities carried out by the Milice, naming collaborationists [and] passing on information about successful resistance raids’. Whilst it is counterintuitive to claim that the distribution of clandestine material was more significant than armed combat

---

42 Hannah, *The Nightingale*.
43 Ibid., p.100.
44 Moorehead, p.30.
45 Mosse, *Citadel*.
46 Ibid., p.594.
in the French Resistance, historians such as John Sweets and Adler claim that the ‘pen was more powerful than the sword’ during the Occupation.\(^{47}\) Adler for instance emphasises a former resister’s statement that ‘chucking a bundle of tracts from the top of a railway bridge was just as perilous as throwing a grenade into a garage’ whilst Lynne Taylor similarly concludes that ‘the underground press was arguably one of the most important forms of resistance’.\(^{48}\) This is supported also by Aubrac’s claim that ‘like the Resistance in general, our group developed from our need to inform’.\(^{49}\) In this respect, the fictional portrayal of Isabelle and Sandrine as central to the dissemination of clandestine material highlights a commonality between Anglo-American produced popular culture and the established academic narrative as outlined by the likes of Adler and Taylor. It can therefore be argued that there is an academic and cultural agreement that this is an important aspect of the definition of resistance.

This Anglo-American corpus also portrays women as playing a prominent role in looking after and orchestrating the escape of downed airmen from France. Mason’s *The Girl in the Blue Beret* for instance focuses on the central role played by Annette’s family in assisting American downed airmen, such as Marshall, in their integration into occupied France and ultimately their escape. Annette’s mother is portrayed as domestically resourceful, particularly when she states ‘I have ten grams of butter – very precious. I have the sugar. We must get along without even ersatz coffee’.\(^{50}\) Although Annette’s family are evidently struggling to obtain enough food for themselves, they continue to house downed airmen despite the extra strain that this places on the availability of food because they believe, if they

\(^{47}\) Sweets, p.200.


\(^{50}\) Collins Weitz, *Sisters in the Resistance*, p.72.

do not successfully get the aviators back to safety, then they ‘have done nothing’. Whilst Annette and her mother are excluded by the gender barrier from the opportunity to wage armed resistance against the Germans, they regard the act of housing the downed airmen as their collective contribution to the liberation of France. Whilst Schwarz argues that certain forms of participation, such as ‘providing food’, became ‘women’s work’ because they tapped [into] women’s traditional roles as housewives and mothers, *The Girl in the Blue Beret* counters this assumption.\(^{52}\) Annette and her mother for instance are instrumental in creating Marshall’s false identity cards and even change his age ‘so that he would be too old for the obligatory work service – the labour camps in Germany’.\(^{53}\) This activity is by no means an extension of their domestic role which significantly challenges Schwarz’s categorisation of women’s contribution to the resistance within a domestic framework. It is therefore evident that, just as the post-Liberation resistance narrative should not have been equated to combat, women’s contribution to the resistance should not be confined to the domestic sphere. After all, the purpose of using gender as a category of analysis is to dispel gender assumptions rather than reinforce them which, when analysing her argument in relation to *The Girl in the Blue Beret*, Schwarz does.

Whilst recognition of the contribution of women to the French Resistance should not be confined to the domestic sphere, it equally should not overlook their input as mothers and housewives. Hannah’s *The Nightingale* introduces Vianne as the epitome of the ideologically constrained French female, politically ignorant of the repercussions of the armistice signed by Pétain in June 1940 and in denial about the Occupation.\(^{54}\) Despite this, the deportation of her Jewish friend, Rachael, ignites Vianne’s maternal instinct as she is obliged to look after the former’s son, Ariel. This in turn motivates Vianne to establish a school for Jewish children at

---

\(^{51}\) Ibid., p.143.

\(^{52}\) Schwarz, *Partisanes and Gender Politics*, p.127.


\(^{54}\) Hannah, p.82.
the local Convent with the assistance of Mother Superior and to put in place measures for post-Occupation France as she discretely creates cards and lists which ‘when put together would identify the children after the war and make it possible to get them back to their families’.\textsuperscript{55} Whilst certainly an extension of her maternal role, Vianne’s contribution to the resistance is still portrayed as brave, particularly as she has to withstand sexual abuse at the hands of the billeting German officer, Herr Sturmbannführer, who merely regards Vianne as his ‘French whore’.\textsuperscript{56} Although Hannah sharply juxtaposes Vianne and Isabelle, the former as maternal and the latter as patriotic, Vianne’s journey of resistance is evidence that Schwarz’s argument of women’s contribution to the resistance being an ‘extension of traditional feminine roles in the home and workplace’ is an oversimplification.\textsuperscript{57} The Nightingale and The Girl in the Blue Beret both convincingly challenge this academic assumption and underline the importance of recognising, in the cultural definition of resistance, women’s contribution to the French Resistance outside of the domestic sphere.

It is evident from analysis of this Anglo-American corpus that the contemporary cultural definition of resistance is not only aligned with but extends beyond that promoted by the academic community. The accounts of Cécile, Danielle and Marie in A Train in Winter and Sisters in the Resistance intimately portray the culture of sacrifice exclusive to mothers in the resistance whilst The Girl in the Blue Beret and Little Resistance significantly identify the emancipation of women from the patriarchal constraints of Vichy’s culture as a form of resistance in itself. Whilst Mason’s fabrication of the sexual relationship between Annette and Robert could suggest that authors seek to romanticise the experience of female resisters to engage a popular audience, the first-hand account of Antonia’s sexual emancipation renders this fictional twist as more typical of women’s experiences in the French Resistance. The Girl

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., p.340.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., p.390.
\textsuperscript{57} Schwarz, Redefining Resistance, p.147.
in the Blue Beret and The Nightingale are significant in identifying that women’s contribution should not be confined to the domestic sphere, as advocated by academics such as Schwarz. This Anglo-American corpus therefore reveals a cultural definition of resistance that both overtakes and challenges that developed by the academic community which confirms that women’s contribution to the French Resistance is no longer an elitist discussion. In order to expand on this further, the next chapter will analyse how relationships between women in the resistance are portrayed in this Anglo-American corpus.
Chapter Two: Relationships between Women in the French Resistance

It is evident from the previous chapter that women had distinct gendered roles within the French Resistance which were ignored by the post-Liberation resistance narrative as de Gaulle sought to rebuild France around the ‘unity’ of the French Resistance. It is important however also to recognise that the heterogeneous character of the French Resistance was similarly repressed by the Gaullist resistance narrative. Whilst Kedward argued in 1978 that the French Resistance ‘could never have been a homogeneous, tightly knit group’ due to regional differences between the numerous resistance networks, relationships between women in the resistance, a significant part of its heterogeneity, have been relatively unaddressed by the academic community. 58 This is perhaps the result of a tendency among academics to regard relationships between members of the resistance as ‘political affinities’ which excludes female resisters as French women did not officially enter the political sphere until 1944 when they received the vote. 59

Whilst Anglo-American popular culture, particularly oral testimonies and memoirs, provides agency to female resisters within this political framework of analysis by revealing that relationships between women in the resistance were often based on communism, it also demonstrates that class could be a source of division between female resisters. This suggests therefore that other factors, as well as political affinity, determined the nature of relationships in the French Resistance. It is important to understand however that popular culture is perhaps more predisposed than academic literature to portraying relationships between women in the French Resistance because of authors’ and editors’ ability to use different characters or themes to reveal the heterogeneous nature of the resistance through a more accessible medium. The purpose of this chapter is to analyse how relationships between women in the French Resistance are portrayed in this Anglo-American corpus and to identify

59 Ibid., p.231.
any divisions between women and how these were overcome. This analysis will be used in conjunction with academic literature supporting the heterogeneous nature of the French Resistance to provide a more informed observation of relationships between women in the French Resistance.

Moorehead’s *A Train in Winter* is significant in revealing that there were a number of differences between the female deportees. This notion of individual diversity is confirmed by the fact that out of the 230 women deported to Auschwitz-Birkenau ‘119 were communists [and] nine were not French [whilst]… the majority came from every part and region of France, from Paris, Bordeaux, Brittany, Normandy, Aquitaine and along the banks of the Loire’. 60 Whilst the majority of women in Moorehead’s study were communist, this should not lead to the assumption that all relationships between the deportees were politically based. Dr Adelaïde Hautval, one of the 230 deportees who was captured by German police in 1942 when attempting to cross the demarcation line to attend her mother’s funeral, argues that politics could in fact be a source of contention, particularly when ‘newcomers [to the camp] without the same political commitment… found the inventive and unflagging determination of the communists daunting’. 61

Despite this, Adelaïde, who was without any strong political conviction herself, states that the women’s commitment to the resistance cause ‘provided a bond that proved far stronger than political allegiances’. 62 Whilst this supports Kedward’s argument that the French Resistance was heterogeneous, it suggests more significantly that it should not be analysed exclusively through a political lens because of the fragility of members’ commitment to politics in the face of deportation. Although Adelaïde’s portrayal of a politically hybrid resistance is in keeping with Kedward’s analysis, the latter only concluded that there were ‘right wing

---

60 Moorehead, p.176.
61 Ibid., p.160.
individuals among the dominantly left wing resisters’ in the Lozère region in southern France after interviewing Henri Cordesse, a prominent French male resister and politician, which ironically reinforces the homogeneity of the resistance by framing it exclusively within a masculine perspective. Adelaïde’s account is therefore significant in providing agency to female resisters within this political framework which has not been forthcoming from the academic community. Despite this, it must be remembered that the 230 deportees in Moorehead’s study overcame their political differences because of their need to survive in concentration camps such as Auschwitz-Birkenau. It is therefore difficult to conclude whether Adelaïde’s political impartiality would have been accepted by her communist counterparts had they not endured deportation together.

*A Train in Winter* is also significant in revealing that class could be a source of division between women in the French Resistance. Cécile reveals that Viva Nenni, a female resister who was involved with the clandestine reporting of the ‘Tintelin affaire’ and arrested in August 1942, often received luxury food packets, including meat such as chicken, from her family due to their middle class status. Despite an agreement amongst the female deportees that ‘food packets would be pooled in order to make an extra morning soup’, Cécile regarded Viva as ungenerous, particularly when the latter picked ‘the carcasses for every last shred of good meat before handing over the bones for the pot’. Whilst it must be recognised that the deportees in Moorehead’s study were subject to starvation, similar class-based tension is portrayed in Saul Dibb’s *Suite Française* (2014), a film adaptation of the second novel of Ukrainian Jew Irène Némirovsky who was murdered at Auschwitz. Lucile Angellier, a French prisoner of war (POW) wife living in Bussy with her wealthy mother-in-law, is

---

64 Moorehead, pp.152-154.
65 Ibid., p.154.
66 *Suite Française*. 
disliked by Celine, a peasant’s daughter, due to her mother-in-law, Madame Angellier, removing Celine’s family from their house and forcing them to live in the attached barn because of their inability to afford the rent. Despite Lucile’s comfortable class status, she disagrees with her mother-in-law’s hoarding of food and provides Madelaine Labarie, a farmer’s wife, with some of the surplus, stating that ‘we have food to spare, if you know what I mean’. 67

Whilst the sharing of resources is more feasible for Lucile than Viva, due to the latter’s food parcels saving her from starvation, it is important to identify the common trend that is represented in A Train in Winter and Suite Française, namely that the Occupation coerced relationships between women to enter new realms that tested not only their political integrity but also their selflessness. This trend is significant in revealing the heterogeneous character of the resistance which is fundamentally lost when analysed exclusively through an academic political lens. Whilst it is important to identify that politics did form the basis of some relationships in the resistance, the class-based tension between women in the French Resistance, as demonstrated by Cécile’s dislike of Viva and the fictional dislike of Lucile by Celine, indicates the need for a broader approach fully to understand relationships between women. Anglo-American culture offers such an approach.

This Anglo-American corpus also underlines that discretion and silence were important elements in the relationships between women in the French Resistance. Annie Kriegal, a teenager at the time of the Occupation living in the Marais district of Paris, states that she was sent to a house ‘said to be taking in Jews’ during the July 1942 round-ups but she ‘never learned who [the woman who owned the house] was, what her affiliation was, or why she took in all those Jews’. 68 The notion of women in the resistance being unable to form transparent relationships with their female counterparts due to the clandestine nature of their
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work is similarly documented in *Little Resistance* when Antonia recalls how she was unable to tell anybody of her plans to leave Paris, stating that ‘it seemed incredibly difficult… to make plans for a picnic a week or ten days hence and know I wouldn’t be there’. This is also portrayed in Mosse’s *Citadel*, particularly when Sandrine decides not to inform Lucie, a politically unaware counterpart in the *Citadel* resistance network, that she was responsible for blowing up the railway line at Berriac despite it being reported by Vichy controlled newspapers. Whilst Lucie demonstrates her ability to exploit her sexuality to dupe the enemy, particularly when she persuades a German prison guard to pass on a parcel to her deported Jewish fiancé Max, Sandrine ensures that Lucie is kept at the periphery of the network due to her naïve disposition.

A similar theme of silence is portrayed in *Suite Française* when Lucile tells Madelaine that she is unable to shelter Benoit, the latter’s husband who is being pursued by German officers for shooting the officer billeting at his farm. Although Madelaine disowns Lucile, confirmed by her statement ‘shame on you’, the latter in fact helps Benoit escape to Paris to join the resistance without informing Madelaine in order to reduce the chances of being caught. Whilst Lucile exploits her sexual relationship with her billeting German officer, Bruno, in order to obtain the travel pass necessary for the escape, a significant theme which will be analysed in the following chapter, the dishonesty present between Lucile and Madelaine is ironically portrayed as a product of loyalty which reinforces the complex nature of relationships between women in a heterogeneous resistance. Although this notion of secrecy among female resisters is aligned with the stance of academics, such as Adler who analyses the anonymity of women’s press authors, the silence inherent in relationships between women in the French Resistance is portrayed more vividly by the first-hand accounts of Annie and
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Antonia and the fictional relationships between Sandrine and Lucie and Lucile and Madelaine in *Citadel* and *Suite Française* respectively.  

Anglo-American popular culture is also significant in demonstrating that relationships between women in the French Resistance could be contentious because each woman had a unique approach to the resistance cause. Hannah’s *The Nightingale* portrays the relationship between Isabelle and Vianne as evolving into one of unity despite their different interpretations of resistance. Isabelle’s disapproval of Vianne’s passivity is overcome due to the strain of war increasing the importance of self-sufficiency. This is demonstrated most significantly when Vianne ‘along with Sophie [her daughter] and Isabelle replanted and expanded the garden and converted a pair of old bookcases into rabbit hutches’, suggesting that differences between women in the resistance, like the political ambiguity between Adelaïde and her communist counterparts in Auschwitz-Birkenau, could be overcome by the common goal of survival. This notion was similarly advocated by Margaret Atack in 1989 who identified that despite the ‘very different perceptions of the nature of the war being waged and the kind of future which victory might bring… the resistance was a coalition of forces united in their aim of national liberation’. Whilst *The Nightingale* positions Vianne and Isabelle’s union as a tool for survival, Hannah ensures that their differences are presented to the reader. This is in contrast to French produced resistance literature which, as identified by Atack, is merely ‘an attempt to spread the resistance message [and]… an expression of the movement towards unity’. It can therefore be argued that Anglo-American popular culture, such as *The Nightingale*, portrays a more realistic narrative of the French Resistance and
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provides greater agency to female resisters in comparison to French produced popular culture which, as already identified, is severely constrained by the ‘Vichy Syndrome’.

Vianne’s position as a mother in *The Nightingale* makes her more susceptible to greater involvement in the resistance and underpins her relationship with fellow mother and friend Rachael. Whilst fully aware of the dangers inherent in such an activity, Vianne encourages Rachael, who is Jewish, to ‘take [her]… children to the free zone’ in order to avoid deportation.\(^\text{77}\) Although Adler concluded from her analysis of clandestine material produced by the PCF, which addressed women ‘as ‘maman’, ‘ménagère’ and ‘Française’ (mum, housewife, Frenchwoman)’, that mothers were expected to be both domestic and patriotic, Vianne only encourages Rachael to undertake a form of resistance, namely escaping to the free zone, because the latter’s maternal status is threatened by the Occupation, not because it is an act of patriotism.\(^\text{78}\) Whilst Adler is correct in identifying that there was an ‘expectation’ for mothers to be dually motivated by both their maternity and patriotism, it is impossible to conclude which factor motivated them more; it is probable however, particularly from the accounts of Cécile and Danielle in the previous chapter, that it was maternity. This notion is strengthened when Rachael’s planned escape in *The Nightingale* is compared with the escape of Benoit orchestrated by Lucile in *Suite Française*, particularly because the former is entirely motivated by maternal instinct whereas the latter, due to Lucile’s childless status, is motivated by patriotism and redemption. Analysis of this Anglo-American corpus is therefore significant in portraying relationships between mothers in the resistance as being entirely based on maternal status and provides greater insight into the experience of the mother resister.

It is therefore evident that analysis of this Anglo-American corpus permits relationships between women in the French Resistance to be explored outside Kedward’s masculine
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political framework. Moorehead’s *A Train in Winter* not only reveals the politically hybrid nature of the 230 female deportees, as demonstrated by the acceptance of Adelaïde’s political impartiality by her communist counterparts, but also the tension that class created in relationships between the women, as revealed by Cécile’s dislike of Viva for not sharing her food parcels. Although the 230 deportees in Moorehead’s study were subject to deportation, which makes Viva’s reluctance to share food more understandable, similar class-based tension is portrayed in *Suite Française* between Celine and Lucile which reinforces the notion that factors, other than politics, are recognised by popular culture as determining relationships between women in the French Resistance. *Little Resistance, Citadel* and *Suite Française* for instance all portray the centrality of silence and discretion in relationships between women in the resistance. *The Nightingale* is also significant in suggesting that differences between women in the resistance could be overcome in the interests of survival as demonstrated by Vianne and Isabelle working together to achieve self-sufficiency despite the former’s political naivety and the latter’s patriotism. Vianne’s relationship with Rachael also reveals the centrality of maternity to mothers in the resistance, particularly when the former encourages the latter to escape to the free zone with her children in order to avoid deportation. This proposed escape is however in stark contrast to Benoit’s escape in *Suite Française* which is orchestrated by Lucile and motivated by patriotism and redemption. It is therefore evident from analysis of this Anglo-American corpus that relationships between women in the French Resistance were complex and diverse and that divisions were rooted in factors such as politics and class. There is an overriding trend however present in the popular culture that divisions were overcome by the common goal of survival uniting women in the resistance which has been overlooked by an academic community analysing relationships from an exclusively political standpoint. In order to place these findings into a wider context however the next
chapter will explore how relationships between men and women in the resistance are portrayed in this Anglo-American corpus.
Chapter Three: Relationships between Men and Women in the French Resistance

Whilst female resisters are the primary focus of this dissertation, it is important to analyse how relationships with their male counterparts are portrayed in this Anglo-American corpus because one purpose of the post-Liberation resistance narrative was to reconnect Frenchmen with their masculinity which had been threatened by the Occupation. Michael Kelly for instance convincingly argues that Frenchmen had been ‘humiliated in the activities which they most valued, notably work and war’, suggesting that de Gaulle chose to exclude the contribution of women from the post-Liberation narrative to prevent any further emasculation of the Frenchman.79 Whilst academic analysis of the gendered division of responsibility gives the impression that relationships between male and female resisters were clearly defined, this Anglo-American corpus significantly challenges this impression and permits relationships between men and women to be understood outside of an ‘emasculated’ framework of analysis. This has been achieved most explicitly by popular culture published during the twenty-first century which is perhaps a result of contemporary culture being less constrained by patriarchy than it was in the mid-twentieth century, and the growing trend of feminism and cosmopolitanism in the post-modern age. It is significant however that authors such as Mason, Sebastian Faulks and Hannah frame fictional relationships between male and female resisters in a sexual context which suggests that there is a trend amongst authors to romanticise the experiences of women in the resistance through sexual encounters with their male counterparts.80 Whilst this trend may be prominent due to the requirement of authors to produce enticing fictional content, the sexualisation of relationships between male and female resisters runs the risk of portraying the latter first and foremost as women rather than resisters.

Faulks, Charlotte Gray.
Hannah, The Nightingale.
The purpose of this chapter is to explore why relationships between men and women in the French Resistance are often sexualised in popular culture and to analyse whether female resisters could retain their femininity in traditionally masculine ‘spaces’ such as the maquis.

Faulks sexualises the relationship between Charlotte, a young Scottish Special Operations Executive (SOE) agent who is parachuted into France, and Julien, a resistance member in the southern village of Lavaurette, in *Charlotte Gray* (1998) to frame the former’s resistance activity within a feminine context. Whilst Charlotte initially refuses Julien’s sexual advances because of her love for Peter Gregory, a British airman who goes missing in France and is Charlotte’s motivation to go there as an SOE agent, she succumbs to Julien’s persistence following a parachute drop where she admits that she was ‘frightened by the dangerous proximity of the plane’. It is significant that Faulks portrays Charlotte as seeking salvation from her fear by having sex with Julien, suggesting that dangerous resistance activity often coerced female resisters into seeking sexual comfort from their male counterparts. The notion of Charlotte being ruled by her emotions is a common theme that runs throughout the novel, demonstrated most significantly when she unofficially extends her stay in France to locate the missing Peter. This in turn results in Charlotte compromising her resistance identity when attempting to extract information from Monsieur Chollet, a suspected contact of Peter, when she states ‘I’m British… I’m not an informer… I can prove it to you. I’m going to speak English’. Whilst Charlotte’s potential as a successful SOE agent is indisputable, having spent her childhood in France and gained a sound knowledge of both the country and its language, her sexual encounter with Julien and infatuated pursuit of Peter severely curtails her credibility as a resister because it suggests she is unable to act in isolation from her emotions.
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It is revealing however that Faulks based *Charlotte Gray*, in part, on the exploits of Nancy Wake, an Australian-born SOE agent who was nicknamed ‘the white mouse’ by the Gestapo because of her ability to evade capture. Nancy’s account of her resistance activity reveals a significant disconnect between her experiences as a female resister and that of Faulks’ fictional character Charlotte.° It is revealing however that Faulks based *Charlotte Gray*, in part, on the exploits of Nancy Wake, an Australian-born SOE agent who was nicknamed ‘the white mouse’ by the Gestapo because of her ability to evade capture. Nancy’s account of her resistance activity reveals a significant disconnect between her experiences as a female resister and that of Faulks’ fictional character Charlotte. ° Nancy was motivated to join the resistance by her hatred of the Nazi regime whereas Charlotte is portrayed as going to France to locate Peter under the guise of her SOE agent identity. ° Nancy abstained from contacting her beloved husband, Henri Fiocca, during her resistance activity in an attempt to protect him from danger. Whilst Henri was in fact tortured and killed by the Gestapo for refusing to divulge Nancy’s whereabouts, the latter’s decision to maintain her distance from her husband reveals that she made a conscious effort to act practically rather than emotionally. By contrast Charlotte is portrayed as compromising her own identity as an SOE agent in an attempt to locate Peter, placing both her and the wider resistance network in potential danger. Another significant difference between Nancy and Charlotte is the former’s ability to gain agency as a resister rather than a female among her male counterparts. Nancy, whose resistance activity involved obtaining resources for the *maquis*, objected to the male maquisards hiding in the bushes while she went to the toilet stating that she ‘wanted their respect not their leering eyes and I couldn’t have both’. ° It is significant that Nancy concluded she could not gain the ‘respect’ of the *maquis* if she was regarded as a sexual object and admitted that she gained their respect by drinking ‘them under the table’, an activity which suggests Nancy underwent a process of masculinisation in order to become accepted by her male counterparts. °

Faulks’ decision to exclude this masculinisation in *Charlotte Gray* is significant and reveals that authors utilise a sexualised framework to portray interactions between men and women in
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the resistance. Whilst this could be for fictional value, Faulks may have romanticised the relationship between Charlotte and Julien in a bid to provide a more understandable justification for her participation in the resistance. It is perhaps more palatable to a popular audience to frame the contribution of female resisters as motivated by infatuation with a male counterpart rather than political conviction or patriotism because this fits the traditional feminine portrayal of women being ruled by their emotions rather than practicality. The popularity of *Charlotte Gray* was confirmed in 2001 when its film adaptation was produced by Gillian Armstrong who, working within a £15 million budget, rewrote the story’s ending to portray Charlotte abandoning Peter for Julien.\(^{89}\) Whilst this confirms that the fictional sexualisation of female resisters is popular with a domestic audience, the novel and film adaptation of *Charlotte Gray* are not aligned with the academic community which, as demonstrated in Chapter One, identifies a multitude of factors which motivated women to join the resistance, other than infatuation with a male counterpart. Faulks’ sexualisation of Charlotte’s experience as an SOE agent positions *Charlotte Gray* as an ill-informed portrayal of women’s contribution to the French Resistance which is arguably in line with de Gaulle’s post-Liberation masculine resistance narrative.

The sexualisation of relationships between men and women in the French Resistance is also portrayed in *The Girl in the Blue Beret*. As demonstrated in Chapter One, Mason created the sexual relationship between Annette and Robert to fulfil the fictional purpose of the novel, stating that it added a ‘dimension of sorrow – a young couple whose possibility of raising a family was lost’.\(^ {90}\) It is significant however that Moët-Agnie, the female resister on whom the novel is based, ‘did not like’ this part of the novel but understood that ‘fiction goes in a
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different direction from a documentary’. Whilst Annette and Robert’s relationship is similar to that of Charlotte and Peter’s in *Charlotte Gray*, in the sense that it is sexual, this is not portrayed as Annette’s primary motivation for joining the resistance. As demonstrated in Chapter Two, Annette is instead motivated by a sense of duty to help liberate France. Unlike Charlotte, Annette’s resistance activity has agency outside of her relationship with Robert and therefore challenges the notion of women in the resistance being exclusively portrayed through sexual encounters with their male counterparts.

This is similarly achieved in *The Nightingale*, particularly when Isabelle pursues her resistance activity despite being abandoned by Gaëtan, a communist resister who travelled with Isabelle from Paris to Carriveau during the mass exodus in 1940. Whilst Isabelle’s infatuation, as demonstrated by her declaration of love for Gaëtan within forty-eight hours of meeting him, is similar to that shown by Charlotte towards Peter, Isabelle, like Annette, does not mould her resistance activity around Gaëtan and is instead motivated by her French patriotism. Her commitment to the resistance is exemplified most significantly by her refusal to stop her mountain trips across the Pyrenees with American downed airmen despite her father overhearing the Schutzstaffel (SS) talking about the ‘Nightingale’, Isabelle’s resistance name. It is therefore evident that, whilst Annette and Isabelle are both portrayed as having sexual relationships with their male counterparts, this is merely a byproduct of their resistance activity which is primarily motivated by a sense of duty and patriotism. This is perhaps the most apparent contrast between *Charlotte Gray* on the one hand and *The Girl in the Blue Beret* and *The Nightingale* on the other, namely that the latter two provide agency to female resistance characters outside of their sexual relationships with male counterparts whereas the former does not. Although *Charlotte Gray* could be considered an aberration in
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this respect, the evident contrast between the novels could be a result of the timing of their publication. *Charlotte Gray* was published in 1998 whereas *The Girl in the Blue Beret* and *The Nightingale* were published in 2011 and 2015 respectively. The progression of feminism within the intervening seventeen years could be identified as one reason why novels are beginning to portray female resisters without a gendered lens, thereby providing them with agency as resisters rather than as women.

*The Nightingale* is also significant in portraying femininity as a strength of female resisters rather than a weakness. Isabelle for instance is portrayed as supporting airmen during their passage across the Pyrenees; she encourages Teddy, an American airman who appears to have given up hope during his passage, by reminding him of his wife back home, stating ‘get on your feet for Alice, Teddy’.95 This is in stark contrast to Nancy’s account whose ‘encouragement’ to an American airman struggling across the Pyrenees involved kicking and swearing at him and then dragging ‘him for a few yards along the snow by his hair’.96 Whilst Hannah, unlike Faulks, claims no commitment to reflecting the exploits of Nancy, it is important to recognise the differences between the latter’s account of her Pyrenees experience and the fictional portrayal of Isabelle’s. Nancy exercises a masculine approach of violence towards the airman whereas Isabelle’s interaction with Teddy is framed within a feminine context, particularly as she provides him with motivation by emphasising his emotional bond with his wife. Hannah’s portrayal of Isabelle within a feminine framework may be an attempt to demonstrate that female resisters did not always adhere to the masculine demands of the resistance and could exploit their femininity in order to provide a significant support network for their peers.

Isabelle’s masculinisation is however revealed in other instances, particularly when she cuts her hair in front of Captain Beck, the first billeting officer at their home, and states ‘it must be
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The notion of Isabelle sacrificing her femininity by cutting her hair is reinforced by Mary Louise Roberts who convincingly argues that ‘the bob haircut’ was objected to in France because it blurred ‘the boundaries of sexual difference [and caused]… women not only to look but also act like men’. Whilst Nancy’s account of her Pyrenees experience indicates that she undoubtedly underwent a process of masculinisation in order to be accepted by her male counterparts, the fictional portrayal of Isabelle allows this notion of masculinisation to be better understood by underlining that female resisters could simultaneously exploit their femininity and adhere to a form of masculinisation in conducting their resistance activity. Whilst Hannah’s portrayal of femininity as a strength rather than a weakness is in direct contrast to Faulks’ *Charlotte Gray*, the popularity of *The Nightingale* is similar in scale and led TriStar Pictures to purchase the rights to produce a film adaptation of the novel in 2015. This suggests that twenty-first century feminism has coerced a contemporary popular audience to appreciate the contribution of women as resisters.

The notion that female resisters exploited their femininity to build supportive relationships with their male counterparts is similarly documented in Anne Marie Walter’s account, *Moondrop to Gascony* (1947), which recounts her experience as a liaison officer, courier and *maquis* support for George Starr who headed up the Wheelwright circuit of the SOE. Anne Marie for instance is asked by Cyprien, a French male counterpart in the network, to sit with a group of rescued American airmen in the back of the van during the journey through German
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checkpoints, stating that ‘a woman might make them forget the dangers on the road’.  
George also instructs Anne Marie to sit with a Spanish maquisard, Alcazio, and write down his thoughts and feelings. Whilst Anne Marie recalls her frustration at taking her notes to George and watching him ‘throw [them]… in the fire without even bothering to read’ them, the latter informs Anne Marie ‘you must do it because it pleases him and I want him to be happy. We need these people badly’.  

Although a demeaning activity for Anne Marie, it is significant in revealing her centrality in maintaining the morale of her male counterparts which in turn ensured their commitment to the maquis. It is therefore evident that Anne Marie was encouraged to exploit her femininity by senior SOE members to maintain unity in the Wheelwright network which strengthens the notion that not all female resisters had to undergo a process of masculinisation, like Nancy, in order to gain acceptance by their male counterparts. 

Despite this, Anne Marie recalls that it was difficult for a female resister to retain her femininity in the maquis. This is perhaps revealed most significantly when she changed into a pair of pink shorts due to the hot weather which resulted in Yves, a male maquisard, commenting ‘my dear girl, do you know that a maquis is a place where women are not meant to be, as a rule? And what do you think the men say or think when they see you trotting past in shorts?’  

Whilst Anne Marie evidently experienced a similar process of sexualisation as Nancy, it is significant that, unlike the latter, she refused to sacrifice her femininity, as demonstrated by her persistence in wearing feminine clothing, in order to gain the respect as a resister among her male counterparts. It is important however to understand that the maquis was a distinct ‘male space’ where the concentration of masculinity was far greater than in other pockets of resistance activity. Authors such as Faulks are perhaps reluctant to portray
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the masculinisation of female resisters because it was reasonably confined to those involved in the *maquis* rather than the clandestine press or liaison work.

It is therefore evident that there is a tendency amongst authors to sexualise the fictional relationships between male and female resisters. Faulks for instance positions Charlotte’s sexual encounter with Julien and her infatuated pursuit of Peter as encapsulating her resistance experience which gives the impression that female resisters were led by their emotions rather than practicality. It is significant however that Faulks excluded the masculinisation of Nancy in *Charlotte Gray*, suggesting that the sexualisation of female resisters is more palatable to a domestic audience than their portrayal as heroic patriots. Whilst the sexualisation of female resisters is similarly portrayed in *The Girl in the Blue Beret* and *The Nightingale*, Mason and Hannah provide agency to Annette and Isabelle as resisters outside of their sexual relationships with Robert and Gaëtan respectively. This is perhaps the most obvious distinction between these two novels and *Charlotte Gray* which suggests that the progression of feminism in the twenty-first century has resulted in authors moving away from portraying female resisters exclusively through their sexual encounters with male counterparts. Analysis of this Anglo-American corpus does however reinforce the notion that responsibilities in the resistance were gendered, as revealed by Anne Marie’s duty as a woman to maintain morale in the *maquis*, and that female resisters did not always have to adhere to the masculine nature of the French Resistance because their femininity was in fact considered a strength. The next chapter will endeavour to provide a more informed account of the sexuality of French women during the Occupation by analysing how female collaborators are portrayed in this Anglo-American corpus.
Chapter Four: The Female Collaborator

It is evident from the previous chapter that the sexualisation of the female resister is a common theme amongst Anglo-American authors seeking to engage a popular audience with the contribution of women to the French Resistance. The portrayal of the female collaborator however is more complex due to the silence inherent in popular discourse surrounding their treatment at the Liberation. Unlike female resisters, who were largely excluded from de Gaulle’s post-Liberation narrative, the female collaborator was publicly punished during the Purge to help restore the masculinity of the Frenchman. The notion of the Liberation being masculinised and the Occupation feminised is supported by Lea Hewitt who identities that ‘the image of the French nation as a woman saved from the Germans’ was fundamental to de Gaulle’s post-Liberation resistance narrative.\(^{104}\) Alison Moore similarly argues that ‘the French nation is perhaps more than any other European nationality constructed as a feminine body’ due to its Republican history which underlines the symbolic importance of French women during the Occupation.\(^{105}\) Women accused of sexual collaboration with the enemy therefore had their heads shaved and were paraded naked in public which has resulted in them being referred to by various actors as ‘les femmes tondues’ or ‘the shorn women’.

Whilst academics such as Virgili have analysed the memory of the ‘tondues’, paying particular attention to the significance of contemporary photographs in the construction of their place in history, the treatment of the female collaborator at the Liberation was largely ignored by academics until the late 1980s despite female resisters’ contribution being addressed in the 1970s.\(^{106}\) This could be a result of the national shame attached to the treatment of female collaborators at the Liberation or a lack of knowledge of the shearings.
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which lasted only for a matter of months in an atmosphere of national restoration. Whilst female collaboration took many different forms, including the denunciation of Jews and resisters to German and Vichy authorities, academic analysis reveals that sexual collaboration received the most public form of punishment which is perhaps understandable when one considers the feminisation of the French nation during the Occupation.\(^{107}\) Although novels in this Anglo-American corpus do not explicitly refer to the treatment of the ‘tondues’ at the Liberation, female collaboration, similar to relationships between men and women in the resistance, is predominantly portrayed in a sexual context. Despite this, Dibb’s *Suite Française* portrays Lucile as collaborating and resisting simultaneously which suggests an attempt to identify that there was a ‘fine line’ between female resistance and collaboration. This complexity is however lost in academic literature which focuses exclusively on the sexual collaboration of the ‘tondues’ and their treatment at the Liberation. It is the purpose of this chapter to explore why Anglo-American authors seek to represent female collaboration in a sexual context.

Dibb’s *Suite Française* reflects the notion that France was ‘impregnated’ by the Germans during the Occupation. The rural town of Bussy is sufficiently feminised, confirmed by Lucile’s narration that ‘there had been no men in our town for so long. The mothers of French soldiers ‘looked on with disgust [at the German soldiers] and begged to God to curse them… but the young women just looked’.\(^{108}\) Whilst this portrays a generational divide, namely that the younger women were more prone to sexual interaction with the enemy than older women, Lucile’s statement reflects Higonnet’s argument that ‘war strengthens the sense that women are property [and]… symbols of national victory’.\(^{109}\) This is similarly reinforced by Benoit’s decision to seek help from Lucile in persuading Bruno to advise Kurt, the soldier
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billeting at his farm, to stop sexually harassing Madelaine, stating that ‘we have lost the war we don’t have to lose our women as well’. Although this implies that French women were merely pawns in the Occupation, it is also significant in portraying Benoit as the epitome of the emasculated French male as he is unable first and foremost to fight against the enemy due to his injured leg or to protect his wife from Kurt without the help of Lucile and Bruno. Benoit’s emasculation is further exemplified by his interaction with Kurt, particularly when the latter states ‘you won’t be in the labour camp for long… it’s likely to be a year plenty of time for me to fuck your wife while you shovel frozen shit’. Whilst Benoit’s frustration causes him to kill Kurt which subsequently leads to his manhunt, *Suite Française* portrays Benoit’s emasculation through an accessible medium perhaps to offer justification for his actions and to emphasise the sexual victimisation of French women such as Madelaine.

Lucile’s sexual relationship with Bruno however is portrayed in a more complex manner because her sexual collaboration coincides with her helping Benoit escape to Paris to join the resistance. Lucile’s infatuation with Bruno is presented as being born out of isolation from male interaction, confirmed by her admission that ‘I was meant to resent him yet there was relief in his presence after months of silence’. The notion of POW wives, as characterised by Lucile, being unable to exercise sexual self-restraint with the enemy is a prominent argument amongst academics such as Miranda Pollard who argues that POW wives were ‘especially prone to seduction [and came to represent] a powerful and popular representation of wayward female sexuality’.

Despite this, Lucile’s sexual collaboration yields benefits for various residents of Bussy including Madame Perrin who, on her return from the free zone, requests Lucile to retrieve
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some valuable family possessions from her house that has been taken over by billeting German officers. Whilst Lucile successfully retrieves Madame Perrin’s items with the assistance of Bruno, she comments that ‘the air was thick with whispers… some saw me as a collaborator, others admired my bravery but none knew what I was really feeling’. Lucile’s admission therefore is significant in portraying female collaborators as unintentionally collaborating and unable to comprehend the possibility that they were falling in love with the enemy. Despite this, Lucile’s experience is complicated by her resistance activity which, in many ways, can be perceived as her penance for her sexual encounter with Bruno because she exploits her relationship with the latter in order to source a travel pass for Benoit’s escape to Paris. Whilst Lucile receives verbal abuse from fellow residents in Bussy, such as ‘I know where you’re going you fucking German whore’, it is significant that she is portrayed as continuing to conduct her resistance activity in private which suggests that French women could be collaborators and resisters simultaneously. Suite Française is therefore significant in challenging the academic analysis of ‘tondues’ exclusively as sexual collaborators because it suggests there was a ‘fine line’ between resistance and collaboration in some instances.

Bradley Brubaker’s For Freedom: The Story of a French Spy (2003) similarly portrays female collaboration in a sexual context. Suzanne, a teenager in Cherbourg when the Occupation begins, pursues her career as an opera singer whilst simultaneously couriering messages for the French Resistance. Whilst Suzanne’s family are ignorant of her resistance activity, Suzanne’s father’s collaboration, which involves maintaining his job as a railroad dispatcher in Cherbourg despite being employed by the Germans, is portrayed as necessary to ensure the family is supported financially. The material advantages of his collaboration are evident when the family are able to travel to Paris to watch Suzanne perform in Rigoletto which is
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portrayed in a positive light by Suzanne who concludes that ‘this was one of the great advantages of Papa’s job – when we needed to, we could travel, even in wartime’. Brubaker therefore deliberately juxtaposes the sexual collaboration of the female hairdresser against Suzanne’s father’s collaboration which is positioned as economically necessary for the family. Whilst *For Freedom* was published in 2003 and *Suite Française* directed in 2014, both portray female collaborators within a sexual context which questions the extent to which feminism has encouraged authors and directors to provide greater agency to female collaborators.

Despite this, Hannah’s *The Nightingale* is significant in portraying the complexities of female collaboration. Captain Beck, like Bruno in *Suite Française*, is portrayed as a ‘friendly’ German soldier which results in Vianne building a rapport with him. Vianne is however coerced into acting against her better judgement and informally collaborating when Beck asks her to write down the names of all the Jews that work at her school which includes Rachael. Whilst Vianne is not explicitly scared of Beck himself, it is evident that she is scared of the authority he has and the fact that he is in ‘control of her home’ which is the motivating factor behind her agreeing to complete the list. Although Vianne’s collaboration, like that of Lucile, supports Pollard’s argument that POW wives were more prone to collaboration because of their loneliness, the former’s collaboration takes this out of a sexual context and frames it within a context of survival. Vianne ultimately writes the list for Beck and
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denounces Rachael in order to ensure that she and Sophie retain their home, which is more
difficult to protect in the absence of her POW husband; Lucile forms a sexual relationship
with Bruno in part because of their mutual interest in music but mostly out of loneliness.
Vianne’s character is also significant in providing agency to female collaborators because of
the sexual abuse she endures at the hands of Herr Sturmbannführer, as demonstrated in
Chapter One. This plot twist is significant in revealing that not all sexual interaction between
French women and German officers was consensual and reinforces the notion that analysing
and portraying female collaborators within a sexual context is severely limiting in scope and
denies them agency.

Mosse’s *Citadel* similarly attempts to portray that not all female collaboration was sexual. As
demonstrated in Chapter Two, Lucie is kept at the periphery of the *Citadel* resistance network
due to her political ignorance and infatuation with Max. Lucie’s naivety is however also
portrayed by her collaboration with Authié, a collaborating agent working for a French
military intelligence agency called the Deuxième Bureau, when he asks her for Sandrine’s
address following an incident on the river bank which involved the latter discovering Antoine,
a resister who had escaped the torture of Authié.122 Whilst Lucie immediately sacrific-es this
information, it is evident that she only complies with Authié’s demands because he has
promised her information about Max as shown by her desperate pleas ‘what about Max…
can you arrange for me to see him?’123 Although Lucie’s collaboration is far removed from
that conducted by Lucile in *Suite Française* and the female hairdresser in *For Freedom*
because it is not sexual, it is still framed within a feminine context because Lucie is
collaborating due to her infatuation with Max. Whilst *Citadel* makes some inroads into
providing female collaborators with greater agency by framing Lucie’s collaboration outside
of a sexual context, it does not go as far as *The Nightingale* which positions Vianne’s
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collaboration as a means of survival. By contrast however Lucie’s collaboration is not pragmatic but selfish. The portrayal of female collaboration in Mosse’s Citadel therefore is as short-sighted as that of Dibb and Brubaker in Suite Française and For Freedom respectively.

Whilst the shearing of the ‘tondues’ is not referred to in the Anglo-American produced novels analysed, it is mentioned in memoirs and oral interviews. Collins Weitz’s Sisters in the Resistance for instance states that Jacqueline Deroy became more tolerant of female sexual collaborators after studying the lives of POW wives, concluding that ‘certainly what they did was very serious but those who shaved their heads did not understand… it was an extreme reaction responding to the times’. It is also evident that female resisters often condemned the way the ‘tondues’ were treated at the Liberation. Lucienne Guezennece, who gave her identity papers to a young Jewish girl during the Occupation, recalls how she ‘cried out in protest’ as ‘she saw two naked girls trying to protect themselves from a group of shouting women who were spitting on the girls and trying to hit them’. Lucienne and Jacqueline therefore reveal a disconnect between the domestic French public and the ‘tondues’ in 1945 which is further revealed in Kedward’s interview with Henry Prades, a member of the maquis, in 1982 where the latter admits ‘we committed crimes in the maquis… but we were only 20 at the time… we did stupid things like shaving women’s heads at the Liberation’. Henry’s denunciation of the treatment of the ‘tondues’ as ‘stupid’ suggests that the shearings were an aberration and perhaps a necessary evil in the process of national restoration. It is significant however that Herbert Lottman identifies that the 1948 opinion poll revealed a popular dissatisfaction with the Liberation as 47 percent of respondents concluded that ‘the purge
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courts had not been sufficiently harsh’.127 Albert Camus’ statement that ‘a country which fails in its purge is ready to fail in its restoration’ is perhaps most fitting here.128 The ‘tondues’ were brutally humiliated for their supposed sexual collaboration with the enemy but this treatment, as indicated by the 1948 poll, did not yield a domestic public satisfied with the Liberation in France. This therefore gives the impression that the suffering of the ‘tondues’ was in vain and that the purge courts should have directed their attention elsewhere. The shaving of the ‘tondues’ was however an essential part of de Gaulle’s masculinisation of the Liberation.

It is however undeniable that the treatment of the ‘tondues’ at the Liberation established a conviction that female collaboration was predominantly sexual which has not been sufficiently challenged by academics or popular culture. Whilst The Nightingale portrays Vianne’s collaboration outside of a sexual context, female collaboration takes a sexual form in Suite Française and For Freedom which reflects a common trend among Anglo-American authors to equate female collaboration with sexual activity with the enemy. Although this is in keeping with academics such as Moore and Virgili, who focus exclusively on the treatment of sexual collaborators at the Liberation, the absence of the ‘tondues’ from popular memory is surprising. It seems that Anglo-American authors seek to portray the sexual endeavours of female collaborators but not their treatment at the Liberation which is somewhat telling. Whilst Citadel, like The Nightingale, attempts to provide female collaborators with greater agency by portraying Lucie’s collaboration as motivated by her infatuation with Max, this is still positioned in a traditional feminine framework of naivety and the inability to act in isolation from emotion. It is therefore evident that this Anglo-American corpus fails to

provide agency to female collaborators outside of a sexual framework which is seemingly short-sighted when one considers the multitude of forms that collaboration could take during the Occupation. This is almost certainly a product of the feminisation of the Occupation and the masculinisation of the Liberation.
Conclusion

Analysis of the Anglo-American corpus discloses a contemporary popular portrayal of women in the French Resistance which is in stark contrast to their exclusion from the immediate post-Liberation resistance narrative in France. An essential part of de Gaulle’s strategy to rebuild a united French nation was the presentation of the resistance as a struggle by an elite band of mostly male freedom fighters and the repression of the memory of Vichy’s collaboration with the Germans. The masculinisation of the French Resistance with its emphasis on armed combat was a product of the ‘Vichy Syndrome’ identified by Rousso in 1987 and left little room for the recognition of the contribution made by women who were mostly excluded from participation in military operations.

The departure of de Gaulle from French politics in 1969 coincided with the emergence in the 1970s of a number of academics who challenged the resistance ‘myth’ with a collaborationist narrative suggesting that Vichy France supported Nazi policy. Whilst academics working within a feminist framework began to recognise women’s contribution to the resistance, there remained an established argument that their contribution was both temporary and subordinate to that of their male counterparts.

The Anglo-American corpus portrays the diversity of roles performed by women in the resistance and makes it clear that there was not one overriding profile of a female resister. These roles provide a contemporary cultural definition of resistance which is wider than those used in the post-Liberation narrative or by the academic community and enables the contribution of women to be better recognised.

There are telling accounts in the corpus of the sacrifices made by mothers in the resistance which have been acknowledged by the academics such as Adler but not in such intimate detail. Much of the resistance activity by women portrayed in the corpus falls outside the
traditional female domestic role and gives female resisters agency outside the private domestic sphere. An example of this is the creation of the false identity cards by Annette and her mother in *The Girl in the Blue Beret*. Nevertheless other female resistance activity, such as the housing and feeding of downed airmen, falls squarely within the domestic role and emphasises that femininity was a strength rather than a weakness. Any assumption that women were exempt from searches because of their gender is rebutted by accounts in the corpus and gives female resisters engaged in the delivery of messages and other clandestine items greater agency by exposing the risks which they faced.

Relationships between female resisters are explored in the corpus outside the masculine framework of academics such as Kedward who concluded that relationships in the resistance were ‘political affinities’. *A Train in Winter*, *The Nightingale* and *Suite Française* are significant in suggesting that there were political and class differences between women but that these could be and were overcome in the overriding interest of survival.

There remains a tendency in the corpus to frame women’s participation in a sexual context but not always exclusively so. In *Charlotte Gray* Faulks positions Charlotte’s resistance activity as driven entirely by her infatuation with Peter. In *The Nightingale* however Isabelle pursues her resistance activity out of patriotism despite being abandoned by Gaëtan. It is also clear however that women portrayed in the corpus achieved a freedom and sexual emancipation which challenged the conservative and patriarchal constraints of Vichy culture. This is exemplified by Anotonia’s pursuit of two men simultaneously in *Little Resistance*.

The conviction that female collaboration was predominantly sexual as established by the treatment of the ‘tondues’ and perpetuated by academics such as Virgili and Moore is not challenged to a significant extent in the corpus. Whilst *The Nightingale* portrays Vianne’s collaboration outside of a sexual context, female collaboration takes a sexual form in *Suite Française* and *For Freedom*; the ‘tondues’ however are surprisingly absent from the corpus.
The corpus therefore is significantly limited by its failure to provide agency to female collaborators outside a sexual framework.

It can be seen therefore that the Anglo-American corpus represents a cultural recognition of the role of women in the French Resistance which is aligned with that proposed by the academic community but in a number of respects goes beyond it. The utility of the corpus lies in its relative isolation from the ‘Vichy Syndrome’ and the period during which it was produced. By the turn of the twenty-first century the rise of feminism in the 1970s had led to societal changes which meant that the public were no longer prepared to accept the exclusion of women from the immediate post-Liberation resistance narrative or even the portrayal by the academic community of the role of women in the resistance as subordinate to that of men. Between 1999 and 2015 there were also celebrations of a number of significant anniversaries in relation to the outbreak and end of World War Two which ensured that the conflict of which the French Resistance and Liberation are part were never far from the public consciousness. It is within this context that the Anglo-American corpus has been analysed in this dissertation and needs to be appreciated.
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