

I. *A Memory of Solferino: An Overview*

A Memory of Solferino is a book about the memory of a hideous and bloody battle of the Italian war in its side with the allied French Army under Napoleon III and the Sardinian Army under Victor Emmanuel II against the Austrian army under the French Emperor Joseph I. The battle of Solferino was a decisive one, for the independence of Italy; it was the second war fought for independence, a nationalist movement to unify Italy long divided between France, Austria, Spain and Papal States. The battle took place near the village of Solferino and San Martino, Italy, south of Lake Garda, between Milan and Verona. The time period was June 24, 1859 to July 12, 1859. The battle of Solferino proved to be very destructive with 40,000 soldiers either dead or wounded.

Over, 300,000 soldiers fought in this important battle, the largest since the battle of Leipzig in 1813 and as destructive as that of "Borodino, Leipzig and Waterloo" (105). There were about 250,000 soldiers with 500 pieces of artillery with the Austrian troops and a combined total of 150,000 French and Sardinian troops with the strength of 400 pieces of artillery. The confrontation was between the French and Sardinian against Austrian forces who opposed in their advance. The Austrians were retreating eastwards after the battle of Magenta. In the morning of 23 June, after the arrival of Emperor Franz Joseph, they changed direction to counter attack along the river Chiese. At the same time Napoleon III orders his troops to advance, causing the battle to occur in an unprecedented location. The clash was chaotic, on a front stretching for 15 kilometers wide. In the early afternoon the French broke through the Austrian center. It was a fierce war. The fighting continued later in the villages near Solferino, Cavrino, Guidizzolo and San Martino, resulting in victory for French - Italian Armies and loss for Austrians.

Henry Dunant, was the war witness, and the writer of the book, is so much affected seeing the dying and wounded soldiers and he tried to help them in curing their wounds and in providing them foods, drinks, clothing and in dressing their wounds because there was no other means (governmental) to care for them. The wound and the dead soldiers were scattered everywhere in the battle field and there were only few ambulances which were helpless for the vast number of soldiers. So, Dunant organized the volunteers of town inhabitants to help for their medication. He also released the imprisoned doctors of opposing country for the sake of the wounded ones and made the equal treatment for both opposing country. In the camps of Castiglione and Berssica he worked very hard for nights and days. There he wrote for the soldiers family and gave them emotional support when they were in the last hours of their life. Thus when there was the least approach of governmental support, Dunant worked his level best to maintain the situation which was full of grown, pains and wailings.

Dunant reached in the pinnacle of his carrier after the publication of *A Memory of Solferino*. Initially 1600 copies were published in the authors own expense and distributed among his friends, in courts and among Europe. It immediately attracted a wide circle of readers and in a few years it was translated into twelve languages. It was widely read and it proved to be very effective in inspiring the readers. It was also read by the by the people of high rank like king, queens, dukes and presidents of that time. They all praised Dunant and helped to establish the institution, International committee for the Red Cross and Red Crescent (ICRC). Here are some of the comments of the book *A Memory of Solferino* by some of the critics. Caroline Morehead, in her essay "Dunant's Dream, war, Switzerland and the History of the Red Cross", writes:

Dunant's instinct that his book was both shocking and timely was right. *A Memory of Solferino* was greeted everywhere with admiration, horror and guilt. People had written of battles before, of course, but not with such a sense

of indignation and revulsion. [...] In France and Germany, throughout Holland and Prussia, Dunant was referred to as a poet, a philosopher, a literary genius, a man *de coeur*, of vision, of inspiration, of initiative. Generals, doctors, writers and statesmen all wrote to congratulate him. (6)

Moorehead's view for the text presents same focal point of deconstruction. She says that "the book was shocking" (6) because it focuses the things which up to then thought to be marginal in such big cause like 'unification of the nation'. Dunant had written about untouched theme by other writers. She says this writing was different because it was written about the battle "with much indignation and revulsion" (6). Likewise, the literary scholar Adolphe Pictet says, "In a few terrifying realistic pages all the horrors of mass slaughter were exposed. The impact on philanthropic circles was electric. It shook the whole of Europe" (22). His saying proves that the text is full of trauma because he takes the war as 'terrifying reality' and as 'horror' and accepts it being shocking. Similarly Pierre Boissier, in *The History of International Committee of the Red Cross*, comments:

There can be no doubt as to the event which gave rise to the work of assistance to wounded soldiers which later became as the "Red Cross". It was the publication in the Geneva towards the end of 1862 of a work by Mr. Henry Dunant entitled *A Memory of Solferino*, The authors striking account of what he had seen and felt during the terrible battle of 24 June 1859 opened the eyes of the blind, moved the hearts of the indifferent and, intellectually and morally, virtually brought about the desired the reforms. Having achieved this breakthrough all that remained was to transform into reality the ideas of this persuasive historian. He was the first to show what might be expected from numerous associations prepared to complement in times of war the work of

military medical services and one can certainly say that it was he who conceived the Red Cross. (48)

Boissier establishes Dunant as a historian who has presented the history of such a bloody battle. Boissier focuses the change brought by the Dunant's work in all readers "intellectually and morally" which proved to be successful to bring "desired reforms" that is the establishment of the institution, ICRC, which later would work for the same mission, which Dunant worked in the battle field during the Solferino war. Similarly in the text *A Memory of Solferino* there are different views given. In his foreword, Alexander Hey writes:

The whole Movement originated with this slim volume, written by Henry Dunant between 1859 and 1862 following his horrifying experience of the aftermath of the Solferino. It inspires the founders of the Red Cross and has continued to inspire successive generation of the Movement's members. May it still arouse the compassion and magnanimity which help us to understand, as the inhabitants of Solferino understood in 1859 that even in a world torn by violence, all men are brothers. (6)

His ideas focus that the Red Cross Movement was the result of the traumatic experience. His devotion towards humanity "in the world torn by violence" (6) helped to arouse the slogan that "all men are brothers" (6). This is the slogan that expressed by the women of Castiglione expressed seeing Dunant as a neutral behavior to everyone of the battlefield. They repeatedly said "Tutti fratelli" meaning all men are brothers. Similarly, Professor Hans Haug former president of the Swiss Red Cross narrates:

Henry Dunant did not merely describe a terrible battle and recalls the events of the following days and the past which he played on them; he also put forward ideas and proposals for the future, aimed at preventing a repetition of the suffering which he had witnessed at Solferino. These ideas at once and

modest, and the speed which they were realized, turned Dunant's work in to more than just another account of war. The book is still worth reading, and is indispensable to an understanding of the worldwide organization known as The Red Cross. (129)

Hans Haug says, Dunant has recalled the time he worked in the battle field with the proposal for the future. If not possible to stop the wars it is liable to give them the appropriate medicinal treatment during and after the war in future. He gives value to the text by saying that the book is still worth reading because of its inspiring elements. Princess Mary, The Princess Royal of Great Britain, 1953, says "Many people are inclined to forget that the Red Cross Movement owes its origin to the efforts of one man, Henry Dunant, who by the sheer force of personality persuaded nations to send delegates to the first international conferences in Geneva" (27). Princess Mary gives the due honor to Dunant for the establishment of such a great Movement of Red Cross and praises Dunant for his incentive and his ability to persuade delegates to come together for the conference to work for. Similarly in the book *Henry Dunant*, Palm Brown gives his view about *A Memory of Solferino* under the same title. He opines:

Dunant had lived with his memories for a long time. Now that he put them down on paper, his horror and his passionate concerns came alive on the pages. [...] Clearly and without hiding any of the facts, he told of slaughter, the efforts of the doctors, the courage of soldiers- and the hard work and infinite kindness of all those, rich and poor who had helped to ease their suffering. (21)

Brown is talking about Dunant's traumatic effects when he says that Dunant lived with "memories for a long time". This is the same thing which trauma theory says PTSD (Post Traumatic Stress Disorder). But, this traumatic memory of Dunant is creative because, he at

the time of war worked for the soldiers and too after the war the traumatic memory helped him to create the text *A Memory of Solferino* which was so inspiring that all the high ranked members of Geneva could come together to the committee of five. The five members Henry Dufour, Dr. Louis Appia, Gustave Moynier, Dr. Theodor Maunoir and Dunant founded the ICRC in February 17, 1863. Brown writes focusing Dunant's main point where Dunant has paid attention to all the marginal groups of the battlefield. He says Dunant hasn't hidden the facts of battlefield and he both talked and treated the matters without any discrimination and with a neutral point of view.

In 1901, Dunant was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his role in founding The International Committee for the Red Cross and Red Crescent and initiating The Geneva convention, The Prize was shared jointly with the French man Fredrich Passy. Since Dunant was too feeble to make the long journey to Christina, the prize, the letter and the medal were sent to him from Geneva, his old home to Heidden where he was spending his last days of life. This was the message from the Nobel Peace Prize Company:

There is no man who more deserves this honor, for it was you, forty years ago, who sent on the foot the international organization for the relief of the wounded on the battle field. Without you, the Red Cross, the supreme humanitarian achievement of the nineteenth century, would probably never have been undertaken. (12)

This message from Nobel Peace Prize Corporation says, the starting footprint of ICRC was the same aid programme of Dunant in Solferino war. It gives Dunant the due value of the establishment of humanitarian institute the ICRC. Many critics have talked about Dunant and his work and I will analyze the traumatic memory mainly with trauma theory and with it the deconstructive things presented in Dunant's text, wherein we can get the main stream historical narratives are subverted by the central focus to the so-called marginal things of war.

Thus, Dunant in his memoir *A Memory of Solferino* subverts the canonical war histories foregrounding the sufferings of the marginal soldiers in the war, which is waged primarily for the states' race. Dunant by showing vast death, destruction, hunger thrust and exhaustion of the soldiers shows a grim picture of the war, unlike the other war accounts which present the sublime picture of war. Those war histories valorize the deaths of fighters curtaining their horrors, and sufferings and pain of dying. They glorify the wars in the name of nationality and neglect the terrifying situation during and after the war. Though the war's destruction and warriors' condition and the under gone struggle to maintain the situation are the focal point in the text there are also other representation of emperors psyche, fighters changed moods, volunteer's psyche and etc.

Dunant's effort to de-centralize the war's glory as a national tragedy is a creation of a new history. It is a small history of Solferino war, which has a new perspective, a new historical sense of war. When the text creates the mood of despising the war in readers, it becomes an anti war history different from the canonical one which generally have the regular shape of war' valorization. Through this text we can see Dunant's hope for future with available food, drinks, on spot medical treatment and decent burial to the dead and appropriate help to the family members to the war fighters.

Many critics have commented on Dunant's text. They all have presented their own views of and about his humanitarian activities and neutrality, his future ambition and his hard work to make up the situation better in the battlefield and also the persuasive factor of the text. But, what I will do in the thesis is that I will relate the pain and suffering of the soldiers with the trauma theory and also will find out the trauma working in the witness too. I will present the signs of reconstruction in the text by presenting the focus of the text mainly for the marginal warriors, which is also an act of de-centering of the main-stream historical viewpoint of wars. The main tools I will apply in the text will be the trauma theory, and

deconstruction in traumatic literature's representation. In this research, there are altogether four chapters. The first chapter is entitled "*A Memory of Solferino: An Overview*" which gives a general introduction to the war, and the role of the witness there and also the different views of the critics. The second chapter entitled, "An Overview of Trauma Theory" is an overview of the tool with many theorist' theoretical opinion. The third chapter is entitled, "Traumatic Memory in *A Memory of Solferino*" is the part where I have presented the situations and facts how and where the methodology is applied in the text with many citations and examples and the final section, the conclusion is the conclusion drawn in relation to all the chapters of my thesis.

II. An Overview Trauma Theory

Trauma arises from the violent worldly events which produce long-lasting effects in the victim's mind and psyche. Trauma has the nature of being recurring whenever the similar kind of situation arises or exposes in the future. A witness is one who can be both the survivor who goes through the event and also a detached observer who assimilates the event by having the similar consciousness of the people related to the event. Trauma can arise from both natural and human violence, for e.g. murders, world wars, epidemics, famines, earthquakes, holocausts, genocides, accidents and crashes, sexual abuses, child abuses, spousal abuses and etc. James Berger, in "Trauma and Literary Theory", compares the survivor or the victim as "black box" (571) because the survivor is the final source of knowledge.

Primarily, in *Studies in Hysteria*, Freud talked about the dynamics of the trauma like the repression and symptom formation. Freud said that an overpowering event which is not expected by our consciousness which can be forgotten and also can return and somatic symptom or repetitive behaviors. But, Freud later concluded neurotic symptoms were the results of repressed drives not the traumatic events. His book *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* is a book which is written after the experience of the treatment of the World War I veterans who suffered from the recurrence of the nightmares which related the war experience. Here trauma is related to psychoanalysis but Freud shifted his stress to the case of the biological urge toward equilibrium called "death drive". His *Moses and Monotheism* came near to the theory of the trauma which talks about the historical development of the entire cultures. He talks about how memory of a traumatic event is lost in a period of time and also how it becomes vivid in the same kind of event. This triggering of the similar events invokes and transforms memories of other catastrophe and history is a function of complex entanglement of crimes suffered with every catastrophe understood which is misunderstood 'in the context

of the repressed memories of previous ones' (Berger 570). James Berger discusses the chief problem of *Moses and Monotheism* in the following words:

The chief problem with *Moses and Monotheism*, it seems to me, is its over reliance on the mythical, oedipal anthropology of *Totem and Taboo*. All *historical* traumas are seen ultimately "phylogenetic" ur-trauma, the murder of the primal father- an interpretation which, in addition to being fanciful, once again discredits the events, whether in a personal or a social history, in favor of some all-encompassing instinctual biological determination. (570)

Theorists nowadays take the theory of trauma as a tool of literary and cultural analysis. Media played a good role to visualize the violent traumatic disasters. It made the matters widely talked about and survivor's feelings are the means of knowledge of the particular event and also there is a rise in the eyewitness accounts. Similarly, the world wars, local wars, civil wars, ideological war, ethnic wars, cold wars, genocides, famines, epidemics and lots of turmoil and the eyewitness of these events shapes the modes of viewing the world. But, trauma is not only the word for disaster. It is a method of interpretation and it can affect in many and various ways. The analysis of the trauma can be both constructive and empirical. So the concept of the trauma can have a great value in the study of the history and historical narratives and in any narrative in general. Trauma theory owes much to the Paul de Man and Heidegger, the post structuralist theorists and deconstructionists like Derrida, Lyotard, and White. Berger writes:

A theory of trauma in addition suggests ways of re-conceptualizing important directions in critical theory itself. In particular, the recent crisis in poststructuralist thought brought on by the Heidegger and de Man controversies seems to require a way of thinking about how events in the past return to haunt the present. More fundamentally, it may be useful to look again

at the rhetoric of poststructuralists and post modern theory their emphases on de-centering, fragmentation, the sublime and apocalyptic and explore what relation they might have to the traumatic historical events of mid-century. This question becomes more immediately relevant when we see thinkers like Jaques Derrida, Jean-Francois Lyotard and Hayden White writing explicitly about the Holocaust in the 1980s in ways that seem uncannily to echo earlier work of theirs which, while full of rhetorics of catastrophe, contained no reference to that history.(573)

Since the early 1990s, trauma theory entered the academics. The book by Dori Laub's *Testimony Cries of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History* published in 1992, similarly Cathy Caruth's collection *Trauma: Exploration in Memory* in 1995 and here monograph *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History* in 1996, these books related trauma to literature. The term trauma theory first appears in Cathy Caruth's *Unclaimed Experience*. Equally important in the theory of trauma are the theorist Dominick La Capra and Kali Tal. Dominick LaCapra talks about the main two points in his book, *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory, Trauma*. The first is to clarify the Holocaust representation and the second one is to defining what historical trauma and what its transmission is. The psychoanalytical matters talked in LaCapra's books are the return of the repressed, acting out versus working through and dynamic of transference. The historical event according to LaCapra, the first is the repressed and then returns in the form of compulsive repetition.

LaCapra is concerned primarily with the return of the repressed as discourse, rather than with physical returns such as the genocidal repetition in Cambodia and Bosnia, and he outlines two symptomatic possibilities for the return of historical trauma as discourse. There is, on the one hand, the "redemptive, fetishistic narrative that excludes or marginalizes trauma through a teleological story that projectively presents values and wishes as viably realized"

(Berger 575). Mostly LaCapra has talked about transference. The failure to come in terms of discursive returns of some traumatic event usually signals the failure to recognize one's own emotional and ideological investments in the event and its representation. It is to recognize the symptoms of the traumas as of one's own and to find it as active and he or she implicated in the destructive effects. It is the return of the repressed; it is a repetition of a past event in new relationship. In psychoanalysis, LaCapra gives more focus to working through than acting out. The therapeutic situation refers to acting out which re-traumatizes the victims with earlier scene of violence. There is the therapeutic setting but in working through there is an imperative to recognize the symptoms and the trauma as one's own and it is also to know that trauma is still active if one is involved in destructive effects. According to the James Berger the two important implications in LaCapra's book, *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory, Trauma* are:

LaCapra describes two important implications of his view of historical trauma. First, trauma provides a method of rethinking post modern and poststructuralist theories in a clearer historical context. As LaCapra suggest, "the postmodern and post-holocaust become mutually intertwined issues that are best addressed in relation to each other" (188). . . . Secondly, LaCapra provides an original rethinking of the debates over the literary canon, suggesting that a canonical text should not help permanently install an ideological order but should, rather, "help one to foreground ideological problems and to work through them critically" (25). Each text would be, in effect, a site of trauma with which the reader would have to engage. (576)

Kali Tal is also a chief theorist of trauma who is different than the psychological approach of Dominick LaCapra and Cathy Caruth because she doesn't approaches psychoanalytically but her approach to trauma is through the victims and survivors. Her book *Words of Hurt* bases

her views of trauma on cognitive psychology and feminist politics. She has the testimonies of rape and incest survivors. The violence against women and the stress to change such violence are intended in her text. According to James Berger:

Tal is hostile to psychoanalysis and bases her views of trauma on cognitive psychology and a feminist politics that identifies strongly with the testimonies of rape and incest survivors. This Strategy has certain strengths- a keen awareness of systematic violence against women and a sense of how traumatic literature might produce social change- but certain limitations as well. Most notably, Tal is unable to discuss the social symptom, the transmissions and reverberations of widespread or systematic violence into forms not overtly testimonial. (580)

Berger points her loose point in her theory which according to him is being unable to find the social symptoms the transmissions and reverberations. The main points in her book which are talked about are holocaust survivors, texts of the war veterans and women victims of different sex and other abuses and the child abuse is another important part. James Berger quotes the definition of Tal for trauma in the following ways, "Literature of Trauma", writes Tal, "is defined by the identity of its author....The work of the critic of the literature identity and explicates literature by members of survivors groups, and to deconstruct the process by which the dominant culture codifies their traumatic experiences" (580). A traumatic work for Kali Tal must come from the survivors and the victims and it must be original to the speakers not being interrupted by the others. The victim talks to the audience and his/her intention must be political in the context of Tal's theory. James Berger writes about Tal's theory:

Testimony, for Tal, must be as nearly as possible unmediated and uninterrupted. Therapy should consist of survivors talking with each other and speaking out to a wider audience, and its goal should be political. Tal criticizes

two editors of an anthology of testimonies who "Emphasize women need 'healing', ... [but] do not mention that many women survivors of child sexual abuse also believe that they need revolution. (581)

James Berger sees Tal's criticism as narrow and personal. He criticizes not talking for the traumatic return of the repressed and claiming that her theory means only, men are harming women and women should raise their voice to stop them.

Cathy Caruth is too one of the most prominent theorist of trauma. Her work *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History*, is the book which answers how trauma becomes a text. She has written in her introduction how a wound becomes a voice. About the traumatic memory she says that it can involve belated temporality that is the period of latency of a real and the fantasized event then it recalls the renewed repression, and after the past is relieved there is no different between past and the present. She explains how trauma is verbalized:

The trauma requires integration both for the sake of testimony and for the sake of cure. But on the other hand, the transformation of the trauma into a narrative memory that allows the story to be verbalized and, to be integrated into one's own and other's knowledge of the past may lose both the precision and the force that characterizes traumatic recall [...] Yet beyond the loss of precision, there is another, more profound, disappearance: the loss, precisely, of the events' essential incomprehensibility, the force of its affront to understanding. (154)

She analyzes the Freud's text *Moses and Monotheism*. Crauth says that trauma in its first stage is incomprehensible but after a period of time it is found. She says traumatic narrative is referential but it is not in any simple or direct way. The historical trauma also arises by the delayed response. Flashbacks, hallucinations, repetitive occurrence are the results of the

psyches disorders. These symptoms are called Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. Any kind of event outside, directly affects inside the mind without any mediation. Destructive psychic experience, Crauth takes not simply as the destruction problem but it is the feeling of survival too.

Crauth also analyses Freud's book *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. She says Freud's theory of trauma and historical violence has the relation. It is by reading the individual theory in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* the structure of the delayed experience that will ultimately link individual trauma to the problem of the historical trauma.

Crauth says Freud's *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* is filled with the war neurosis and he compares the nightmares with reliving process of battle trauma. The recurring dreams of trauma perplex Freud because it can't be compared with wish or unconscious meaning. The flashback works as the inability to avoid an un-pleasurable event. Crauth tells that Freud concludes the traumatic repetition which defines the shape of the individual's life. She opines that Freud finds that in traumatic neurosis is not the reaction of any horrible event but a feeling of the survivor. There is a mediated relationship between trauma and survival-a mediation brought doubt by the inflection of trauma with the ethics and politics reflection. In the essay "Violence and Time: Traumatic survivals" Caruth shows the relation of the trauma and survival as:

Trauma is constituted not by the destructive force of violent event but by the very act of its survival. If we are to resist the impact of violence, we can't therefore, locate it only with the destructive moment of the past but in an ongoing survival that belongs to the future. It is because violence inhabits, incomprehensively, the very survival of those who have lived beyond it that it may be witnessed best in the future generations to whom this survival is passed on. (25)

Cote and Simpson, in *Covering Violence*, discusses the ethics and politics of trauma. In their opinion, trauma analysis is explicitly concerned with the personal or collective catastrophe; it aims to reveal the ways in which texts are engaged with the delayed remembrance of trauma. There is something more concerning the theories and method of trauma analysis. Trauma analysis has yet to debate how the un-representability in a text is to be made, whether it can be assumed as criticism, and whether the texts related to catastrophe are likely to reveal, the trauma's absent traces. There is much debate concerning many aspects of trauma analysis, its basic theories, and the reading of the trauma texts are hindered by the nature of the material itself and the context in which it is discussed. To criticize and debate may seem unethical when the sufferings are addressed to the audience. Not to debate may silence the questions of academic discussion of the trauma theory. So, Cote and Simpson present three aspect of the trauma analysis, first, the construction of and positioning of the trauma text's analyst; second, the fascination of trauma and, third, the designation of the field to be included in the trauma analysis. Cote and Simpson say, in its primary stage the ethical imperatives were accepted and trauma analysis positions itself by analogs with the witness of a testimony and s/he understands the task and works through of those trauma whose absent presence marks the analyzed texts. The need to reflect is the tendency of trauma analysis is to foreground analyst's sensitivity and emphatic capacities.

The book, *Coping with Trauma* by Jon G. Allen is an out way from the different kind of traumas. It is a therapeutic text which describes the different ways to regulate a traumatized person. Allen opines that rather to suppress the emotions it is better to cultivate and make them rich and evaluate it with judgments which are essentials to our flourishing. From a sensitized nervous system steaming from trauma, they can become destructive or be contrary to our flourishing. From the traumas, we have either to fight or to flight. Rather to flight we can monitor, evaluate and adjust our emotional response. We appraise and

reappraise the emotional response, we have feelings upon feelings. But, the emotions require effort. The goal of regulation from crafting to resenting is to optimize emotional response. Tranquility is one desirable emotional state. There are several techniques of self regulation, sleep, exercise, relaxation, imagery, mediation and biofeedback. And there are also enjoyable emotions like compassion, love and hope.

Hope is a positive expectation for future, and it is related to optimism. Optimism is associated with good mood, health, popularity, perseverance and success in endeavors. So, from healing of a psychological wound, trauma requires hope. Hope is to adopt existential stance. Grounds of hope lie in reality but not in facts. It helps to make out meaning. Hoping is not static, it alternates with fear. In the case of tragedy and suffering, hope is good for everyone. Traumatized people are themselves survivors. One should come out from the trauma through hope. One must try to flourish through hope.

Jenny Edikins, Geoffery Hartman and Tom Toremans are some of the trauma theorists who relate trauma with discourse and deconstruction. Jenny Edikins in her book *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* talks about the war and its aftermath. She points out the connection of trauma, violence and political community and talks about in traumas like war where in the dominant views are inscribed in everyday narratives:

[...] how we remember a war, for example, and the way in which we acknowledge and describe what we call trauma can be very much influenced by dominant views, that is, by the state [...], can be in contemporary society, as forms of political community, are themselves produced and reproduced through the social practices of trauma and memory. (11)

She tells that after the war is over the dead and the missing one's list is printed out and only victory is glorified. The war remains "tell of glory, courage and sacrifice" (1). The personal grief is curtailed by national mourning and national victory. Edikins shows that that because

the state has the dominant power which makes its views dominant too "trauma can be very much influenced by dominant view that is by the state "(11). She also talks about the relation between memory and traumatic event. Likewise, Geoffrey H. Hartman argues in "On Traumatic Knowledge and Literary Studies" that trauma is made of two different elements that one is the event and the other is the memory of the same event. He also talks about the literary studies and shows that the theory of trauma is derived mainly by the psychoanalytical sources, though it is also affected by the literary practices:

The theory holds that the knowledge of trauma, or the knowledge which comes from that source, is composed of two contradictory elements. One is the traumatic event, register rather than experienced. It seems to have bypassed perception and consciousness, and fall directly into the psyche. The other is a kind of memory of the event, in the form of a perpetual trooping of it by the bypassed or severely split [...]. (537)

In the same text he also talks about the trauma theory which also has figurative and poetic language or the symbolic process as something other than an enhanced imagining of a prior experience. Tom Toremans in his essay "Trauma Theory: Reading (and) Literary theory in the Wake of Trauma " says that the passage of trauma theory must be read as the passage of the performance of a theoretical of discourse which is tended for an impossible transmission of its object. He further explains:

Trauma's double gesture of triggering and contaminating theory simultaneously charges the concept with an outspokenly literary agency; yet what is at stake in double gesture is performative undoing in a discourse simultaneously establishing and resisting itself as theoretical, calling upon the literary to account of its inevitable excess of signification. This calling, the charging of the literary is always at risk of foreclosing the critical impact of

theory of giving way to the temptation to avoid reading in the service of anything but itself. (351)

Talking about the *A Memory of Solferino* its memories full of traumas are focused to the marginal soldiers' situation during war, there is the lack of the state' necessary performance which is made a central issue. This thing can be talked as the 'discourse' exercised by the state in its name and nationality upon the thousands of soldiers' troops who have no personal benefit in such kinds of warfare activities. It is a selfless action but where they are only destined to get grief, pain, loss and death for themselves and for their own family members. This effort to picture the actual representations of fighters' state 'reconstructs' a new war history which is an act of deconstruction. We can find many traumatic aspects of the fighters and of the witness who has tried to heal his traumatized self by writing the text making it a voice to work for them in the future by inspiring the all readers. It works as the therapy for the witness to heal the pain of such bloody battle and the main tool to heal is the hope for the betterment of the future.

III. Traumatic Memory in *A Memory of Solferino*

Henry Dunant was a detached observer of the battle of Solferino, where the two opposing countries allied France and Italy and the Austrians were fighting. He belonged to neither of the countries, he was the man of Geneva' Switzerland and was also a detached person in his mission when he came there to the battle field. He came there to meet the emperor Napoleon of France for the consignment of his right of water resource which he was in dire need to run his business in Algeria. Because Algeria was under the French colony at that time, he came to meet the emperor Napoleon in the same day when the war was going on in Solferino, where he could observe the war from the different facets. There he saw the emperors, fighters, town's peoples and every one and also the destructions of the physical structures. The vast death and destruction affected him hardly. But he mostly felt for the thousands of warriors who went on fighting till their last drop of blood and strength and died for the sake of the nation but for nothing personal. But during and after the war Dunant could capture the mismatched feelings of those warriors whose feelings, which were suddenly changed by the maltreatment and maladjustment of the state. Thus, Dunant's picture of war has become a small history which is also true from one facet. This new war history never echoed the words like victory, bravery and glory like other national war historians but resounded with the pain, cries, hunger, death, destruction, through out in the text.

At the very outset of the text Dunant gives a detailed description of both the opposing country's troops, their taken positions, their leading leaders and their arm capacities and then slowly he describes the battle. On the outer part, the war seems to be exciting to the readers when he writes, "The alarm is given to the both armies; on the all sides are heard bugles sounding the charge, and the roar of the drums"(17). Then the war begins slowly. The difficulty while marching ahead to attack is described as "The French Army was forced to beat a way through row upon the row of mulberry trees with grapes vine strung between

them,"(18). Then Dunant describes the attack he writes "The Austrians, from their vantage point on the hills, swept the French with artillery fire and rained on them a steady hail of shells care -and grape-shot" (18). This picture immediately enters the grim world of war with the rain of the bombs fired by the fighters towards each-other. Then slowly the result of the war start to be seen everywhere when Dunant writes "Every mould, every height, rocky crag, is the scene of a fight to the; bodies lie in the heaps on the hills and in the valleys" (19). The cruelest scene of the war opens up when he writes about the scennery:

Here is a hand- to- hand struggle in all its horror and frightfulness, Austrians and Allies trampling each other under feet, killing one another on piles of bleeding corpses, killing their enemies with their rifles butts, crushing skulls, ripping bellies open with bare and bayonet. No water is given, it is a sheer butchery; a struggle between savage beasts, maddened with blood and furry, even the wounded fight to last gasp. When they have no weapon left, they seize their enemies by the throat and tear them with their teeth. [...] One poor wounded man has his jaw carried away another man his head shattered, a third who could have been saved, has his chest beaten in. (19-20)

This is the apex scene of the war, which is very inhumane and full of trauma. It can easily shock the witness and the readers. It is the time when there is no sense of life, humanity and honor but it is a grim picture of butchery, which will fill the environment with grown and pain only. The fight continued slowly by slowly in every province like Guidizzolo, Solferino, Cavriana, Valeggio, Villafranca, San Martino, San Cassiano and etc and it proved to be very disastrous. In their tired condition while fighting, the soldiers exclaimed like, "It seemed as if the wind was carrying us forward" and the other was saying that "The smell of powder, the noise of guns, drums beating and bugles sounding, it all puts life in to you and stirs you up!" (34), the fighters were saying so because they were extremely tired and hungry. The only

boost of theirs was their courage and love for their nation. And after the war is over what will be the condition of the battle field in such terrible and horrifying battle. Dunant describes the after war scenery like this:

The stillness of the night was broken by groans, by stifled sighs of anguish and suffering. Heart-rending voices kept calling for help. Who could ever describe the agonies of that fearful night! [...] Bodies of men and horses covered the battle field, corpses were strewn over roads, ditches, ravines, thickets and fields; the approaches of Solferino were literally thick with dead. The fields were devastated, the wheat and corn laying flat on the ground, fences broken, orchards ruined, here and there were pools of bloods. The villages were deserted and bore the scars left by muskets shots, bombs, rockets, grenades and shells. (41)

This description makes us think what was the aid then given to the injured ones? Dunant writes, "Towards the end of the day when the shades of night began to cover this immense field of slaughter, many a French officer and soldiers went searching high and low for a comrade, a countryman, a friend" (38). They were searching the living one for the treatment. There were also the black flags floating which were the posts of the first - aid and the ambulances in the battlefield. And there was also a general consent made that no one shall fire in that direction and there were also the wagons loaded with bread, wine, meat, and soup for the fighters. But, there was also a great lack of the appropriate amount of these things. The insufficiency of the water, food, and medicine was the most disastrous one. Dunant watched all the injured ones and slowly by slowly engaged himself to the medication of the soldiers. Dunant then writes about the burial of the dead soldiers that moves the readers too. He writes, "It took three days and three nights to bury the dead on the battlefield, but in such a wide area many bodies which lay hidden in ditches, in trenches, or concealed under the

bushes or moulds of earth, were found much later, they, and the dead horse, gave a fearful stench" (48). There was no honor in this kind of burial of the dead soldiers. Dunant tried to work for the injured fighters to save them, to give them a little comfort while they were dying. He worked in many camps like Cavriana, Castiglione, Brescia, Maggiore, Chiesa, and etc. The time when Dunant started to work for the soldiers; he writes down his feelings like:

I succeeded by the Sunday morning, in getting together a certain number of women who helped as best they could with the efforts made to aid the wounded. It was not a matter of amputations or operations of any kind. But food, and above all drink, had to be taken around to men dying of hunger and thirst; then their wound could be dressed and their bleeding, vermin-covered bodies washed; all this in a scorching, filthy atmosphere in the midst of vile, nauseating odors, with lamentation and cries of anguish all around ! (62-63)

This passage shows the tragic situation of the soldiers, and their repentance for their indulgence in the warfare activity. As Dunant starts to work in the camps, there we can see more accurately what pain do the injured soldiers were undergoing. They were very grateful towards Dunant and they bore a grudge against the power holders of the state. They complained Dunant about the maltreatment and about the pains filled with their inner emotions. Dunant writes, "Don't let me die!" some of these poor fellows would exclaim and then, suddenly seizing my hand with extraordinary vigor..." (66), this extraordinary vigor is because of his kindness and help and a hope of living by the medical treatment. Dunant writes about the feelings of young corporal Claudius Mazuet and other soldiers in the passage below:

There was no hope for him, and of this he was fully aware. When I had helped him to drink, he thanked me, and added with tears in his eyes: "oh sir, if you could write to my father to comfort my mother!" I noted his parents' address

and a moment later he had ceased to live. An old sergeant, with several service stripes on his sleeve, said to me with the utmost suddenness with conviction, and with cold bitterness: "If I had been looked after sooner I might have lived, and now by evening I shall be dead!" And by evening he was dead. (66)

There are lots of such similar incidents with the bitter truth of war, which create a lot of pity in readers. A grenadier shouts writes Dunant "I don't want to die, I don't want to die"(66).The text is filled with similar incidents which are very heartrending and traumatic. His neutral care for everyone in the battlefield is very welcoming:

But the women of Castiglione, seeing that I made no distinction between nationalities, followed my example, showing the same kindness to all these women whose origins were so different, and all of whom were foreigners to them. "Tutti Fratelli "; they repeated feelingly. All honor to these compassionate women to these girls of Castiglione! (72)

Dunant has remembered the every single person who helped the soldiers during the war and included them in the text and thanked them all. He is grateful to the women of Castiglione, every doctor who worked for whole days and nights the people who donated money and foods for the soldiers and the visitors like Florence Nightengale. Then Dunant gives the data of the camps filled with wounded soldiers. In Brescia 30,000 to be cured by only 140 doctors, Basilica 1,000 in the cathedral of the same place 30,000. In Chiesa Maggiore nearly 500, at Guidizzolo nearly 1000, hundreds of Austrians in Volta and etc and their most striking wounded soldier's situation with their wailings have the description with many different incidents. Then, he talks about the severe amputations which were done without chloroform. Being unable to endure the pain of the amputation some of them were fainted with the pains while doing amputation.

Henry Dunant has mostly thought and felt for the warriors, who for the sake of nation fought so hard and risk their loss of life, and who had to remain handicapped there after throughout their lives only with the bitter memory of war and the feelings of betrayal and indifference of the state. They were miserable and bitter in the battle field, only left to die with groans and cries without being provided of a morsel of food, a glass of water and medication. Dunant at his level best tried to help them; to ease them, and make them a little comfort. He inspired to help and also organized the volunteer groups of town's people to help the warriors and show them little sympathy and reverence for their deeds, to those who were dying and were at the last moment of their life and to those who were wounded badly and groaning roughly in the battle field. The expressions of the wounded soldier evoke the bitter sense of war in the readers and arises the idea that war makes nothing good and the race of war is futile, nothing grand and good and the national achievement will do nothing for their personal pain and for the great loss of their family members. Dunant describes the changed feelings of the fighters after the war was over, like this:

"Oh, sir I am in such a pain!" several of these poor fellows said to me, "they desert us, leave us to die miserably, and yet we fought so hard!" They could get no rest although they were tired out and had not slept for nights. They called out in their distress for a doctor, and writhe in desperate, convulsions that ended in tetanus and death. [...] Another wretched man had a part of his face nose, lips and chin taken off by saber cut. He could not speak, and lay, half blind, making an uttering guttural sounds to attract attention. I gave him a drink and poured a little fresh water on his bleeding face. A third with his skull wide open was dying, spitting out his brains on the stone floor. His companions in suffering kicked him out of their way, as he blocked the passage. I was

able to shelter him for his last moments of his life, and I led a handkerchief over his poor head [...] (61-62)

We can see the war is the event where humanity, brotherhood, love and compassion are trampled down by the fighters' grin, hate and enmity. Dunant expresses, "How many silent tears were shed in that miserable night when all false pried, all human decencies even, were forgotten!" (38). There are other innumerable expressions of agonies expressed by both the writer and the injured armies of the battle field. Dunant has exclaimed like, "Oh, the agony and suffering during those days, the twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, and twenty-seven of the June! Wounds were infected by the heat and dust, by shortage of water and lack of proper care, and grew more and more painful"(60). Such was the critical condition of the war stroked armies. Everywhere there is the hateful picture of war'-devastation. Some of the Austrians, who were in the camps after the war, were terrified seeing the French soldiers even when they tried to help in their critical condition. When one Austrian army was given a "flask of water" (50) by the French man, with the suspicion the Austrian picked up a rifle laying near him and "he stroked at the French man with the butt with all the strength he had left" (50). There is also the similar example of "prince of Isenberg" (121). The war ultimately becomes the symbol of enmity with loss of faith, void of mercy and brotherhood and humanity remaining only the beastly instincts. Later, Dunant is told by an Austrian officer, "Do not be surprised by the harshness and roughness of some of our troops we have savages from the most distant corners of the empire" (51).The Austrian emperor is decreasing the value of the fighters who fight selflessly for the nation. Despite of praising their bravery he is making their values with that of a beast. This becomes the extreme sense of discourse exercised upon the war' fighters who become the story of bravery and tragedy is like this, "Brains sprout under the wheels, limbs are broken and torn, bodies puddle with blood, and the plain littered with human remains" (19-20). This inhumane activity acted by humans is fully traumatic because they

will gain nothing in the race of war but only death and bitter and painful war memory.

Dunant writes on further for the fighters like, "Truly it did seem in that battle that each man was fighting as if his own personal reputation were at stake, as though it had been the matter of his own credit that the victory should be own" (34). From the time of ancients there was trend of glorifying the wars by shading its all destructions, which is an act of discourse exercised by the national historian's canonical trend. Mostly, we get many novels, fictions and poems which praise the wars in the name of nationalism or national unity for the nation's cause or objective. War histories are always written in the perspective of nation. So there are some things flashed or highlighted like victory and bravery and many things are under the curtains or they are overlooked. Dunant presents one such event:

The Austrian Emperor was terrible. He had born himself like a hero, he had seen shot and shell raining around him all day long; and now he could not help weeping in the face of his disaster. In his disaster, he threw himself in to the path of the fleeing men calling them cowards. When calm succeeded these out of bursts of vehemence, he gazed in silence at the scene of desolation with the great tears streaming down his cheeks [...]. In their consternation, Austrians officers threw themselves into the teeth of death; such was their anger and despair. But they sold their lives dearly. Some of them killed themselves in their grief and fury, unable to bear to survive this fatal defeat. (36)

Obsessed for victory, they even not thinking of their family members take their life themselves. The weeping officers seem ridiculous in their situation. They seem more like puppets of nation. And what was the emperor Napoleon doing in the battlefield when the war was going on and what was his role there then, the question arises. He was directing the armies and was surrounded with hundreds of the army personnel and waiting eagerly for the

news of victory and after getting the message of victory, circulating it to the Empress. Dunant writes about him like this:

All day long the emperor Napoleon was to be seen wherever his presence seemed to be needed. He had with him Marshall vaillant, Meior-General of the army , General Martimprey, Assistant-Major-General, Count Roguet, Count de Montebello, General Fleury, the prince de la Moskowa, Colonels Reille and Robert, the Imperial Escort and the squadron of the One Hundred Guards. Where ever there were the most difficult obstacles to be overcome, the Emperor would himself direct the battle [...] and from there he sent a dispatch to the Empress to tell her of his victory. (36-37)

It looks like the war fought for the personal benefit of the emperors shake by the above mentioned indent. They will have nothing to loose personally in the war. So, victory is most desired by them and loosing the battle is extremely shameful to them. There are hundreds of guards for his service and if he is attacked by the opposing troops, they will oppose in need. He will get the most immediate treatment if he becomes injured during the war even if he is in the large crowds or amid the battle field. Therefore, Dunant by presenting the heavy death and destruction creates a negative war history, which is not in the side of the nation but for its demo graphs. The history of wars glory and the glory of the soldiers' bravery is deconstructed by personal feeling and the heightened pain of soldiers, their lamentations, the description of tragic situation of the wounded soldiers and the heavy destruction of the physical structures, which show the grim picture of war and arise disgust for war in the readers. There is the transmission of the pain of the soldiers in the readers and in the witness. Dunant tries to show that the collective hankering for victory by the fighters' becomes futile because it becomes the victory of the nation, and the emperors' only, because immediately after the war is over they are neglected in the battle field indifferently and without any esteem. Their bravery is not

counted anymore. The dead don't even get a decent burial. There is no medical support for the wounded soldiers' they are immediately forgotten by the state. They are left miserable in the battle field with full of the groans only to dye. In the text there are many expressions of emperors which show that the war was fought for their profit and the soldiers are only the means. Dunant describes:

Austrian prince was discovered among the dead bodies, wounded and unconscious from loss of blood. But he was immediately treated by the French surgeons and was eventually able to ho home, to his family who had given him up for dead and had been wearing mourning for him for several weeks.

[...]In the French army a certain number of soldiers were detailed from each company to identify and bury the dead. Usually they picked out the men of their own units. (48)

Here Dunant shows the picture of the discrimination among the high ranked officer and between the common soldiers. Though, every one in the battle field risk the life, the common soldier is not approached for the medicine like the Austrian prince he is searched and cured but others die even by the loss of blood by a small injury and many are buried alive. The state is indifferent towards the fighters' pain and their family members' great loss. Their dead bodies rot in the battle field. There is no medical appropriateness at all. We also see how the emperors are hankering for the victory and at his loss how he insults the fighters who dye selflessly for the sake for the nation. This too makes the readers hate war. There is also the issue of historical analysis of war that all war histories are full of traumas. Dunant compares the war of Solferino with the worst battles like Borodino, Leipinz and Waterloo which is the feeling of 'historical trauma', wherein war is always glorified in the name of nation. So, Dunant by presenting the similar situation of those battles with bitter aspects of war like 'Solferino' deconstructs their imprints. By raising the voice from the margin, which is the act

of 'reconstruction' of a new history of the deadly battle Solferino. He takes the war of Solferino as a "European catastrophe" (106). The grand objective itself becomes ridiculous in the cost of vast destruction of lives. Dunant has shown the marginal untraced parts of war which have become center in the text. Dunant writes:

In those Lombardy hospitals it could be seen and realized how dearly brought and how abundantly paid for is that commodity which men pompously call Glory! The battle of Solferino is the only one of this Nineteenth century which can be compared, for the number of casualties in it involved, with the battles of Borodino, Leipzig and Waterloo. (106)

There is not any effort of witness to numb his pain by distractions and dissociations. Neither the witness has avoided his traumatic memory which is also a symptoms of PTSD for the region to numb his pain rather in the memory of war witness, he is associated in his trauma which becomes an act of 'constructive coping' and in the flashback he has re-lived the war's scene filled with trauma, as proposed by the theorist Cathy Caruth, Dunant's traumatic memory of war too is unforgettable and this memory is creative and inspiring. We too see there is the fear of the occurrence of similar events in the future wars in the text, and there is also the political and social objective raised by witness to change the future situation of war affected peoples who are made victims, more clearly who become mere the scapegoat for such kind of grand political objectives like that of unification of nation or 'nationalism'. This thing the theorist Kali Tal writes in her theory of trauma is "to deconstruct the process by which the dominant culture codifies their traumatic experiences" (580). So, apart from the warriors Dunant too is the victim, a survivor and the witness of the war trauma. He has tried to change the future situation of war victims, by making it manageable by a major social change, by the help provided by the establishment of the institution ICRC (International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent). Thus, in trying to heal the problem of warriors,

he is too trying to heal the his traumatized self, which a war witness, a victim and a survivor undergoes. So, the book is a cry for the establishment of an organization which is active at the time of wars, and in peace time it makes the planning for the fulfillment of its objective:

But why have I told of all these scenes of pain and distress, and perhaps aroused painful emotions to my readers? [...] It is a natural question. Perhaps I might answer it by another: Would it not be possible, in the time the time of peace and quite, to form relief societies for the purpose of having care given to the wounded in war time by zealous, devoted and thoroughly qualified volunteers? (105)

Dunant helped the treatment of the fighters of the both the country, neutrally. His aspirations to save the lives in future wars also and to make the situation manageable in future, is a quest aroused by war trauma. He gives his humanitarian purpose both "human and Christian stand point" (116). He makes the proposal for the future for these societies making clear, how they should work in future. He says:

Societies of this kind once formed and their permanent existence assured, would naturally remain inactive in peace time. But they would always organized and ready for the possibility of war. They would have not only to secure the good will of the authorities of the countries in which they had been formed, but also in case of war, to solicit from the rulers of the belligerent states authorization and facilities enabling them to do effective work. (17)

Dunant makes the focus to these healing societies' importance showing their importance to the "Solferino war". He says, "If an international relief society had existed at the time of Solferino, and if there had been volunteer helpers at Castiglione on June 24, 25 and 26, or at Brescia at about the same time, as well as Mantua or Verona, what endless good they could have done!" (120-121). He tries to say that if such international relief societies could be there

at the time of Solferino war with the trained nurses and available doctors would save many lives and they would be able to manage the treatment of the fighters.

With the ruthless account of battle field and one is forced to think, what good is war? With the terrific feelings of war inauguration and its bitter splendor the readers despise war. Dunant's psyche is presented in the flashback method with narration, is a bitter memory which is printed in the text. In the fight climax men are in their animalistic instinct. The fighters while fighting have lost the sense of humanity, love, compassion, sympathy and brotherly feelings. These feelings have too shut down for the sake of fighting of the so called 'nation'. The mass slaughter is only the thing which is counted in the race of war. The blood of men, their sprouted brains, broken and massed limbs are scattered and puddle with mud, they don't have the value, not even of 'handful of soil'.

Now, talking about the language of the text, it is very impressive and it has very strong memory. Though being the account of war by the witness, there are also the other voices of war wounded people. The fighters talk of their own state and have their own representation. Their voice in the text, make a vivid visualization of war scenery. The description of the war area is also minutely presented. Every 'untraceable' thing of war is at the affront of the readers, which are often shadowed in the war glorification in other war journals, which always represent the national historiography. There is the minute representation of the psyche of warriors, workers, doctors, helpers, coachman, emperors, and the destroyed condition of the houses and structures are also minutely represented in the text, which is a very good 'reconstruction'. The very marginal things in the war are counted and re talked in Dunant's text. Dunant writes about his language in the text as:

Everyone has heard, or may, have read, same account of battle of Solferino.

The memory of it is so vivid that no one has forget it, especially as the consequences of that day are still being felt in many European countries.

I was a mere tourist with no part in this great conflict but it was my rare privilege through an unusual train of circumstance to witness the moving scene that I have resolved to describe. In these pages I give only my personal impression; so my readers should not look for specific details, nor for information on strategic matters; these things have their places in other writings. (16)

Both the warriors and the witness and even the emperors and family members are the people whom we can see be traumatized in warfare activity. The warriors are traumatized both physically and psychologically. They have the twin traumas. Obviously, having the physical destruction they also have the tragic sense of being "un-heard, un-cared, and being neglected", which makes them a big psychological pain. They will have only the bitter memory of pain, death, exhaustion, hunger and terror of war in future and no reverence for it at all. Like wise, the witness is affected psychologically. He is one, who rushed there for the sake of his business to up-lift it in Algeria, which was still under the French colony, by seeking the agreement on water right by emperor Napoleon but he is ultimately moved to work for these warriors voluntarily and who thereafter is bankrupted and gives up his business activity for the struggle of the establishment of ICRC. In *A Memory of Solferino* we can see the rise of his humanitarian self which is described in the following words:

The moral sense of the importance of human life; the human desire to lighten a little the torments of all these poor wretches, or restore their shattered courage; the furious and relentless activity which a man summons up at such moments: all these combine to create a kind of energy which gives one a positive craving to relieve as many as one can. There is no more grieving at the multiple scene of this fearful and solemn tragedy. [...] some small unexpected detail which

strikes closer to the soul seizing on our sympathies and shaking all the most sensitive fibers of our being. (73-74)

This motivation of his self to humanitarian purpose is to minimize or heal his traumatized self. As, Jon G Allen proposes in his psychiatric theory in "Coping with Trauma" we can see Dunant's effort towards healing through future hope working through an institution ICRC both to heal the warrior's pain by better care, medication and treatment, for war wounded people and also for his self to lessen his bitter memory of war. This 'constructive coping' of Dunant's war trauma is very inspiring and welcoming which ultimately was healed more or less by the establishment of the world wide institution, the ICRC.

There are many wishes of Dunant's in the concluding paragraphs, if there would have better transportation, effective treatment, language mediators to console the natives, there would be a good situation in the battle field. The anxious volunteers were tired, caught by fever and were wearied and discouraged to help. So he says there is need of voluntary orderlies, trained and experienced nurses and their "Mission facilitated and supported" (125). He calls for all the countries people to sit and talk for their advantage. He prepares the outlines for the ICRC. Dunant's is also anxious with the future arms which will be more and more destructive and he thinks it is also unable to avoid wars. He concludes his last paragraph by showing the danger of future war armaments and with the urgency to the need of ICRC for the preparation to save the lives in future in such warfare activities:

[...] it is more likely; on the other hand, that future battles will only become more and more murderous. Moreover, in this age when surprise plays so important a part it is not possible that war may arise, from one quarter or another, in the most sudden and unexpected fashion? And do not these considerations alone constitute more than adequate reason for taking precautions against surprise? (128)

The text is filled with multiple traumas, the trauma of nation, the trauma of the fighters, the trauma of the state holders, the trauma of relatives of the fighters and trauma of the witness. Their feelings described above proved to be traumatic. The text is the narration by the witness but all the other characters like the fighters and the emperors have got their place for their voice and feelings and they have their own true representation. Raising the voice from the marginal view point of the warriors and thinking for their conditions which is utterly tragic and unmanageable because of deaths, wounds, destructions, hunger, thirst and pain, the writer has made the a glorification of war. We can't get their wars' valour and glory but only grief, anxiety, pain, alienations and hatred filled in the fighters. The motive of the wars becomes ridiculous. This war we can take as the trauma and nothing better. Presenting the different tragic situation in the text and talking for the marginal soldiers the writer has deconstructed the canonical war histories.

IV. Conclusion

A Memory of Solferino proves to be an utterly traumatic text with a horrific detail of Solferino war, which is full of many un-visualized scenes of war unlike the other war histories. The text takes the marginal side in the wars' representation which is the reconstruction of a new war history, very different from the national war histories. It is a war history of marginalized warriors, their death, destruction, hunger, pain and exhaustion, anxiety, hatred and of the war which is waged for the sake of nation and emperors, where the fighters are only the means of the objective and it is an act of deconstruction. The history he constructs in *A Memory of Solferino* is a of a bitter memory and a true picture of pain and death of fighters, who are blasted by the shells, of destroyed structures, and of discourse exercised by the nations and emperors upon their subjects. This situation of the armies, make the exercise of war an act of violence by all the states.

The traumatic experiences of the war witness and trauma of fighters are widely presented in the text. But, actually, the writer is able to make a way out from the traumatic pain, an effort to lessen the trauma of the witness by presenting the death, destruction, and the injured to be helped and managed by the central institution of ICRC by all nations in future wars. Rather to flight he fights in the battlefield to save the lives of soldiers and by healing them, he is also benefiting in lessening his psychological pain which he got when he went through such a disturbing battle. Healing the trauma through the hope is a positive 'act' and this way of healing trauma is more positive and encouraging; unlike the act of flight or trying to numb it or ignore it. In over-all inspection, there are different kinds of trauma memories in the text, which are both physical and psychological as experienced by the soldiers and the war witness.

In *A Memory of Solferino* we get Dunant's inspiration to publicize his experience of war in the form of book; is thus instigated by the 'traumatic memory' with full of discourses, which he experienced in the battle field. And this traumatic memory is the cause which has instigated the writer to visualize what he has seen and felt in the war in the form of the text by very minute details and description to transform his feelings all over the world and to arouse feelings for the war fighters.

Works Cited

- Allen, Jon G. *Coping with Trauma*. Washington DC: American Psychiatrists Publishing, Inc, 2005.
- Berger, James. "Trauma and Literary Theory." *Contemporary Literature* 38.3 (1997): 369-582.
- Boissier, Pierre. *History of the International Committee of the Red Cross*. Geneva: Henry Dunant Institute, 1985.
- Brown, Pam. *Henry Dunant*. Chalk Hill, Britain: Exley Publication Ltd, 1988.
- Cathy, Caruth. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History*. Baltimore: Jhon Hopkins UP, 1996.
- ."Violence and Time: Traumatic Survivals." *Assemblage* 20 (Apr. 1993): 24-25.
- Cote, William, and Roger Simpson. *Covering Violence: A Guide to Ethical Reporting About Victims and Trauma*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Dunant, Henry. *A Memory of Solferino*. Geneva: The International Committee of the Red Cross, 1986.
- Edikins, Jenny. "Introduction: Trauma, Violence and the Political Community." *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd, 2003.1-19.
- Hartman, Geoffrey. "On Traumatic Knowledge and Literary Studies." *New Literary History* 26 (Summer 1995): 537-563.
- LaCapra, Dominick. *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory and Trauma*. Ithaca: Corell Up, 1994.
- Morehead, Caroline. "Dunant's Dream, War, Switzerland and History of the Red Cross." <http://www.dunantdream.com:par.:1-47>
- Toremans, Tom. "Trauma Theory: Reading (and) Literary Theory on the Wake of Trauma." *European Journal of English Studies* 7.3 (April, 2003): 333-351.

