Review of International Studies, Vol. 42, part 4, pp. 597–612. doi:10.1017/S0260210515000595

First published online 11 January 2016

RIS

Rethinking national temporal orders: the subaltern presence and enactment of the political

Tarja Väyrynen*

Professor of Peace and Conflict Research and Director of Tampere Peace Research Institute (TAPRI), University of Tampere

Abstract

How the past is remembered is fundamental to the production and reproduction of postwar sovereign political power. However, Internation Relations' (IR) explicit interest in the practices of remembrance, and particularly in time remains a relatively new one. This article seeks to show how Jacques Rancière's discussion of temporality, subaltern history, and politics – which allows the study of parallel and enmeshing temporal universes – contributes to the IR literature on time. In this view, when speech is acquired by those whose right to speak is not recognised they can produce temporalities that disturb hegemonic representations of time constellations and reorganise the nation's relationship to its past. The article analyses the moment of Kaisu Lehtimäki's telling her war story in public, and understands it to be a material and symbolic event that shatters the hegemonic distribution of the Finnish postwar national history and truth.

Keywords

Temporal Orders; Sovereign Power; Subaltern History; Politics

Introduction

In 2010 Kaisu Lehtimäki made her story public. This was the first time in Finnish history when a woman who had been accused of fraternising with the Nazi soldiers and who had left Finland in the autumn of 1944 with the withdrawing German troops told her story to a large audience. She told her story in a documentary film entitled *Auf Wiedersehen Finnland* by the Finnish filmmaker Virpi Suutari and on the morning TV show as well as giving an interview to a major Finnish newspaper.[1] Her story appeared in many local papers too. In Finland, the recasting of history and public memory of the Second World War has been a political project that continued to the present day and has

* Correspondence to: Tarja Väyrynen, Professor of Peace and Conflict Research and Director of Tampere Peace Research Institute (TAPRI) at the University of Tampere, Finland. Author's email: tarja.vayrynen@uta.fi

[1] Kaisu Lehtimäki in the documentary film by Virpi Suutari, *Auf Wiedersehen Finnland* (Helsinki: ForReal Productions, 2010); Kaisu Lehtimäki in a discussion that followed the release of the documentary, 'Saksalaissotilaiden matkaan lähteneet avaavat kipeitä muistojaan', *Yle aamu-tv* (28 January 2010), available at: {http://yle.fi/uutiset/saksalaissotilaiden_matkaan_lahteneet_avaavat_kipeita_muistojaan/5498851} accessed 12 September 2014; Kaisu Lehtimäki in a major newspaper interview, Anna-Stina Nykänen, 'Saksalaisten matkaan 1944 lähteneet naiset epäröivät yhä puhua', *Helsingin Sanomat* (21 March 2010). Rens van Munster and Casper Sylvest discuss the truth claims documentary films make. In this article I am not interested in the truth claims of Suutari's film as such, but rather in Kaisu's corporeal performance. Rens van Munster and Casper Sylvest, 'Documenting international relations: Documentary film and the creative arrangement of perceptibility', *International Studies Perspective*, 16:3 (2015), pp. 229–45.

aimed at realigning memory with national identity.[2] In the country where the postwar national identity project is characterised by an acute quest for a consensual view of history and 'obsession'[3] with war, Kaisu's appearence broke the long silence that had followed her as well as the collective taboo that had prevented her becoming a part of the national memoryscape.

The context for Kaisu's story is the Second World War and Finland's troubled relations with the Third Reich. More than 200,000 alien military men traversed or were stationed in Finland over the three years when Nazi Germany's occupation of Norway brought to the fore the need to transfer troops and munitions through Sweden and Finland. Diplomatic relations between Finland and the Third Reich had improved in the winter of 1939–40 and an agreement was reached that allowed Germany to set up supply depots along the Arctic truck road. Germany declared war on the Soviet Union in June 1941 and Finland grew closer to Germany. Eventually, Finland became a co-belligerent with Nazi Germany.[4]

When Kaisu's story is read side-by-side with official national history – which denies the Nazi alliance – a cross-cutting and interrelated temporal order emerges, which reveals the selective nature of the writing of the nation's history.[5] Kaisu's account of the past, and unavoidably the present and future too, is examined in this article through contrapuntal reading, which offers 'a simultaneous awareness both of the metropolitan history and of those other histories against which, and together with which, the dominating discourse acts'.[6] I extend my reading of the Finnish nation to a subaltern[7] presence that was once forcibly excluded. My reading of Kaisu's performance recognises both the temporal processes of nationalism and resistance to it, hence its contrapuntal nature. The aim is to reveal the intermeshed, overlapping and mutually embedded histories of the nation and their temporalities. Reading Kaisu's performance using contrapuntal methods allows me to *rethink the temporal dimensions of the nation's identity politics* since the reading makes visible 'a liminal signfying space'[8] that is marked by the heterogenious histories of contending people,

[2] Cf. Ville Kivimäki, 'Between defeat and victory: Finnish memory culture of the Second World War', *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 37:4 (2012), pp. 482–504; Tiina Kinnunen and Ville Kivimäki (eds), *Finland in World War II: History, Memory, Interpretations* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012); Henrik Meinander, 'A separate story? Interpretations of Finland in the Second World War', in Henrik Stenius, Mirja Österberg, and Johan Östling (eds), *Nordic Narratives of the Second World War: National Histographies Revisited* (Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2011), pp. 55–78. The consensual view of history has been advanced also by the national core curriculum. The public school system with its highly homogenised national core curriculum has reinforced a widely shared desire for national consensus regarding its history and a belief in the unifying potential of the Second World War. The materials used for teaching history have been published by the major publishers and have been homogenous in their content. The unifying potential is thought to be particularly important in the country that was divided in the bloody civil war in 1918.

[3] For the relationship between obsession, power, and dominance see Shelly Brivic, *Joyce Through Lacan and Žižek: Explorations* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), pp. 65–76.

[4] Henrik Lunde, *Finland's War of Choice: The Troubled Finnish-German Alliance in World War II* (Havertown, Newbury: Casemate Publishers, 2011); Kivimäki 'Between defeat and victory', pp. 490–1.

[5] I use the term 'history writing' instead of historiography in order to indicate that the consensual view of Finnish history has gone beyond history as an academic discipline.

[6] Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Vintage, 1993), p. 51.

[7] The term 'subaltern' is elaborated in the work of Antonio Gramsci to refer to groups who are outside the established structures of political representation. I am aware of the critique presented, for example, by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak who argues that using the term too loosely is dangerous. For me, the term relates to the Rancièrian understanding of the political, namely, to those who form no part, those who are invisible.

[8] Homi Bhabha, 'DissemiNation: Time, narrative, and the margins of the modern nation', in Homi Bhabha (ed.), *Nation and Narration* (New York: Routledge, 1994), p. 148.

subaltern temporalities and the tense locations of political differences.[9] I seek to show how the rhetorically fixed national identity is gained by manipulating the variety of coexisting temporalities.

Time has been discussed in IR from a variety of perspectives, although IR's explicit interest in time remains a relatively new one. Kimberly Hutsching's *Time and World Politics: Thinking the Present*[10] which examines the assumptions about time embedded in IR theories and their ethicopolitical consequences is a key text. Similarly, Andrew Hom studies how time is constitutive of the international system.[11] Furthermore, time has been discussed in the contexts of, for example, sovereignty,[12] memory,[13] security preparedness,[14] trauma and rupture,[15] change, tranformation, and political violence.[16] In the postcolonial and subaltern studies, on the other hand, there is an abundance of scholarship that explores the variety of temporalities and particularly shows the limits of hegemonic history writing.[17] This article derives inspiration from the postcolonial literature and, at the same time, seeks to contribute to the sudy of the connection between IR, time, and national identity. Its ambition is to show how any national 'now' is always already 'disjointed'[18] and how this disjointedness implies political struggle. It seeks to show how Jacques Rancière's discussion on politics contributes to the IR literature on time. I demonstrate how Kaisu's performance challenges the linearity of the nation's narrative of its progress in ways where 'chronology itself, the sacred cow of historiography'[19] is sacrificed. The nation is considered to be a site of conflicting, or at least plural,

[9] Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, pp. 51–66. For contrapuntal method in IR see Geeta Chowdhry, 'Edward Said and contrapuntal reading: Implications for critical interventions in International Relations', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 36:1 (2007), pp. 101–16; Sankaran Krishna, 'Race, amnesia and the education of International Relations', *Alternatives*, 26:4 (2001), pp. 401–24.

[10] Kimberly Hutchings, *Time and World Politics: Thinking the Present* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008). See also Barry Hindess, 'The past is another culture', *International Political Sociology,* 1:4 (2007), pp. 325–38; William Connolly, *Pluralism* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2005).

[11] Andrew Hom, 'Hegemonic metronome: the ascendancy of Western Standard Time', *Review of International Studies,* 36:1 (2010), pp. 145–70. See also Andrew Hom and Brent Steele, 'Open horizons: the temporal visions of reflexive realism', *International Studies Review*, 12:2 (2010), pp. 271–300.

[12] R. B. J. Walker, *After the Globe, Before the World* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010).

[13] William Callahan, 'War, shame, and time: Pastoral governance and national identity in England and America', *International Studies Quarterly*, 50:2 (2006), pp. 395–419.

[14] Claudia Aradau and Rens van Munster, 'The time/space of preparedness: Anticipating the "next terrorist attack"', *Space and Culture*, 15:2 (2012), pp. 98–109; Marieke de Goede, *Speculative Security: The Politics of Pursuing Terrorist Monies* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2012).

[15] Antoine Bousquet, 'Time zero: Hiroshima, September 11, and apocalyptic revelations in historical consciousness', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 34:3 (2006), pp. 739–64; Maria Ferreira and Pedro Marcelino, 'Politics of trauma times: Of subjectivity, war and humanitarian intervention', *Ethics & Global Politics*, 4:2 (2011), pp. 135–45; Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); David Campbell, 'Time is broken: the return of the past in the response to September 11', *Theory & Event*, 5:4 (2002), pp. 1–9.

[16] Charlotte Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence: Militancy, International Politics, Killing in the Name* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013); Lee Jarvis, *Times of Terror: Discourse, Temporality, and the War on Terror* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

[17] See, for example, Bhabha, 'DissemiNation'; Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Ranjarit Guha, 'The small voices of history', in Shahid Amin and Dipesh Chakrabarty (eds), *Subaltern Studies IX, Writings on South Asian History and Society* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 1–12; Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

[18] Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, p. 108; Connolly, *Pluralism*, pp. 68–92.

[19] Guha, 'The small voices', p. 12.

temporalities marked by class, ethnicity, gender, and race.[20] In the article, Kaisu's temporality and the political event she created are used to demonstrate the importance of the study of hegemonic national time and a variety of alternative temporalities that coincide with it. In order to accomplish this, I will trace Kaisu's temporality in relation to the official national time and its memoryscape. By discussing her temporality, I will also problematise the collective denial that is at the heart of the Finnish nation. Furhermore, it can be shown how Kaisu's narrative brings difference and contestation to the core of the nation whose political imagery is based on consensual history, and, therefore, talking about Kaisu's subaltern history in this context is talking about politics.[21]

I rely in the article, as indicated above, on Rancière's understanding of politics that is characterised by the declassification of spatial orders as a precondition for politics, but I pay more attention to his theorising on the disturbance of temporal orders. From this position, when speech is acquired by those whose right to speak is not recognised they can produce spatiality and temporality that disturbs hegemonic representations of time-space constellations, namely 'who are we?' and 'where are we?'[22] This kind of *politics* in the Rancièrian sense – which differs from *police* – is a matter of knowing who is qualified to bring forth a particular temporality and become visible as 'politics revolves around the properties of spaces and the possibilities of time',[23] whereas *police* constitutes a society where groups of people are dedicated to specific modes of action and places as well as modes of being.[24] Furthermore, I am interested in Kaisu's agency too. It will be demonstrated that just as time has multiple dimensions so has political agency which is capable of producing ruptures as agency emerges from the body, voice and relationality.

War, abject bodies, and consensual national history

Kaisu is an elegant greyhaired slim woman who tells her story in the documentary and on the morning television show with a clear voice. She says that she left Finland with the Nazi forces in 1944 because she was afraid of a Soviet occupation. She did not have an affair with a German soldier, but rather saw the possibility of employment with the withdrawing German troops and, at the same time, escape the Soviet threat. 'I escaped the Russkie' and 'was given the identity of Gretel Laubert for a short while during my escape', she says.[25] Kaisu gives in the documentary and interviews detailed accounts of how she travelled through Norway with the withdrawing German troops to Germany, held a variety of occupations there, and saw the collapse of the Nazi regime and the total destruction of the German cities.

Feminist IR has drawn attention to bodies such as Kaisu's in the literature where the role of women's corporeality in symbolising the nation and its honour is studied, particularly in times

[20] Cf. Bill Marshall, *Quebec National Cinema* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001), p. 9.

[21] Cf. Chakrabarty, *Provincializing* Europe, p. 107.

[22] Jacques Rancière, *Disagreement* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), pp. 99–100; Jacques Rancière, 'A few remarks on the method of Jacques Rancière', *Parallax*, 15:3 (2009), p. 116.

[23] Jacques Rancière, 'Politics and aesthetics: an interview', *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 8:2 (2003), p. 201; Jacques Rancière, *The Politics of Aesthetics* (London: Continuum, 2006), p. 13.

[24] Jacques Rancière, 'Ten theses on politics', *Theory and Event*, 5:3 (2001), thesis 7, available at: {http://www.egs.edu/faculty/jacques-ranciere/articles/ten-thesis-on-politics/} accessed 1 October 2014; Rancière, *Disagreement*, pp. 28–9.

[25] The direct quotations are from the documentary film, although Kaisu repeats their content in her morning TV appearance and newspaper interviews.

of violence and war.[26] The abject figures of, for example, 'comfort women' who have been subjected to nationalistic violence and 'female terrorists and torturers' taking part themselves in violence and war have been also brought to the research agenda of feminist IR.[27] Recently, Christine Sylvester's *War as Experience: Contributions from International Relations and Feminist Analysis*[28] has opened up a new domain for the study of violence and war as a corporeal and a mundane phenomenon. She suggests that war should be studied as an institution whose actual mission is to injure the human body and destroy normal patterns of interaction. Due to the overtly abstract notion of war in IR starting with states, organisations, fundamentalists, security issues and weapons systems, ordinary people and their bodies are overwhelmingly absent in IR and its studies of violence and war, and consequently of postwar peace too.[29] Sylvester's view resonates with Julia Kristeva's quest for research that seeks concrete instances of 'women's time'. This type of research emerges from lived experiences and, thereby, can reveal alternative temporalities not heard in mass media or politics.[30]

Kaisu is certainly an ordinary person and yet she does more than could be expected from the 'ordinary': her performance and temporality disrupt and destabilise, and as such, stand as guarantee for the reconfiguring of the space of the political. Kaisu's speech act as such does not constitute the political contestation. Rather, the contestation comes forth through an ensemble of performance at a moment when there is an 'opening' in the national

[26] Urvashi Butalia, *The Other Side of Silence, Voices from the Partition of India* (New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1998); Jean Bethke Ehlstain, *Women and War* (New York: Basic Books, 1987); Cynthia Enloe, 'Womenandchildren: Making feminist sense of the Persian Gulf War', *The Village Voice* (25 September 1990); Nira Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation* (London: Sage, 1997); Mira Yuval-Davis and Floya Anthias, *Women – Nation – State* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2002); Julie Mostov and Rada Ivekovic (eds), *From Gender to Nation* (New Delhi: Zubaan Books, 2006).

[27] Swati Parashar, 'Women militants as gendered political subjects', in Annica Kronsell and Erica Svedberg (eds), *Making Gender, Making War* (New York: Routledge, 2012), pp. 166–81; Hirofumi Hayashi, 'Disputes in Japan over the Japanese "comfort women" system and its perception in history', *The Annals of the Academy of the American Political and Social Science*, 617:1 (2008), pp. 23–32; Laura Sjoberg and Caron Gentry, *'Mothers, Monsters, Whores: Women's Violence in Global Politics* (London: Zed Books, 2007); Sara Soh, *The Comfort Women: Sexual Violence and Postcolonial Memory in Korea and Japan* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008).

[28] Christine Sylvester, *War as Experience: Contributions from International Relations and Feminist Analysis* (London: Routledge, 2013). See also Christine Sylvester, 'War experiences/war practices/war theory', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 40:3 (2012), pp. 480–503; Cynthia Enloe, *Nimo's War, Emma's War: Making Feminist Sense of the Iraq War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010).

[29] For the corporeal IR see Eeva Puumala, Tarja Väyrynen, Anitta Kynsilehto, and Samu Pehkonen, 'Events of the body politic: A Nancian reading of asylum-seekers' bodily choreographies and resistance', *Body & Society*, 17:4 (2011), pp. 83–104; Eeva Puumala and Samu Pehkonen, 'Corporeal choreographies between politics and the political – failed asylum-seekers moving from body politics to bodyspaces', *International Political Sociology*, 4:1 (2010), pp. 50–65; Tarja Väyrynen, 'Keeping the trauma of war open in the male body – resisting the hegemonic forms of masculinity and Finnish national identity', *Journal of Gender Studies*, 22:2 (2013), pp. 137–51; Tarja Väyrynen, 'Corporeal migration', in Mark B. Salter and Can E. Mutlu (eds), *Research Methods in Critical Security Studies* (Oxon: Routledge, 2013), pp. 169–72; Tarja Väyrynen, 'The Finnish national identity and the sacrificial male body: War, postmemory and resistance', *National Identities* (2015), DOI 10.1080/14608944.2015.1061489.

[30] Women's time refers to female temporality that is devided between cyclical, natural time (for example, repetition, the biological clock) and monumental time (for example, the cult of maternity). They are different from linear national time that is defined by progression and teleology. Julia Kristeva, Alice Jardine, and Harry Blake, 'Women's time', *Signs*, 7:1 (1981), pp. 13–35.

historiography.[31] In short, she exemplifies Sylvester's point on the importance and unexpectedness of the mundane and corporeal in relation to war and to postwar national identity politics as well as Kristeva's notion of alternative temporalities that rupture linear 'normal' time.

To understand the ways Kaisu has symbolically functioned as an abject who has not been 'taken into account'[32] and how her narrative brings an anxiety to the core of the imagined unitary postwar Finnish nation, this article derives from the psychoanalytically oriented IR that examines the nexus between war and collective identity, memory, and history.[33] In this vein of thought, war and violence are seen to be a constitutive and, at the same time, traumatic event in the nation's existence as it reveals the instability of the sovereign subject that was thought to provide security. Jenny Edkins argues that sovereign power cannot provide full security for its members. Instead, it sends individuals to their deaths in the name of the survival of the collective self. It is in this sense, that war and violence constitute a trauma in the nation's existence: they reveal the unstable nature of sovereign power as a security provider. [34] The postwar moment that follows the war and violence is a potential moment of social disintegration, in which the cohesive power of the ideology that has created the nation's identity as the primary security provider loses its efficiency. In Jenny Edkin's words, this is 'trauma time' when nothing is certain and no decision is assured.[35] In a similar vein, Peter Burgess summarises the characteristics of the national subject during this moment by arguing that 'the subject is, … unstable, exposed, threatened and at risk'.[36] Hence, a new master narrative is needed to stabilise the identity of the sovereign power and to make the war and the collective trauma readable for the national subjects.

Postwar memory work is of primary importance when the mastery of the postwar anxiety is created and its collective effects are controlled. Since the nation's identity is rendered extremely truncated, impossible, mutilated, and antagonistic during the war, collective memory work, and particularly history writing, functions as a tool to cement a closure. National history works to secure for a contingent nation the false unity of the national subject evolving through time. According to Prasenjit Duara, 'the subject of History is a metaphysical unity devised to address the aporias in the

[31] Jacques Rancière, 'The thinking of dissensus: Politics and aesthetics', in Paul Bowman and Richard Stamp (eds), *Reading Rancière* (London: Continuum, 2011), pp. 1–17; On resistance, agency, and social transformation see Terry Lovell, 'Resisting with authority: Historical specificity, agency and the performative self', *Theory Culture Society*, 20:1 (2003), pp. 1–17. In Finland, the opening has been brought forth both individual calls for recognition from, for example, the children of foreign soldiers and the new generation of Finnish academic historians who have partly answered to this call.

[32] *Rancière*, 'Ten theses on politics', thesis 4.

[33] Roland Bleiker and Emma Hutchison, 'Fear no more: Emotions and world politics', *Review of International Studies*, 34 (2008), pp. 115–35; Peter Burgess, *The Ethical Subject of Security: Geopolitical Reasons and the Threat against Europe* (London: Routledge, 2011); Jenny Edkins, 'Forget trauma? Responses to September 11', *International Relations*, 16:2 (2002), pp. 243–56; Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*; Jenny Edkins, 'Remembering rationality: Trauma time and politics', in Duncan Bell (ed.), *Memory, Trauma and World Politics* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 99–115; Michael Shapiro, *Violent Cartographies: Mapping Cultures of War* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997); Väyrynen, 'Keeping the trauma'; Väyrynen, 'The Finnish national identity'; Cynthia Weber, *Faking It: American Hegemony in a Post-Phallic Era* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999). For a Freudian account see Richard Schuett, *Political Realism, Freud and Human Nature in International Relations* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

[34] Edkins, 'Remembering rationality', p. 109.

[35] Ibid., pp. 113–15.

[36] Burgess, *The Ethical Subject of Security*, p. 7.

experience of linear time'.[37] Furthermore, as a number of scholars have pointed out, the way in which wars are remembered and war history written is fundamental to the production and reproduction of postwar sovereign political power.[38]

By 2010, when Kaisu told her story, the Finnish nation had largely sedimented a master narrative of its post-Second World War national history and location in world politics.[39] By coincidence, in the same year postwar 'abject history' got some official recognition when the Prime Minister's Office and the National Archives of Finland commissioned a study on the children of foreign soldiers in Finland. It was the first officially initiated attempt to deal with the question of children fathered by foreign soldiers, and consequently the relations between Finnish women and foreign armies. However, Kaisu's public appearance carried more historical weight than the officially commissioned report[40] that was published a year later as her performance exposed her as a living container of residual historical material whose subaltern past made visible the disjuncture with the present view of the national self.

[37] Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), p. 29. See also Eric Hobsbawm, 'Ethnicity and nationalism in Europe today', *Anthropology Today*, 8:1 (1992), pp. 3–8; Jeffrey K. Olick and Joyce Robbins, 'Social memory studies: From "collective memory" to the historical sociology of mnemonic practices', *Annual Review of Sociology,* 24 (1998), pp. 105–40; Pierre Nora, 'Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire', *Representations*, 26:2 (1989), pp. 7–24.

[38] Edkins, 'Remembering rationality', p. 101. See also Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*, p. xv; Michael Shapiro, 'Partition blues', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 27:2 (2002), p. 254. On memory and collective identity see, for example, Duncan Bell, 'Memory, trauma and world politics', in Duncan Bell (ed.), *Memory, Trauma and World Politics* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 1–32; Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). In Finland, historiography has taken part in sedimenting a master narrative of the Second World War. The Finnish newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat* conducted a survey in 2008 among 28 professors of History and the results show that the historians themselves were then open to a variety of interpretations concerning, for example, the Finnish alliance with Nazi Germany. They, however, agreed that the public view of Finnish history has remained one-sided and alternative interpretations often evoke emotional responses. Professor Kirsi-Maria Vainio-Korhonen noted that 'Finnish historiography is foremost about men's history and particularly men's war and combat history' and Professor Juha Siltala suspects that 'if one questions the consensual view of Finnish history approved by the financial, political and administrative elite, one is unlikely to get research funding'. Esa Mäkinen, 'Suomi oli natsi-Saksan liittolainen', *Helsingin Sanomat* (19 October 2008). The newspaper calls also for academic research on the close relation between the Finnish artists and researchers and the Third Reich during the 1930s and 1940s. Veijo Murtomäki, 'Natsisuhteissa olisi penkomista', *Helsingin Sanomat* (12 August 2015).

[39] The narrative states that the postwar years had entailed a careful and cautious balancing act between Soviet influence and the West. The Finnish integration into the EU in 1995 was seen as a 'return to Europe' and to 'European family' of equal, free, and wealthy nations. The EU was seen to be a peace project in which Finland could easily find its place, and even take a leading role, for example in civilian crises management initiatives.

[40] Lars Westerlund (ed.), *Saksalaisten ja neuvostosotilaiden lapset* (Helsinki: Nord Print, 2011). See similar studies on other countries: Helle Aarnes, *Tyskertjentene: Historiene vi aldri ble foralt* (Oslo: Gyldendal, 2009); Kjersti Ericsson and Eva Simonsen, *Children of World War II: The Hidden Enemy Legacy* (Oxford, New York: Berg, 2005); Roberta Gildea, Anette Warring, and Olivier Wieveorka, *Surviving Hitler: Daily Life in Occupied Europe* (Oxford, New York: Berg Publishers, 2006); Birthe Kundrus, 'Forbidden company: Romantic relationships between Germans and foreigners, 1939 to 1945', in Dagmar Herzog (ed.), *Sexuality and German Fascism* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2005), pp. 201–22; Clemens Maier, *Making Memories: The Politics of Remembrance in Postwar Norway and Denmark* (Florence: European University Institute, 2007); Fabrice Virgili, *Shorn Women: Gender and Punishment in Liberation France* (Oxford, New York: Berg Publishers, 2002).

National memoryscape

Since the official relations between Finland and Germany were friendly and benign, the state apparatus did not instruct the Finns not to fraternise with the Germans. Many Finns benefitted from the presence of the German army: they undertook small-scale commerce and exchanged goods and services. There were also jobs available, for example, for professional translators and secretaries in the German military establishment.[41]

Despite the initially collaborative relations, the women who fraternised with the Germans were later positioned as outcasts who deserved to be erased from the memoryscape of the postwar nation. Kaisu and the other women who were accused of fraternising with the Germans came to represent for the nation 'shadows of other presences and pasts'[42] whose existence could not be reconciled with the postwar national identity narrative. The nation forgot the existence of the women: postwar collective memory work and its sedimentation, national history writing, produced closure of the identity narrative that sealed the women off from the memoryscape of the nation. Forgetting is indeed an integral element of memory work and national history writing. According to Larry Ray, 'the nation is a mnemonic community whose *raison d'être* derives from both remembering and forgetting, especially where the past poses a threat to the unity of the nation'.[43] In other word, the nation 'forgets to remember'.[44] In short, creating a symbolic grammar for war and violence and writing postwar history is as much about forgetting as it is about remembering.[45] National history is the outcome of a highly selective process where the memories of extreme trauma of war and violence are not remembered as such but rather selected to be remembered to only a limited extent and in a controlled manner as well as emplotted in such a way that they respond to certain expectations of genre and structure. Some events come coded as historically 'real', and they form a foundation for the master narrative of the nation. They are argued to be uncontradictorily remembered, documented, or reconstructed and, thereby, they are given a privileged place in a linearily and chronologically ordered sequence of significations.[46]

What is typical of national history writing is that it produces causal and linear temporality where events are sequentially ordered. The time of the nation is progressive in the sense that the nation is

[41] Anu Heiskanen, '"Sitä taas eletään tätä päivää": Nuoren naisen elämä ja valinnat Kolmannen valtakunnan vaikutuspiirissä ja miehitetyssä Saksassa', in Tiina Kinnunen and Ville Kivimäki (eds), *Ihminen Sodassa* (Helsinki: Minerva, 2006), pp. 261–74; Marianne Junila, *Kotirintaman aseveljeyttä* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2000); Ville Kontinen, 'Lemmestä, pelosta ja pakostakin: Suomalaisten motiivit saksalaisjoukkojen mukaan lähtemiselle syksyllä 1944', in Lars Westerlund (ed.), *Saksalaisten ja neuvostosotilaiden lapset* (Helsinki: Nord Print, 2011), pp. 159–79; Kari Virolainen, *Elinikäinen taakka* (Rovaniemi: Lapin yliopisto, 1999).

[42] Gyanendra Pandey, *Routine Violence, Nations, Fragments, Histories* (Standford: Standford University Press, 2006), p. 60. See also Butalia, *The Other Side of Silence*, pp. 350–2; Guha, 'Small voices', pp. 1–12.

[43] Larry Ray, 'Mourning, melancholia and violence', in Duncan Bell (ed.), *Memory, Trauma and World Politics* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 138.

[44] Bhabha, 'DissemiNation', p. 311.

[45] On national memory and forgetting from the perspective of International Relations see Roland Bleiker and Jung-ju Hoang, 'Rembering and forgetting the Korean War: From trauma to reconciliation', in Duncan Bell (ed.), *Memory, Trauma and World Politics: Reflections of the Relationship between Part and Present* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 195–212; Maja Zehfuss, *Wounds of Memory: The Politics of War in Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[46] David Campbell, *National Deconstruction, Violence, Identity and Justice in Bosnia* (Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1998), pp. 33–43; Ian Klinke, 'Choronopolitics: a conceptual matrix', *Progress in Human Geography*, 37:5 (2013), pp. 678–9.

seen to be a solid community which moves along the line of history in a teleological and linear manner. This linear temporality, *Chronos*, the measurement of time, seeks to produce a coherent and causal origin and a straightforward historical path of development for the nation.[47] In the linear temporal structure there is no scope for a bifurcation of the path, which the narrative takes through time because a bifurcation would threaten the already established ending, namely, the current state of the national order. The timeframe suggests coherence with time and equates the past with the present. In the linear temporality, war and violence are seen to have a first cause and this cause can be unambiguously traced back to a singular past.[48]

In Finland, the master narrative of national history hails into being a small and impartial country that fought alone in the Second World War against its mighty enemy, namely the Soviet-Union. From the late 1940s onwards, history writing sedimented a view where Finland had drifted towards its collaborative relations with the Nazi regime: Finland did not actively seek the collaboration nor did it form a coalition with the regime. The nation had no alternative other than cooperation with Germany. This 'driftwood theory' was soon replaced by a modified version where Finland appears to be a rational actor whose drifting represented a set of carefully selected moves where the country deliberated the options available to it and chose to appear as drifting. In addition to this, according to the hegemonic narrative Finland's war against the Soviet Union was a 'separate war' where Finland held a unique position in world politics. The nation's war against the Soviet Union and its alliance with Germany were specific events in the Second World War, not a part of the general warfare and the war's alliance structure.[49]

In 2005, President Tarja Halonen summarised the dominant view of Finnish history that is at the core of Finnish foreign policy doctrine and which has guided, for example, the history curriculum used in schools. In her speech at the French Institute of International Relation before an international audience she states:

> To begin with, let me say a few words about how Finland has reached its present position in Europe, since this still influences our perspective today. European integration has been the answer to the experiences of the Second World War. The Finnish approach to integration must also be seen against the background of events that took place over six decades ago. In late summer 1939 Germany and the Soviet Union agreed on a division of Europe into spheres of influence. The following winter Finland had to fight off an attack by the Red Army in order to preserve her independence and avoid being occupied by the Soviet Union. We had to do this alone, without significant outside help. Five years later, in the summer of 1944, we again managed to stop the Red Army's attempts to conquer Finland. Our country was not occupied at any stage, during or after the war. We lost part of our territory, but we achieved a defensive victory. We held on to our independence as well as our democratic political system and our economic system.[50]

[47] Gilles Deleuze, *Logic of Sense* (London: Continuum, 2004), p. 89.

[48] On national time see Bhabha, 'DissemiNation'; Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1993), pp. 24–6; Duara, *Rescuing History*; James Boyarin, 'Space, time, and the politics of memory', in James Boyarin and Charles Tilly (eds), *Remapping Memory, The Politics of TimeSpace* (Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1995), pp. 1–32; Guha, 'The small voices'; Kristeva, 'Women's time', pp. 16–19; David Martin-Jones, *Deleuze, Cinema and the National Identity: Narrative Time in National Context* (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 2008), pp. 19–39.

[49] D. G. Kirby, *Finland in the Twentieth Century: A History and an Interpretation* (London: C. Hurst & Co. Publishers, 1979); Lunde, *Finland's War*; Kivimäki, 'Between defeat and victory', p. 483.

[50] Tarja Halonen, 'Speech by President of the Republic Tarja Halonen at the French Institute of International Relations' Paris, IFRI (1 March 2005), available at: {http://www.eilen.fi/fi/1451/?language=en} accessed 1 October 2014.

At the centre of the narrative there is a tiny nation who is at the mercy of the forces of world politics and whose survival is dependent on its capacity to take evasive action. In the narrative, Finland is a solid national subject that moves along the line of history in a teleological and linear manner from the Second World War to the present day's European integration. The swerving moves are purposefully planned and their sequential order can be traced back to the prime mover. In other words, the cause of the nation entering the war can be unambiguously detected. The nation's past makes its present possible as the nation has moved intentionally towards the present moment. The nation would not be where it is now without its singular past and history. In the case of Finland, the narrative sees the war and the postwar reparations paid to the Soviet Union as a necessary sacrifice on the nation's path to becoming one of the wealthiest nations in the world.

This view brings into being 'national normal time' where causality and the first cause prevail. In it, time is a succession of infinite 'nows' which provide the nation with a sense of continuity. National normal time coincides with a particular spatial structure, namely territorialisation where the nation is imagined as a territorial entity with clear boundaries as 'collective identities are produced as much through temporal boundaries as they are through spatial ones'.[51] Within the timeframe and its bounded spatiality, it is possible to maintain one hegemonic view of national history and a seemingly coherent identity narrative that relieves the anxiety of postwar temporal flux. In summary, in the teleological time of national history, the nation is a pregiven entity, subject, which experiences the war. The entity is territorial and its 'past appears to evolve logically in only one way, creating one true past'[52] which, in turn, ensures the notion of one true national identity. Complex transactions between the past and present are reduced to a single teleological path. One past is privileged and other pasts excluded in this 'either/or temporality', which denies the existence of other possible timeframes.

However, the favouring of one past that is claimed to be true is not without its fissures, as there is a constant pull towards heterogeneous histories that threaten to bring difference and contestation to the core of the nation. A nation's memory must be constantly reworked to substantiate the linear national past and the hegemonic historical identity narrative. By rejecting the heterogeneous histories, the linear national normal time keeps the residual historical material at bay. In Finland, the sanitised narrative has allowed the nation to keep its distance from the crimes of the Nazi regime. Residual material indicating Finland's alliance with the Nazi regime would have threatened the unitary postwar national self and the closure of its identity narrative. Ultimately, the normalised Finnish national history writing hides the continuous process of nationbuilding and the possible antagonisms that characterise any nation.

Corporeal mnemonics

Kaisu reminisces in the documentary how 'most of the Finns thought that the conditions in Germany would be better, but to our surprise, that was not the case'. She remembers how: 'Hitler proclaimed that the Finnish girls can be treated as sisters-in-arms and can enter Germany.' She spent several months in Germany and during the last months of the war in 1945 she was transferred to a transit camp from where she escaped back to Finland. In Finland, she was incarcerated in a detention centre administered by the Finnish security police. She was interrogated there several times. Her voice fails

[51] Klinke, 'Choronopolitics', p. 675.
[52] Martin-Jones, *Deleuze*, p. 29.

three times in the documentary film: when she apologies for the hardship she has caused her family, when she remembers the suffering of the Jewish population, and when she tells about her humiliation at the detention centre.

There are loops and tangles in Kaisu's story. Furthermore, subtle bodily gestures and movements as well as changes in her voice indicate her ambiguous relation to the Finnish national identity narrative and its closures. Narrative loops and tangles indicate that her temporality does not coincide with the linear national temporality and the selective and constrained memoryscape allowed by it. 'Do excuse me the suffering I have caused to you, but there was nothing else I could have done' reads Kaisu from a letter she has written to her relatives on the 15 September 1944 where she explains her reason for leaving with the withdrawing German army. When Kaisu reads a letter in the documentary that she wrote almost seventy years ago, her time slows down and, as Henri Bergson writes about pure duration, her time 'refrains from separating its present from its former states'.[53] Time loses its measurable and linear qualities when the multiple layers of possible pasts actualise in the act of reading the letter. Her reading of it consists of the memory of the event of writing the letter which, on the other hand, contains other memories that can be interpreted from her corporeal components as her body re-enacts the moment of writing, her mother's reading of the letter, and the mother's reaction to it. The reading of the letter in the present moment blurs the distinction between the past and the present moment as it brings the past to the present where they form an organic whole.[54] Her temporality is incomplete and continuously growing as there is no beginning nor ending to it.

Henri Bergson's notion of time as a whole, *durée*, captures Kaisu's temporality. Time is not, in the Bergsonian view, a linear and causal line where past precedes present and is succeeded by future, but a 'surface' where past and present exist symbiotically together and are in a constant process of becoming. Moreover, duration disturbs the linear and causal timeframe by setting the temporalities in direct confrontation where the future does not follow the present and past. When Kaisu acknowledges her past in the present, the fusion of the past, present, and future follows the acknowledgement. The past is not based simply on Kaisu's direct experience, but it is a mosaic of what she knew firsthand, what she was told, what she imagined, and what happened around her as part of a historical process that she shared with millions of other people. Many pasts exist in parallel and some of them have been previously wiped out due to their disturbing qualities. In this temporality, the memory of the past can make the past out as not necessarily true, or the past can be misrecognised, as the past and present exist on the same 'surface', not in linearity, but repeatedly in flux, flowing from one to another.[55]

Kaisu remembers the suffering of the Jewish population too. She describes in detail how the Jews were contained in small underground bunkers and how their bodies were malformed due to that. 'I and some other Finnish girls encountered a Jewish woman who wore a yellow patch with the Jewish star. Her eyes were full of anguish and they were begging us to notice that she was indeed wearing the patch.' She wonders what kind of suffering has caused such timidity in a fellow human

[53] Henri Bergson, *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*, trans. F. L. Pogson (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1910), p. 100.
[54] Ibid., p. 100.
[55] For the Bergsonian view see Henri Bergson, *Matter and Memory* (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. Ltd, 1911); Bergson, *Time and Free Will*; Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 2: The Time Image* (London: Continuum, 2005); Kimberly Hutchings, 'What is orientation in thinking? On the question of time and timeliness in cosmopolitical thought', *Constellations*, 18:2 (2011), pp. 190–204; Hutchings, *Time and World Politics*.

being. Her voice becomes low and husky when she reminisces the suffering of the others. Her own hardship in war-torn and ravaged Germany seems to have only minor importance compared to the suffering of the Jewish population. When Kaisu mourns the suffering of the others, a splitting of the subject as well as temporality takes place. She is not Kaisu located here and now, but young Kaisu who glimpsed into the void of human existence. She loses her notion of herself as an autonomous subject and in control. As Judith Butler describes the event of mourning the other:

> What grief displays is the thrall in which our relations with others holds us, in ways that we cannot always recount or explain, in ways that often interrupt the self-conscious account of ourselves we might try to provide, in ways that challenge the very notion of ourselves as autonomous and in control. I might try to tell a story here, about what I am feeling, but it would have to be a story in which the very 'I' who seeks to tell the story is stopped in the midst of the telling; the very 'I' is called into question by its relation to the Other, a relation that does not precisely reduce me to speechlessness, but does nevertheless clutter my speech with signs of its undoing. I tell a story about the relations I choose, only to expose, somewhere along the way, the way I am gripped and undone by these very relations. My narrative falters, as it must.[56]

When the autonomous 'I' rambles, the chronological timeframe loses its grip. In this splitting, the 'subject is at once both inside and outside, self and other, virtual actual, recollection and perception and, indeed, past and present'.[57] Kaisu's temporality is without a centre and it is expanding as is enlarges outwards towards the suffering of the others. Her temporality becomes a series of infinitely bifurcating pathways. Kaisu herself becomes a discontinuous entity who simultaneously exists in multiple temporalities. Here her time moves backwards in a nonlinear way to uncover the other pasts and the pasts of the others.

In one of the most affective scenes of the documentary, Kaisu sits on the stairs of a grey wooden hut where she was incarcerated by the security police on her arrival back in Finland. She smokes a cigarette with a firm hand, but the viewer can see how her overtly upright body holds the memories of the past where the representatives of the Finnish nation interviewed her several times in the most humiliating ways. 'Hautojärvi – that was his name – took me three times to special interregations where no notes were taken, and I can tell you, he was a brute', says Kaisu and continues that 'however, in front of Hautojärvi I did not cry!'. That particular layer of the past and its temporality is mainly beyond language and it is incorporated into her body in the form of pain and grief. For Kaisu, 'what is "remembered" in the body is well remembered',[58] as Elaine Scarry argues when she dicusses torture. The codified national memory skates along the flat surface of the past, whereas the past that is remembered in the body penetrates the deepest layers of human existence as Kaisu's presence indicates. Kaisu's body has indeed been inscribed by a variety of disciplinary practices as it has been located into the national order of things. The sovereign power has named her, medicalised her body, and subjected her to the mechanisms of surveillance.[59] Chronological national time has, therefore,

[56] Judith Butler, *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (London: Verso, 2004), p. 23.
[57] Martin-Jones, *Deleuze*, p. 30.
[58] Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 209.
[59] Anu Heiskanen, 'Kolmanteen valtakuntaan 1944 lähteneiden naisten kokemuksia äitiydestä ja selviytymisestä', in Lars Westerlund (ed.), *Saksalaisten ja neuvostosotilaiden lapset* (Helsinki: Nord Print, 2011), pp. 184–98; Junila, *Kotirintaman aseveljeyttä*; Kontinen, 'Lemmestä, pelosta ja pakostakin', pp. 159–79; Tarja Väyrynen, 'Muted national memory: When the "Hitler's Brides" speak the truth', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 16:2 (2014), pp. 218–35.

taken hold of her body. Yet, Kaisu's temporality writes itself out of normalised national time. The body is transformed by processes and does not only represent those processes, but experiences them as the lived memory constantly in flux and in the process of becoming. [60] The time of Kaisu's body is in this sense immeasurable. As Christian Haine writes with reference to Deleuze, this type of 'body time' is 'finite in that it manifests itself in particular modes of activity, but infinite in that it operates through a process of relation that is open, composing itself through contingent, inventive combinations'.[61]

Enacting the political

Why are Kaisu and her subaltern temporality important? Kaisu is constituted outside and she is unaccounted for in the symbolic order of the nation. This outside, however, opens up the possibility, if not the necessity, for the enactment of the political as it composes itself through contingent, inventive, and interruptive combinations. Kaisu is important because her corporeal presence and her temporality resist symbolisation and as such they become stubborn remainders of the residual historical material that escape the linear and teleological timeframe of the nation. This remainder that cannot be symbolised by the existing interplay of political forces disrupts and destabilises and, thereby, restages the exclusion at the core of the Finnish nation in the ways Jacques Rancière sees it to constitute an 'enactment of the political'. Politics in this view is a particular type of event that emerges with respect to the police orders.[62]

Politics in Kaisu's case is signalled by the enmeshing of the temporalities that create a moment of interruption, a moment where her temporal presence disturbs the national order of things. In Kaisu's case, it is not just her speaking and the content of what she says, but also her (corporeal) temporality that disturbs the singular form of the national truth by introducing the political potential embedded

[60] On corporeal memory see Gay Becker, Yewoubdar Beyene, and Pauline Ken, 'Memory, trauma, and embodied distress: the management of disruption in the stories of Cambodians in exile', *Ethos*, 28:3 (2000), pp. 320–45; Roberta Culbertson, 'Embodied memory, transcendence, and telling: Recounting trauma, re-establishing the self', *New Literary History*, 26 (1995), pp. 169–95; Connerton, *How societies remember*; Veena Das, 'Language and body: Transactions in the construction of pain', in Arthur Kleinman, Veena Das, and Margaret Lock (eds), *Social Suffering* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 67–92; Parin Dossa, 'The body remembers: a migratory tale of social suffering and witnessing', *International Journal of Mental Health*, 3:3 (2003), pp. 50–73; Arthur Kleinman and Joan Kleinman, 'How bodies remember: Social memory and bodily experience of criticism, resistance, and delegitimation following China's cultural revolution', *New Literary History*, 24 (1994), pp. 716–17; Janice McLane, 'The voice on the skin: Self mutilation and Merleau Ponty's theory of language', *Hypatia*, 11:4 (1996), pp. 107–18; Paul Stoller, 'Embodying colonial memories', *American Anthropologist*, 96:3 (1994), pp. 638–9; Lyn Spillman and Brian Conway, 'Texts, bodies, and the memory of Bloody Sunday', *Symbolic Interaction*, 30:1 (2007), pp. 79–103.

[61] Haines quote refers to a larger Deleuzian view of the 'capitalist body' and 'communist body' and their temporalities. She writes that 'capitalist corporeality separates communist corporeality from itself, by translating the infinite and common into the equivalent and privative; it transforms time into a ticking of the clock. Communist corporeality, on the other hand, takes the form of a process distributing and redistributing the surplus of potentiality in a construction of the common, a field of equality and a domain of wealth that refuses equivalence; time becomes the very power of activity.' Christian Haines, 'Corporeal time: the cinematic bodies of Arhur Rimbaud and Gilles Deleuze', *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 16:2 (2011), p. 116. In my view, nationalism takes hold of the human body in a similar fashion as capitalism and produces disciplined corporeality and a linear timeframe whereas Kaisu's performance brings into being corporeality that breaks the national(istic) order of things.

[62] Rancière, 'Thinking of dissensus', pp. 1–17; Rancière, *Disagreement*, p. 32.

in multiple parallel temporal universes. She offers an alternative history without it being specifically given as correct. The fusing of the national 'true' past with her past causes the resurgence of difference and contestation that destabilises the already established national, teleologically determined, ending. A discontinuity emerges between the nation's present status and its myth of being a singular unitary subject. To paraphrase Homi Bhabha, Kaisu's presence and temporality reveal the insurmountable ambivalence that structures the equivocal movement of national linear time.[63] Her *durée* provides the potential for the national hegemonic past to be made out as not necessarily true, and it is this that creates memory capable of activating a new future.[64]

The moment of Kaisu telling her story in public can be understood as material and a symbolic time-place event that shatters the hegemonic distribution of the Finnish postwar national history and truth. Her presence enacts the wrong and exposes the ruptures that cut through the national body politic. It can be seen to force the nation to 'stutter' in its articulation when faced with this kind of subaltern speech and its destabilising power.[65] Kaisu's discontinuous temporality brings forth the other pasts and presences as well as renders visible the continuous reimagining and reproduction required for the imagined unitary national identity. Her temporality shifts political judgment and action from sedimented criteria to unfamiliar contexts where the criteria for history and national identity must be negotiated anew. It introduces political dissensus that is not a discussion between speaking people who would confront their interests and values or who disagree with the presence of a common object, but rather it concerns the very capacity to the interlocutors to present the object.[66] In Kaisu's case, the dissensus is about national history, its temporal orders, and national identity. Kaisu hence embodies the political where the political involves a conflict about who speaks and who does not speak, about what has to be heard as the voice of pain and what has to be heard as an argument on justice.

As Rancière notes, political struggle is not a conflict between well-defined interest groups; it is an opposition of logics that count the parties and parts of the community in different ways.[67] He writes:

> The essence of politics, then, is to disturb this arrangement by supplementing it with a part of the no-part identified with the community as a whole. Political litigiousness/struggle is that which brings politics into being by separating it from the police that is, in turn, always attempting its disappearance either by crudely denying it, or by subsuming that logic to its own. Politics is first and foremost an intervention upon the visible and the sayable.[68]

It is in this sense that Kaisu introduces political struggle to the core of the nation. She does not rupture the power positions, but rather challenges the classifications of those worthy of inclusion and those excluded as well as bringing forth a space for the appearance of a subaltern subject.[69] She enables herself and her kind to be seen and heard as speaking subjects and engages in a radical political practice that displaces the limits of social exclusions. Political struggle in this sense is not a rational debate between multiple interests, as noted earlier, but the struggle for one's voice to be recognised as the voice of a legitimate partner.

[63] Bhabha, 'DissemiNation', p. 308.
[64] Cf. Haines, 'Corporeal time', p. 103.
[65] Guha, 'The small voices', p. 12.
[66] Cf. Rancière, 'Thinking of dissensus', p. 2; Jacques Rancière, *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).
[67] Rancière, 'Ten theses', thesis 6.
[68] Rancière, 'Ten theses', thesis 7.
[69] Cf. Rancière, 'A few remarks on the method', p. 116.

Had Kaisu chosen not to expose her temporality, she would have remained invisible. Through enacting the wrong that is located at the core of the nation, she becomes visible. Kaisu's appearance in the documentary and in interviews creates a moment of eruption that makes visible the violence that characterises the nation and its consensual history. The performance simultaneously stages equality and exposes the violent practice of a linear temporal national order, despite the latter's constitutional presentation as the foundation for the unitary national subject. It is a moment when a particular political-temporal condition becomes the stand-in for a generalised nationalistic practice and, in doing so, reaches beyond its particular location and politicises the exclusion that was thought to produce closure in the nation's identity narrative. Erik Swyngedouw notes that 'the emergence of politicization is always specific, concrete, particular, but stands as the metaphorical condensation of the universal'.[70] A political sequence unfolds through the universalisation of such concrete time and space moments that are condensations of the universal political conditions. In exposing the wrong she suffered, Kaisu also presents herself as the immediate embodiment of society as such, as the stand-in for the nation in its assumed coherence.[71]

Conclusion

I have suggested in this article that subaltern corporeal presences, such as Kaisu's, can become the revealer of a nation's temporal orders as subaltern pasts allow it to make visible the disjuncture of the present with itself. Furthermore, subaltern presences are characterised by a surplus of temporal potentiality that can reorganise the nation's relationship to its past. The nation and its hegemonic history writing does not always want to recognise these abjected presences and their alternative temporalities as acknowledging them would introduce a bifurcation into the causal path of the linear and teleological national time. Their disruptive potential lies in the enactment of the political through the temporal disruption, namely in their capacity to evoke the question who belongs to the political community and who is cast out.

In Kaisu's case, the abject had been able to 'speak'[72] about the other pasts, but the nation has not wanted to hear what the abject wanted to say. From the perspective of IR, her case demonstrated that the universalising procedures of consensus history are infiltrated by fragmenting forces that disrupt the seemingly unanimous national order of things. In more general terms, her appearance in the form of an ensemble of corporeal performances in the documentary and interviews made her visible and produced agency that allowed her to make enunciations and demonstrations about the common, about who belongs to the common. She created a time-space event where politics appeared out of place, that is, in a place that was not supposed to be political. Ultimately, her presence signals the empty ground of the nation, the inherently split condition of a nation's existence that prevents the subaltern presence entering into its teleologically constituted temporal order.

In addition to showing the empty ground of the nation and arguing for the 'temporal polymorphism'[73] in the study of International Relations, I have demonstrated in this article the importance of linear normal time in the production and reproduction of postwar sovereign political power.

[70] Erik Swyngedouw, 'Interrogating post-democratization: Reclaiming egalitarian political spaces', *Political Geography*, 30:7 (2011), p. 376.
[71] Swyngedouw, 'Interrogating post-democratization', p. 370.
[72] Cf. Judith Butler and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Who Sings the Nation-State? Language, Politics, Belonging* (New York: Seagull Books, 2007).
[73] Cf. Klinke, *Chronopolitics*, p. 681.

By offering a Rancièrian understanding of the subaltern history and temporality, it has become possible to enrich the IR literature on time. Rancière has enabled me to show how the plurality of different articulation of time brings forth the multiplicity of the forms of interruptions and dissensus. In this connection, I have elaborated the usefulness of the contrapuntal method for IR as the method provides a means to listen and bring forth subaltern temporalities that the grand narratives of nationalism help to silence. It is in this sense I have contributed to the research agenda suggested by Christine Sylvester too: instead of directing the researcher's gaze towards abstract systems, organisations, and ideologies, I have studied concrete instances of temporal eruptions that arise from the 'ordinary', the 'particular', and the 'corporeal', and yet stand for the universal.

Acknowledgments

For their useful comments on previous drafts of this article, I would like to thank my research group Anitta Kynsilehto, Samu Pehkonen, Eeva Puumala, and Tiina Vaittinen and our extended research seminar on corporeality, movement, and politics (COMPORE) as well as three anonymous reviewers of *Review of International Studies*.

Biographical information

Tarja Väyrynen is Professor of Peace and Conflict Research and Director of Tampere Peace Research Institute (TAPRI) at the University of Tampere, Finland. She has published widely on gender and peacebuilding, postwar memory politics, and resistance in journals including *National Identities, International Feminist Journal of Politics,* and *Body & Society*. Her next book (co-authored with her research group) explores mundane sites of resistance and politics.