

Sofía Casanova y la narración de la Revolución Soviética en *ABC*

Pedro OCHOA CRESPO
Investigador
pedro.ochoa@openmailbox.org

Recibido: 12 de mayo de 2016
Aceptado: 10 de agosto de 2016

Resumen

El objetivo de este artículo es el de mostrar como el desigual empoderamiento político de las mujeres durante la Primera Guerra Mundial, se mostró de una manera particular en Sofía Casanova debido a sus condicionantes biográficos y su contexto familiar. Su ideología conservadora y lo que Gisela Bock denominó como maternalismo social relacionada con la práctica católica, delimitaron en gran medida sus discursos en torno a la potencialidad política de sus actos, tanto en su labor como periodista como en su vida cotidiana en la época revolucionaria.

Palabras clave: Periodismo; Primera Guerra Mundial; Feminismo; Espacio público; Revolución Bolchevique.

Sofía Casanova and the narration of the Soviet Revolution in *ABC*

Abstract

The aim of this article is to show how was the unequal political empowerment of women during the First World War. Thus, it was expressed in a particular way in Sofía Casanova because her biographical and familiar context. The Casanova's conservative ideology and Gisela Bock's concept of social-motherhood related to Catholic practice, largely delineated her discourses about the limited political potential of her historical activity, both in her work as a journalist and in her daily life in the revolutionary era.

Keywords: Journalism; Great War; Feminism; Public Sphere; Bolshevik Revolution.

Referencia normalizada

Ochoa Crespo, P. (2016). Sofía Casanova y la narración de la Revolución Soviética en *ABC*. *Historia y Comunicación Social*. Vol 21, número 2, páginas 463-476.

Sumario: 1. Introduction. 2. Sofía Casanova as an historiographical and analytical challenge during Great War. 3. 1917-1918: Political derivations of the historical activities of Sofía Casanova during the Bolshevik Revolution and her narration of the events in the newspaper «ABC». 4. Conclusions. 5. Bibliographic references.

1. Introduction

Every investigation in human and social sciences – actually as is the case in every discipline or know-how – entails a question and a motivation upon which it stands. The historiography debate on the impact of the Great War on social relationships, is materialized in gender history in many ways – a major factor that will appear many times in this work – having thus given way to debates that generally converge in seeing the conflict as a censorship between two worlds, two very different forms of social and political organization. This way of thinking was shared by many until a few decades ago.

Currently, the debate on the change model is dissolving and becoming more complex, shedding more light upon the processes that traverse the war and that are rooted in times prior to 1914, while at the same time looking at those that last through until the November 1918 armistice. Currently, the aim usually centres on the irregularity of changes and the resistances towards these, which were conditioned by an accumulation of possibilities that came about during the long war; all of this without losing sight of the complexity of changes within the gender system that stretch out before the murder of archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo. Inserted within this type of approach, the investigation I present is guided by the combination of two elements: the historic construction of public space, and the special conditions created between 1914 and 1918 regarding the existing gender system. In the intersection between both issues arise the questions or hypotheses that shape this doctoral thesis. If we understand that gender, “as something real is not only the effect of representation, but also its excess, that which remains outside of discourse, potential trauma that can destabilise, if not contained, any representation (Lauretis, 2001: 46)”. A question arise: considering gender relationships during World War I, taking historic circumstances and processes in which they participate and/or needs as a conditioning event, how is public and private space represented? For further deepening of the question we should understand private space as a form of representation that mediates in discourse and in practice of political and social order within societies directly or indirectly affected. Can we observe these representations through variations and changes? In doing so can we make out forms of political enabling for subjects – women in this case – that have been previously expelled from the norm according to majority rules on how the public sphere must be represented?

The approach to the question using these terms, does not aim to obtain a closed and decisive answer, instead it aspires to build a tool that can shed light upon the form in which, through western history, political and social subordination have come to exist. It also wishes to learn about resistances against such subordination and understand the derived tensions created by the contradictions of a majority rule: to understand the actual resistances and, obviously, reactions of power towards these resistances. These questions can be answered by studying the identity and configuration of how subjects are represented and represent themselves (Beebe, Davis, Gleadle, 2012: 527).

Choosing for this exercise the Spanish journalist and writer Sofia Casanova (1861-1958) accommodates well to the methodological pretence that guides me, considering that Sofia Casanova is a woman that actively partakes in public life prior and during the Great War. This circumstance favours the analysis of the aforementioned questions concerning the singular nature of the war. In Sofia Casanova's figure and from it (writer, poet, journalist, catholic, mother, grandmother, wife, Galician... and an endless list of categories that by themselves would never explain her biography), I believe it is possible to recreate both the contradictions inherent to identity creation, as well as articulating the links between the individual and the collective.

The development of the theoretical research applied to the biographic narrative of Sofia Casanova's life, has followed guidelines determined by available documentation. In this sense, Rosario Martínez Martínez's help, the biggest expert on the character, has been a key factor in organising sources. It must be said immediately, in order to better understand the way in which I have undertaken the creation of this biography, that there are very few Sofia Casanova documents not originally intended for publishing, that have survived till present day. It is in the A Coruña Archivo Municipal, where the majority may be found, albeit they are merely a series of letters relating to an epistolary relationship between herself and the Bugallal family (specially with Pilar Marchesi). To those scarce 20 letters we can add a few correspondences between Sofía Casanova and the following: Blanca de los Rios, Miguel de Unamuno, Antonio Maura, and Marcelino Menendez Pelayo. A total of 30 short letters. However, we have the addition of her literary texts as well as her publishings in Torcuato Luca de Tena's newspaper *ABC*.

2. Sofia Casanova as an Historiographical and Analytical Challenge During Great War

Sofia Casanova married the Polish philosopher Wicenty Lutoslawski in 1887, a decision which led the Spanish poetess to live in Poland, a country which in those days belonged to the Russian Empire. Although Casanova, born in 1861, is not unknown to the Spanish, European or even American historians, she has never been made the protagonist of any historiographical representation of the period she lived (Hooper, 2008; Alayeto, 1992; Martínez Martínez, 1999; Antón M. Pazos, 2010). The last sentence appears to bring about the forgetfulness of Sofía Casanova's active presence in history, which is in turn the reason why the thought of the social anthropologist Ignasi Terradas regarding the necessity to be mindful of those historical events that overshadow the lives of all individuals, emerges as the right paradigm to face the study of the individual in history (Terradas, 1992: 13). Biography must be a method that focuses on the comprehension of the links between the social and the individual, a method that faces a number of recurrent problems related to its cultural and historical nature, as well as to the collection of materials and documents or to the building of a framework in which the historic actions of totalized and objectivized individuals

may be represented (Davis, 2005: 34; Bourdieu, 1997: 77). My goal is to shed light over the irregular and unequal processes of female empowerment before, during and after the Bolshevik Revolution, through the study of Sofia Casanova's writings.

I will focus on the analysis of the historic categories of "public" and "private" in the knowledge that such concepts may be regarded as an historical and cultural product and also as a category of analysis. There is an old tradition of debates and representations that encompasses its definition as one of the cultural products emerged from bourgeois societies, which in turn embodies the dichotomy that arises from the social and political relationships of individuals and, on the other hand, the sphere of the familial and private. This has also been explained as the result of the process of specialization of the economy according to gender that took place in the transition towards modernity and capitalism; it has even been explained as a historical product implying the existence only of such dichotomy within a maze of gender, class and race relationships (Habermas, 1992; Federici, 2011). These definitions are not necessarily opposed to each other, since a high degree of epistemic compatibility enables more sophisticated historiographical analysis in which they are implemented in all their possible variations. The relationship of representation between the public and private spheres is linked to the social hierarchy created by political power and to its distribution among individuals and social groups. In this paper I will show the different practices and representations of questions related to the public and private spheres in the case of Sofia Casanova, and I will seek the tensions between these practices and representations and the governing norms and mores under the Russian revolutionary period. The modification, even the transgression, of such norms of representation offers a political opportunity for the individual, that is, it yields situations that render possible the empowerment of individuals otherwise prevented by the social norms of a concrete historical moment from being politically capacitated (Butler, 2001).

This methodological approach requires the analysis of sources dealing with activities in turn related to the links between the public and private spheres. The most important documental body for Casanova is revealed to us in the pages of the conservative Spanish journal «*ABC*», for which Casanova worked as a reporter from the spring of 1915. The majority of her personal papers were lost during World War II, when Poland was invaded by the Third Reich (Meissner, 1997). Thus, the bibliographical methodology must be reassessed by means of the transposition and comparison with the experiences of individuals analogue to the person under to biographical (and historical) reconstruction, although by no means intending to identify or equal them to the story of the protagonist. This is a way to write history already undertaken in the 1970s, when the methodology of microhistory opened new avenues and possibilities for biography as a genre, an innovation revitalized in its theoretical aspects by feminism (Peltonen, 2001; Barry, 1990).

The classic debate in terms of the change model in gender interactions facilitated by the Great War has in turn given way to new approaches that avoid such debates on the grounds that they are obstinate and inclined to homogenize experiences which in some cases are completely opposed. It is impossible to refer to a unique group

experience and those discussions ignore historical processes previous to 1914 which are fundamental to understand the evolution of contemporary gender relationships. Current tendencies focus on the study of World War I as a mechanism that facilitated crucial reconfigurations in the nature of gender relationships as well as in the category of the public sphere (Doan, 2006: 339-40). To undertake a study of such characteristics requires careful consideration of questions related with writing, the eastern front, the work carried out in the infirmary and the household keeping under a period of violence. All these aspects composed the quotidian reality of Casanova, whose life between 1917 and 1918 unfolded in a social and political milieu emerged from a Soviet standpoint which generated tensions between the theories of a new communist citizenship and a the strong resistance of the Russian patriarchal traditions (Wood, 2002: 100). The choice of those other women who will enable the execution of this historiographical exercise is justified by the similarities between their activities and the setting of these historical characters and between their practices and representations in terms of political empowerment, all in relation with the equivalent activities carried out by Sofía Casanova. It is important to emphasise that Sofía Casanova will always function as the inter-subjective epicentre of a network of historical possibilities suited to show the irregularities of female empowerment during World War I and the Soviet Revolution.

Sofía Casanova represents an archetype of the conservative woman, religious, bourgeois and a writer, like many of the women who took part in the Congreso Pedagógico Hispano- Lusitano-Americano that met in Madrid in 1892. This conference is frequently brought up and analysed as the event that created meanings explaining the discourse commonly held by cultured bourgeois women. It became habitual to refer to strategies of empowerment based on the reinforcement of the domestic qualities of women from which they could project themselves as beings capable of generating well-being for the society (Alzate, 2011). A tendency among bourgeois female writers to develop a certain attachment towards their nation and motherland has also been demonstrated: some authors like Kirsty Hooper have concluded that whereas it is not possible to speak of a complete subversion of masculinity and the norms determined by gender, it is perfectly acceptable to speak of a compatible and alternative understanding of nationalism not altogether unaware of the political potentialities of the actions of women (Hooper, 2007). This kind of representations coexisted with other representations which emanated from the subordinate elements of society, in which, quoting Concha Roldán , «“wise” women could not be admitted but as exceptions, as “muses”, “monsters of nature” or “masculine spirits” within “female bodies”» (Roldán, 2008: 59).

Sofía Casanova lived in Poland long enough so as to consider the influence of the representation in that place of the dichotomy between the public and private spheres. The participation of that part of the society dedicated to the reproduction of the moral norm in order to achieve the conquest of the political autonomy for Poland kindles an alternative relationship between that which is active and that which remains subordinated: this is the most telling characteristic of Polish nationalism. Such social

pattern created an avenue which enabled political participation for mothers and families (although not for women as such). During the 19th century and up to World War I this discourse grew stronger as pointed out by the historian Bianka Pietrov-Ennkere. This political predestination for Polish mothers must not be mistaken with an active political attitude, but must be rather seen as a command they willingly complied with (Pietrov-Ennker, 1992: 11). Furthermore, she hosted gatherings of intellectuals and aristocrats, in which got to be known as the Lutoslawski Salon in Cracow, the intellectual and social reawakening for Sofia Casanova in Martínez Martínez's opinion (Martínez Martínez, 1999: 130-138). Salons act as places with heterotypic characteristics, if Foucault's terminology is to be accepted, since several spaces superpose in them with no opportunity for disengagement (Foucault, 1984). At any rate, the political possibilities had to overcome certain cultural filters of superposition of hierarchies in terms of the access to public spaces. Sofia Casanova defined in the Ateneo of Madrid in 1910 how the ideal woman was expected to be, and how was she supposed to be given access to the public and historical spheres: «[...] the woman, who returns in life the kiss of love, who ennobles with motherhood the responsibility of her fall, the soul of the Spanish woman, as you know was there spread among a hundred hearts and whole in each one of them, from the fire, from the faith that those wandering towards the chimaera transmitted the fruits of maternal bosom» (Casanova, 1910: 11-12). For Casanova, a woman was entitled to participate in public life only once such ideal had been fulfilled.

3. 1917-1918: Political Derivations of the Historical Activities of Sofia Casanova During the Bolshevik Revolution and her Narration of the Events in the Newspaper *ABC*

The 23rd of February 1918, the journal «*ABC*» referred to the work as reporter of Sofia Casanova in a review of her book *De la revolución rusa* (1917) as: «a modern chronicler, sagacious, who holds open views, able to harmonize the dryness of data verification with the art of narrative and analysis». After three years as the reporter of the Great War for the conservative and monarchic journal, Sofia Casanova was well on her way towards the recognition in Spain that she had not been granted before (Alayeto, 1992: 109-110). It is interesting to raise the question of the extent to which Sofia Casanova negotiated with herself the happenings and the decisions which she took during the years that the war lasted. In other words, what was the impact of World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution in her self-representations over the dichotomy of the public and private spheres, and to how deep was it in any case? And, consequently, how did those representations relate to the historical practices of Casanova (and other women) that may be disengaged through the method proposed in this paper. I will approach the task at stake from the three thematic axes from which traditionally the duality public-private has been represented by history and historio-

graphy, my aim being that of simplifying the narration, always acknowledging that this is in the end a methodological choice (Smith, 1998).

The first axe establishes the link between privacy and public spaces, between the professional life and home, between productive and reproductive work, which includes or excludes individuals in and from political participation placing them in a concrete space of social mediation. Sofia Casanova was one of the very few women who published chronicles dealing with quotidian and private matters as well as with geopolitics and military issues concerning World War I. The fact that it was a woman that she told both her personal experience and what was happening in the Eastern Front, in the exotic Poland and Russia, provided a bigger appeal to the readers: «the confidential nature of the letter, dated on the 14th October, bestows more interest over its contents». During the second half of the 19th century the tendency in the mainstream political press was to offer a discourse in which the masculine point of view was prevalent. All reference to a feminine voice was allowed only as an ornamental element intended to offer a more “humane” version of the events. Afterwards, in the midst of the development and heyday of the New Journalism (from 1880 to 1914 approximately), the press embraced those accounts denominated as “humane”, although women would rarely utter any sort of ideological implications. During the Great War the involvement with either the war or the front experienced by women was seldom published in the press: those experiences were only available in books (Chambers, Steiner, Fleming, 2004: 16-26). The journalist activity of Sofía Casanova during World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution is framed in this general context; it cannot be argued that her texts were anomalous in terms of the issues they dealt with.

Generally speaking, the journalistic style of Sofia Casanova’s accounts during the years before and after the Soviet Revolution fit into the New Journalism model mentioned above. However, some aspects of her accounts regarding her work or even her profession in relation and in addition to what she understood as femininity and its social tools, project contradictions in relation to the dichotomy public-private as represented by Casanova prior to 1914 and especially before 1917. In February 1916 Casanova confronted in a sort of sarcastic pun the ideas of privacy and daily life as well as the «the feminine amenities of the women from Moscow» against the importance of the war. She did it with “sadness”, thus merging politics and morality, which was in turn a habitual aspect that could often be found in the discourse inherent to the New Journalism. Casanova regarded the daily events of life, family matters and private events as elements out of history, society and politics, and she found in that difference and that distance constitutive of human relations the links which during the October Revolution would generate situations in which the professional and familial spheres interacted and interlinked, and that it was not to be altered by history, in spite of its rejection a priori of the radical change in human and political relationships.

During the Revolution and in spite of some passages in which she apologized for showing openly certain ideological stances in her journalistic works, her perspective over the relationship between the public and private spheres changed, especially when it came to all aspects related to the identification of the possibilities of women.

Thus, in the text of her renowned and often quoted interview with Trotski, Casanova described the activity of a journalist, the activity that she was then carrying out, as «a man's feat», while at the same time she represented herself as «and old and pious woman». It is interesting to notice the way the British nurse Violetta Thurstan expressed in 1916 her regret that many of the female volunteers under her command behaved as women rather than as men, in order to gain a wider perspective of the representation of professionalism and its links with gender systems during World War I. Nevertheless, after of her relatives were killed by the Bolshevik justice, Casanova approached in new terms the assessment of the relationship between the professional and private ambits in her texts, going back to a 19th century version preceding the New Journalism: «its being a personal misfortune will not keep me from voicing this drama, one of the gloomiest in Russia». From that moment on the association of familial Soviet violence with the death of her brothers-in-law determined her texts with regard to everything Bolshevik; morality returned to its previous position as an indicator against which the limits of acceptable actions in the public sphere would be established, but acknowledging the possibility for different political action for her own sex. This model quite coincides with the behaviour and representation of Russian female housekeepers in 1917 as portrayed by the historians Jane M. McDermid and Anna Hillyar (Mcdermid, Hillyar, 1999).

Ever since the spring of 1919, when Sofía Casanova left the USSR, she made use of her column in the journal *ABC* to advocate for a change in Soviet Russia, while meditating at the same time on the capacity, scope and professional validity of this sort of journalism. In her chronicles she addressed the issue of the forms that as a woman she could bear on professional journalism. Her beloved journals, beyond showing the «the palpitation of the motherland», may function as the tribune from which a concrete behaviour may be exhorted. In order to carry out such aim, it is necessary to establish within the hierarchy of power a series of priorities which regulate the access to political enablement and exclude all individuals who do not possess a minimum of requirements. In this case, her motherland, the sens of duty towards it as a citizen, demand an effort out of Casanova: «[...] I have always put and will always put my pen to and my heart into the service of my Motherland and of those who suffer within our without its boundaries». Thus, it is not only a moral subjection that Casanova is referring to (that of her heart) but moreover her capability as a public female personage and as a writer expands insofar as it depends on the Motherland. She will even explicitly encourage her female readers to organize themselves and join the Red Cross and thus meet their patriotic responsibilities, even though reproducing in such a way the empowerment of the women as the reproducers of economy and social care, that space intended for women by the constitutive rules of modernity. This interpellation to the Motherland as an enabling element for individuals was in fact a habitual strategy used by many women during World War I, the moment when the limits of all that can be represented blurred, a mechanism of representation which in turn placed many a woman within a space of alternative historical agencies (Lee, 2006).

Sofía Casanova was a Red Cross volunteer since 1914 and still in 1920, during the Polish-Soviet war, continued her duties as a volunteer, although her texts dealing with such occupation lost some of their prominence in «*ABC*». As a nurse she dressed in an especial uniform that made her stand out both in the hospitals where she worked and in the front. The historiography concerned with the study of the dichotomy between the public and private spheres has already underlined the importance of garments in the understanding of social mobility and especially in the case of women acting in public and private spaces (Parkins, 2002; Turbin, 2003). During World War I the identification through uniforms (from soldiers to officials, ambulance drivers and nurses) generated the possibility of change in the political and public representation of individuals. The nurse and ambulance driver Grace MacDougall provides a paradigmatic example of this possibility in many of the texts that she donated to the Imperial War Museum. Above all, the letter published by «*Trp's Weekly*» in 1915 allows us to understand these processes of social and political appropriation through her identification with war uniforms. Sofia Casanova was no exception to this phenomenon and the uniforms she wore facilitated military salutes and discussions over military tactics. Even nurses like Casanova and MacDougall took part in the military organization through the disposition of rooms, as recounted by Thurstand, or the awarding of medals even if in reward for a task related to the reproductive aspects of economy. In Russian hospitals they received the Army Certificate of Identity, thus linking even more the representation of the different groups participating in the war.

For Sofia Casanova the war and the violence generated during the Bolshevik Revolution carried negative consequences in the lives of women. Their participation in battalions in the revolutionary period of 1917 and 1918 were regarded by Casanova as a complete social abomination which threw these women into the worse experiences of the war. On the other hand, it is an obligation to respond to the revolutionary violence, which is not only irrespective of gender but that, moreover, bestows a bigger quality onto those women who undertake such path. The differences in the representation of the empowerment, the obligation and the abomination, of the limits of the private and the public ambits as well as of the productive and the reproductive activities in relation to violence may be best observed in a text by Casanova about Dora Kaplan and her attempt on Lenin's life in November 1918: women who fight for justice and morality, these heroines, do not chose violence as their first option but it is rather always an election sprung from a «a sentimental secret, a resentment or a subjective impulse, which induce to commit a crime». Here it is pertinent to recall the reflexive and philosophical sediments of the violence, during the revolutionary period, of the Russian intelligentsia (Stites, 1999: 29). In a conference entitled «*La mujer y la guerra*» (women and the war) on the 10th June 1913, Sofia Casanova merged all her discourses into these questions: violence had a negative impact on the social function and duties of women, in spite of the fact that in those spaces of historic agency they could offer their capabilities as caretakers with the charity distinctive of Christian women. Women not only suffered violence as much or even more than men (whether the violence of war or the ideological violence of the revolution), but such violence forced them to contribute as a part of the mechanism of its industry.

Her essentialist assumption of the social qualities of both sexes leads her to associate female soldiers with the worst features of men. Women are not entitled to develop a sentiment of war impetus and should they do it they may become social freaks like “Petrova of the moustache”; women seek shelter and the male’s affection by nature.

It may be said that neither during the war nor during the Bolshevik Revolution did Sofía Casanova show a rupture with her life before 1914, provided that such affirmation is allowed in history. Nevertheless, the tension and clashes between her practices and representations generated small and occasionally circumstantial changes which determined her historical agency during the interwar period. Although due to the format of this paper it is impossible to carry out an analysis in depth, I would like to point out some of the most significant modifications with regards to the links between citizenship, politics, national identities, and the public and private spheres. On the 16th of August 1913 Sofía Casanova published in *ABC* some ideas concerning the way she thought the “free man” should be, as well as his moral attributes, and she added some characteristics of the political empowerment of that historically unmovable ideal. These ideas were guided by the principle of the positive action and the possibility of change through the mechanisms self-bestowed by different societies, ranging from indignation to protestation. The role as guardians of morality of women, as thought by Casanova, of their continent and their contents, enabled her to provide a definition of those characteristics within a text published as a woman and a journalist.

The relationship between class, gender and race generated a series of hierarchies which placed all individuals in different levels of access to the social and political domains in modernity (Karl Schlögel, 2007; Blom, 2000). Sofía Casanova was not oblivious of this trend of representation of power during the war and the Revolution, like Margaret Fawcett or Violetta Thurstan (above mentioned), both working in Russia as nurses during those years and who established a distance with Asian barbarism and a maternal condescendence towards their daily and political habits. Likewise, still during the Bolshevik Revolution, Casanova distinguished the historic and public activity of women which granted access to political power, as consorts and heirs across history, with the non-historic recreation of the social duties of those women excluded from social and political power. In those texts Casanova addresses the necessity of a situation of social disequilibrium for women to be allowed to work, to become soldiers or to be the individuals with more political power of a given nation. At any rate, the participation of women as soldiers is an anomaly that she is not willing to tolerate.

The disorder and the daily chaos that surrounds the revolution prompted her to find these explanations to the anomalies in public empowerment that she understands to have taken place in history. But the norm governs and must govern under the form of the above mentioned interactions among class, gender and race hierarchies. After her departure from Russia and her return to Spain, her arrival afterwards to the new Polish state, the relationship between the repetitions of her discourses prior to the revolutionary period and the options opened by the possibilities encountered during

the immediately preceding period, produced a new version of Casanova's ideas over the public and the private spheres. She maintained her representations in terms of the national empowerment of individuals, (Polish and Spanish nationalities in her texts), whose choice was to opt for the reproductive action with the exceptions governed by class, gender and race relationships. Her praises to the access of female intellectuals to the government of the new Polish republic are by no means anomalous. Besides and in spite of the fact that in the Polish patriotic ideal women seemed to have attained an active position even in the struggle against the enemies of the nation, such position arose from a command rather than from a decision positively taken, a political act. This cultural phenomenon, which may be traced back to the partition of Poland, created the boundaries of the forms of political life as a structural element of the modern Polish nationalism (Żarnowska, 2004: 61). On the other hand, Casanova reinforced her conservative representation of the public sphere, sliding into her texts the axioms of social Christianity and refusing any possibility of social equality between men and women.

4. Conclusions

It seems that no renovated discourse emerged from Sofia Casanova's way to represent the public and private spheres; and even that after her witnessing the Revolution her views became more conservative than those held not only in 1917 but even in the summer of 1914. Yet, many of her daily practices and self-representations were indeed influenced by the new possibilities developed by some women in those years. She ignored the failure of her marriage and, instead of portraying herself as a separated woman or a divorcee, she would not name Wicenty Lutoslawski and she would call herself a widow. The popularity of her articles in *ABC* intensified her professional life and she attained an economic autonomy that she could not or did not want to achieve before. Moreover, she accentuated the political nature of her public talks, those talks in which she would apologize for being a woman while nonetheless daring to draw her own political analysis of the geopolitical or ideological tensions, or even to turn them into real political rallies undoubtedly intended to convince her audiences on matters dealing with certain ideologies, clearly trespassing the very limits she had established in her representations of the public and private spheres and the political empowerment of women. On the 14th of April 1919, in the headquarters of *ABC* and after delivering an intense harangue to the employees of the journal, she said: «a poor woman that I am, with no right or desire to meddle with the political life».

5. Bibliographic references

- ALAYETO, O. (1992) *Sofía Casanova: (1861-1958): Spanish, Poet, Journalist and Author*, Potomac Maryland: Scripta Humanistica.
- ALZATE, C. (2011) «Aptitud de las mujeres para ejercer todas las profesiones: Comentarios memoria presentada por Soledad Acosta de Samper en el Congreso Pedagógico Hispano-Lusitano-americano reunido en Madrid en 1892», *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, 38, 2011, pp. 166–168 and 169–175.
- BARRY, K. (1990) «The New Historical Syntheses: Women's Biography», *Journal of Women's History* 1, 3, pp. 75–105.
- BEEBE, K. DAVIS, A. GLEADLE, K. (2012) *Introduction. Space, Place and Gendered Identities: Feminist History and the Spacial Turn*, *Women's History Review*.
- BLASCO HERRANZ, I. (2002), “La acción católica de la mujer y la participación política femenina durante la dictadura de Primo de Rivera,” in Carlos FORCADELL (edited by), *Usos públicos de la historia*, Zaragoza, AHC, pp. 339–50.
- (2007) «Citizenship and Female Catholic Militancy in 1920s Spain», *Gender & History*, 19, 3, pp. 441–66.
- BLOM, I. HAGEMANN, K. and HALL, C. (edited by) (2000) *Gendered Nations: Nationalisms and Gender Order in the Long Nineteenth Century*, Oxford, Berg.
- BOCK, G. (2001) *La mujer en la historia de Europa: De la Edad Media a nuestros días, la construcción de Europa*, Spa. Trans., Barcelona, Crítica.
- BOURDIEU, P. (1997) «La ilusión biográfica», in *razones prácticas: sobre las teorías de la acción*, Spa. Trans. Barcelona, Anagrama.
- BUTLER, J. (2001) *El grito de Antígona*, Spa. Trans., Barcelona, El Roure.
- CASANOVA, S. (1898) *El doctor Wolski: Páginas de Polonia y Rusia*, Madrid, [s.n.], 1894; Fugaces, La Coruña, Andrés Martínez.
- (1907) *Lo eterno*, Madrid, R. Velasco.
- (1908) *Más que amor*, Madrid, R. Velasco.
- (1910) *La mujer española en el extranjero*, Madrid, R. Velasco.
- (1913) *La madeja: comedia frívola en tres actos y en prosa*, Madrid, Los Contemporáneos.
- (1916) *De la guerra: crónicas de Polonia y Rusia*, Madrid, R. Velasco.
- (1917) *De la revolución rusa en 1917*, Madrid, Renacimiento.
- (1919) *Impresiones de una mujer en el frente oriental de la guerra europea*, Madrid, [s.n.].
- (1922) *Princesa rusa*, Madrid, Prensa Gráfica.
- (1926) *De Rusia: amores y confidencias*, Madrid, Librería y Editorial Madrid.
- (1929) *En la corte de los zares (del principio y del fin de un imperio)*. Madrid: [s.n.].
- CHAMBERS, D. STEINER, L. and FLEMING, C. (edited by) (2004) *Women and Journalism*, London, Routledge.
- DAVIS, J. C. (2005) «Decadencia final de una necesidad cultural: La biografía y su credibilidad intelectual», in J. C. DAVIS and Isabel BURDIEL (edited by) *El*

- otro, el mismo. *Biografía y autobiografía en Europa (siglos XVII-XX)*, Valencia, Publicaciones Universidad de Valencia.
- DOAN, L. (2006) «A Challenge to ‘Change’? New Perspectives on Women and the Great War», *Women’s History Review* 15, 2, pp. 339-340.
- FEDERICI, S. (2011) *Calibán y la bruja. Mujeres, cuerpo y acumulación originaria*, Spa Trans., Madrid, Traficantes de Sueños.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1984) «Of Other Spaces, Heterotopias», *Architecture, mouvement, continuité*, 5.
- HABERMAS, J. (1992) «Further Reflections on the Public Sphere», in Craig CALHOUN (edited by) *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, London, MIT Press.
- HOOPER, K. (2007) «Death and the Maiden: Gender, Nation, and the Imperial Sacrifice in Blanca de Los Ríos’s *Sangre Española* (1899) », *Revista hispánica moderna*, 60, 2, pp. 171–85.
- (2008) *A Stranger in My Own Land: Sofía Casanova, a Spanish Writer in the European Fin De Siècle*, Nashville, Vanderbilt University Press.
- LAURETIS, T. de (2000) *Diferencias: etapas de un camino a través del feminismo*, Madrid, Horas y horas.
- MARTINEZ MARTINEZ, M. R. (1999) *Sofía Casanova: Mito y literatura*, Santiago de Compostela: Secretaría Xeral da Presidencia.
- MCDERMID, J. and HILLYAR, A. (1999) *Midwives of the Revolution: Female Bolsheviks and Women Workers in 1917*, Athens, Ohio University Press.
- MEISSNER, K. (1997) «Las Tres Muertes de Sofía Casanova», *Razón Española*, July.
- PAZOS, A. M. (ed) (2010). *Vida e tempo de Sofía Casanova (1861-1958)*, Madrid, Editorial CSIC - CSIC Press.
- PELTONEN, M. (2001) «Clues, Margins, and Monads: The Micro-Macro Link in Historical Research», *History and Theory*, no. 40.
- PIETROV-ENNKER, B. (1992) «Women in Polish Society. A Historical Introduction», in Rudolf JAWORSKI and Bianka PIETROW-ENNKER (edited by), *Women in Polish Society*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- ROLDÁN, C. (2008) «La escritura robada: Literatura filosófica contra las malas costumbres», in Pura FERNÁNDEZ and Marie-Linda ORTEGA (edited by) *La mujer de letras o la letraherida. Discursos y representaciones sobre la mujer escritora en el siglo XIX*, Madrid, CSIC, 2008
- SCHLÖGEL, K. (2007) *En el espacio leemos el tiempo. Sobre historia de la civilización y geopolítica*, Spa. Trans., Madrid: Siruela.
- SMITH, B. G. G. (1998) *The Gender of History: Men, Women, and Historical Practice*, Cambridge, London University, Press.
- STITES, R. (1999) «Days and Nights in Wartime Russia: Cultural Life 1914-1917», in Aviel ROSHWALD and Richard STITES (edited by), *European Culture in the Great War. The Arts, Entertainment, and Propaganda*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 29.
- TERRADAS, I. KENDALL, E. (1992) *Reflexiones sobre una antibiografía*, Barcelona: Publicacions d’Antropologia cultural. Univ. Autònoma de Barcelona.

- WOOD, E. A. (2002) «The Trial of the New Woman. Citizens-in-Training in the New Soviet Republic», in Kathleen CANNING and Sonia O. ROSE (edited by) *Gender, Citizenship & Subjectivities*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- ŻARNOWSKA, A. (2004) «Women's Political Participation in Inter-War Poland: Opportunities and Limitations», *Women's History Review*, 13, 1.