Circulation, Internationalization, Globalization of the Question of Memory

MARIE-CLAIRE LAVABRE*

Abstract The connotations linked to the notion of memory – when it is defined as collective or social– have only recently emerged. "Memory" is a mostly polysemic concept in social sciences. It also represents a social phenomenon. If the discourse surrounding memory seems to be largely internationalised, it has come at the cost of discrepancies in temporalities, theoretical traditions and objects of history. A general synthesis would be improbable. Today it appears that three big problematical concepts co-exist, from French literature but largely exported: the "realms of memory" (Pierre Nora), the "work of recollection" (Paul Ricoeur), the "frameworks of memory" (Maurice Halbwachs).

*****

It is widely acknowledged that the so-called question of "memory" is heading towards "globalization"[1]. The organizers of a symposium, which recently gathered in Paris some twenty-five researchers from thirteen French research institutes in Europe, Asia, Latin America and Africa, took note of this obvious fact and symptomatically chose as a federative theme "Presences of the past. Memories and societies in the contemporary world"[2]. However, several levels must be differentiated:

- that of the circulation, sometimes of the exportation or even the application to heterogeneous contexts, of one or several problematics or notions related to the question of memory in social sciences,
- that of the internationalization of the memorial phenomenon, whether social and/or political, independently from the historical experiences in question, which can be contrasted as well as specific, independent, or antagonistic and interacting, interdependent,
- that of the possible globalization of some of the contents of memory.

Today, the thematics of memory is largely *internationalized*, in the sense that in the last quarter of the 20th century there was an outbreak of "social memories", or more precisely an outbreak of

* Professor Marie-Claire Lavabre is Directrice de recherche au CNRS at the Institut des Sciences sociales du Politique – ISP/CNRS and can be contacted at: mlavabre@u-paris10.fr

their public expression over all the continents. This does not nec-
essarily mean that the contents as such are *globalized*, even if it
is true that certain past experiences may seem to have been
widely shared through time and space. This does not mean either
that the representations, concepts, notions and words that are the
vehicles of a phenomenon are the same, even if certain themes such
as national identity, minorities' rights, justice, the recognition of
victims and reconciliation, can here and there accompany the
question of memory.

Narratives about the past by nations and states are not some-
thing new. But the explosion of the memorial phenomenon stems
largely from the increase in utterances from specific groups,
whether intranational or transnational groups, and from the range
of scales on which the narrative of past experience is legitimately
expressed. Herein lies a paradox that undoubtedly invites us to be
cautious. It is again and always advisable to compare and draw up
an inventory of existing differences before concluding on the exist-
ence of similarities. But on the same impulse it seems that is also
advisable to understand how and why "memory" can today be the
subject of a shared concern, a common vocabulary and common
concepts in China, as well as in Latin America, the United States,
Europe or Africa.

Yet, it would be rather presumptuous – and unconvincing – to
pretend that we can reasonably assess the question of memory
today, insofar as comments and researches have developed both
qualitatively and qualitatively, whereas they were almost non-
existent in the 1970s. The memorial phenomenon itself can take
extremely diverse shapes, sometimes carried by the decomposition
and recomposition of national myths, sometimes fed by specific
political or social experiences, both individual and shared, and
sometimes boosted by the circulation of paradigms. This fact as
such raises a series of questions and brings up alongside a few
difficulties, starting with the very definition of memory[3].

This will be my first general point, even though it relies on what
is by definition merely a fragmentary knowledge of the writings in
social sciences, on the one hand, and on specific forms of the
memorial phenomenon on the other hand. In other words, it is
mostly based on thoughts/reflections on the French situation, and
by extension on what anybody can now know about the *interna-
tionalization* of the question of memory.

The issue here is not to present an operational theory of collective
memory or a personal interpretation of the social memorial phenom-
enon but to make visible the uses of the concept in social sciences.

It is worth repeating that memory as the capacity to remember
was still, not so long ago, strictly referred to the individual or to a

group of individuals, defined in time and space and the vehicle of a lived historical experience. On the other hand, the narratives of the collective past referred to history, which was established by the academic and/or learned communities, and was commemorated by the political authorities. "We are not yet used, Maurice Halbwachs wrote in the interwar years, to talking about the memory of a group, even in metaphor"[4]: nowadays, this statement of facts seems strange, and it would be advisable instead to reverse it and to emphasize how the notion of memory as applied to the nation, to the collective and to society, has become rather obvious.

When one gets straight to the heart of the matter, uttering these questions and difficulties therefore constitutes a first element on which we can reflect. The first aforementioned statements of facts concerning memory, which is traditionally referred to the definition, more complex than it seemed, given by Saint Augustine of the "present of things past", shows indeed that this question now constitutes an angle of attack, and a problematics that has become a major one in social sciences in France, but obviously not exclusively so. However, in the same movement, what we will for the time being call the memorial phenomenon is as such, an issue, sometimes a claim, a resource, in particular a political one, everywhere, especially in contexts of strong breaks or intense political and social mutations.

The so-called question of memory thus has a twofold aspect. "Memory" is a concept in social sciences, or more precisely a notion, and a mostly polysemic one, and as such it is the subject of controversies among observers and analysts. It also represents a social phenomenon, called as such by social and/or political actors. Therein lies the first difficulty. In fact, the vocabulary of memory now circulates between different spheres, whether scientific, political, social or media-related. While it is undoubtedly not relevant to inveigh against the proliferation of the memorial phenomenon, we should yet pay attention to the confusion that might result from accepting a vocabulary common to observers, historians, anthropologists and other sociologists on the one hand, and to the actors or contractors of memory on the other hand.

Thus, for instance, an example of this confusion can be seen in the notion of the "duty to remember", now widespread in France and rather often summoned by the political and social actors, and in the notion of the "overuse of memory", which is supposed to thwart the former and has been formulated by some analysts of the memorial phenomenon[5], on a quite similar register as far as its theoretical grounds are concerned[6]. We could also bring up the "pact of forgiveness", born from the political will in Spain. Many commentators have adopted it to describe the specificity of the Spanish transition to

democracy, after Franco's death,[7] instead of notions, like the "pact of silence" or the "pact of denial"[8], which, though close, would have authorized, because of this tiny discrepancy with the political vocabulary, the concrete analysis of the coexistence of eclipse and handing down, and consequently may have forestalled the "return of memory" as can be observed in recent years in Spanish public space. More generally, the too easy utilization of the notion of forgetfulness can only puzzle anyone who has become aware of the paradox that "struggle against forgetfulness" can only be formulated when the past has not been forgotten[9], or who has become aware of this so often established fact that "nothing is forgotten" in a society[10], which was the case in Spain, but also in Poland after the implementing the policy of making a "clean break with the past" about the communist period, or in the former Soviet Union. A Polish journalist could say that "the Poles have forgotten everything but have nothing forgiven". This brilliant formulation is not a paradox if we understand that silencing the past is not forgetting.

This first remark on the duality of "memory" as a *theoretical* and conceptual object and as a *real*, social object also invites us to emphasize that the notion of memory in the social sciences has itself a specific history. This history is relatively recent, while of course the social phenomena related to the presence of the past are not a new thing. Nietzsche himself analyzed the reasons why we "need history" and the uses and misuses of the past[11]. For now, all we need is to bring to mind – once again with the help of the French examples of the religious wars or of the French Revolution – the existence of an oral tradition coming from the war of the Camisards (the French Protestant insurgents after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which guaranteed religious freedom), which could be felt up to the "Camisardization" of the Cevenol resistance during World War II[12], or to think of the perennial stamp of the massacre of Lucs in the Vendée, which has yet "not left any clear archivistic trace"[13]. "Memory", whether it is understood as the remembrance of lived and/or handed down experience or as the exploitation of this experience according to the political uses of the past, is therefore not something new. This is evidenced in the works of Moses Finley[14], who in the early 1970s expressed his concern of seeing historians and sociologists constitute the uses of history into a legitimate object. However, what is new is, on the one hand, the memorial phenomenon claimed as such by social and political actors, and on the other hand, the attention paid by social sciences to this phenomenon, dating from the mid-1970s, particularly in France – apart from the founding theories of Maurice Halbwachs and the repercussions they found in Roger Bastide's work on religions in Brazil in the 1960s[15].

However, as we have already emphasized, the question of memory (and there again, the vocabulary which is related to it) is now largely internationalized, maybe at the cost of a few misunderstandings. This point constitutes in itself the second difficulty that should be stressed. The question of memory is raised almost everywhere, in Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America, because of dictatorships, wars, massacres, and of the genocides perpetrated in the twentieth century against the Armenians, the European Jews, the Tutsi in Rwanda and elsewhere. In short the question of memory is the question of the settling of past scores. This question is also raised as a result of the forced transfer of populations, the aftermaths of slavery and colonialism, to say nothing of the more invisible but largely shared splits caused by economic migrations, the de-industrialization or the disappearance of farming worlds. The very designation of the phenomena in question is itself an object of memory, a memorial issue. For all that, this enumeration could not exhaust the objects, the demands and the conflicts over memory such as they are now coming up at the social, political and scientific levels. To the circulation of the vocabulary of memory between different spheres can thus be added the international circulation of approaches and models. Examples of this can be found in the spreading of the title of "Righteous", which is yet related to the specific context of the creation of the title of "Righteous among Nations" by the state of Israel to honour the non-Jews who saved Jews during World War II[16], the spreading of the Truth and Reconciliation commission, or the expertise of the Georg-Eckert research institute on textbooks, whose raison d'être, beyond the German context at its origin, is reconciliation through the production of an official narrative on prejudices[17]. "Ideas have legs"[18]: this phrase used as the epigraph to an analysis of the circulation of the pacification techniques from the bottom up[19] indicates that in at least this field, that of the policies concerning the resolution of intra- or international conflicts and of reconciliation, the ideas are carried by easily identifiable transnational actors[20].

The internationalization and the circulation of vocabulary do not mean the absence of discrepancies. These discrepancies are first temporal, since the emergence of the notion of memory in the political debate on the one hand, and its emergence as an object within the social sciences on the other hand, takes place at different rates here and there. These discrepancies are also, in all likelihood, theoretical, in the sense that the contents given to the notion, the epistemological traditions or the reference authors conveying it are not necessarily equivalent everywhere. If we only take one example: Jan Assmann[21], widely dominant in Germany, is not

much mobilized in France where Pierre Nora[22], Paul Ricœur[23] and Maurice Halbwachs[24] represent three relatively different ways of thinking the same question. We will return to this later. On top of these temporal and theoretical discrepancies – or more simply of definition on the object "memory" – are added or superposed historical discrepancies, or strictly speaking discrepancies of contents. It is of little use to linger over these as they are so obvious. They are related to the specifically chronological inscription and to the nature of the events and the divisions which, here and there, involves the question of settling past scores, or more widely of "memory", since it is true that the latter is not necessarily and deterministically confined to the existence of founding event(s), which are retrospectively considered as such[25]. "All social thinking is a memory[26]": in that sense, "the present of things past", in its twofold dimension of a *trace* of the past – possibly blind to itself – and of an *evocation* or an elective reference to the past[27], memory, as the "image of the similarity between past and present[28]", is also the ordinary of social worlds, groups and the individuals belonging or identifying with these groups, and realizing, in the final analysis, the memories that are called "collective" or socially shared.

When one glances through the literature written on memory, even fragmentarily, one can in fact perceive the utmost diversity of how this notion has been used, as a concept or analytical framework and as a social reality. Public narratives of the past (whether historian, judicial, mythical, fictional or aesthetic), uses and misuses of the past and political exploitations, museums and monuments, shared or fragmented identities, whether at the national or infra-national level, collective and individual traces and evocations of the experience or sufferings shared at different levels, whether at the international or national level or at the level of "intermediary" groups or of "emotional communities"[29], and at social, political and ethnic levels: memory is really there, everywhere, and may encompass too much not to thereby indicate if not the metaphorical nature of the notion, at least its polysemic nature.

Although this first series of remarks may have contributed to blur the obviousness of the notion of memory and to dent the twofold fiction of an assured, if not common, vocabulary, and of a shared interpretation of the memorial phenomenon, it is nevertheless a fact that there eventually are a limited number of approaches, definitions and arguments.

If they are not definitely representative, the French writings authorize an appraisal, some setting in order of the different connotations of the notion of memory, even if one has to keep in mind that beyond the observable divergences outlined beforehand – the temporal, theoretical and historical divergences – there are also

points of convergence, due to the very fact that the aforementioned problematics of memory is internationalized or even that certain concepts are being exported. This will be my second point.

In France the question of memory consists of a few canonical, if not fossilized, references: starting with Maurice Halbwachs, a pioneer thinker of "collective memory", and ending with Pierre Nora, whose great work, *Realms of Memory,* is more characteristic of the memorial moment that occupies us and has been largely exported. Nowadays, memory is a major object of social sciences and a recurrent issue in the public and political debate, in which the stands taken by the specifically political actors and those taken by the observers and analysts of the memorial phenomenon mix with each other.

When one confines oneself to the situation in the social science, it is advisable to take up and try to put in order a few elements already sketched. It seems that there are three great problematics coexisting nowadays, that is, three great paradigms of memory. It is true in France, but it seems to be also true elsewhere, with slight differences in the temporality, which will not be analyzed in detail here. The first paradigm is that of Pierre Nora's "realms", the second is that of the "work through" or "work of recollection", to which Paul Ricoeur must be associated, and the third is that of the "social frameworks of memory", which stems from the thinking of Maurice Halbwachs on "collective memory", i.e. on the social conditions of the production and evocation of memories. Although these three paradigms coexist, and are sometimes superimposed, they nonetheless each have a distinctive history, are the products of different chronologies, are essentially anchored in different disciplines, and focus on different objects. Even though Maurice Halbwachs might be considered as a precursor (*The Frameworks of Memory* were published in 1925, *The Legendary Topography of the Gospels* in 1942, *On Collective Memory*, published posthumously in its first version in1950), he is not an origin. On the contrary, it was because of the memorial wave and vogue that the Halbwachs of memory – and not the more classic sociological writer of social morphology, the standards of living or the causes of suicide – was to be rediscovered, republished and quite recently become the object of a biography[30] that set him up as an intellectual and political figure of the interwar years. Incidentally maybe, and yet symptomatically: even if Maurice Halbwachs involved himself in the political life of his time and died in the camps, his political stature may be more debatable, strictly speaking an effect of memory and of the contagion of the contemporary forms of the memorial on the thinker of "collective memory". Be that as it may, sociology was not at the forefront of the contemporary movement of interest for the "present

of the past". Historians were the first to take memory as an object, hence a sometimes excessive attention paid to the distinction between history and memory in the very definition of memory, particularly in France. "Memory" refers to the forms of the presence of the past that do not fall within the scope of history (understood as the expertise, methods and demands of the work of an historian). If we take this to extremes, we might add that in the most contemporary period this roundabout definition of memory has resulted in an epistemological oddity that consists in opposing and prioritizing an academic discipline – subject to the necessity of finding evidence and argument – and a social phenomenon that is disqualified even before being analyzed, if not with reference to the norm constituted by the intelligibility of the past and the establishment of a fact. In that case, and logically so, the falsifications of history would come within the scope of memory[31] while "the ambition of truth[32]" of memory, insofar as it proves that something did happen, would be considered to be unimportant.

The fact remains that it is chronologically legitimate to first consider the problematics of realms, when it is a matter of giving an account of the present state of social sciences, which is clearly associated to Pierre Nora's name[33]. It mostly comes from historians, and it remains quite largely dominant, at least in the definition of memory that it presupposes. It was largely popular through its multiple translations and it gave rise to national versions in Germany[34], in Italy (even if the spirit and the epistemology of these *Realms of memory* are different[35]), in the Netherlands, etc. As far as it chose as an object the genealogy of the representations of the symbols on which collective identities, public narratives of the past and even more political uses of the past focus, the first signs of this problematics can however be found in the 1960s in a seminar given by René Rémond at the Institute of political studies in Paris ("History, duration, memory and politics") or in the aforementioned thoughts of Moses Finley on the uses and misuses of history and the command for historians to take the uses of the past as an object. The detail of the chronology of the emergence of *Realms of memory* in France in the mid-1970s could be developed further, but it is of little importance here[36]. We will remember what Pierre Nora acknowledged in 1978 about the "liberating divorce between history and memory" and the program he announced: to make memory the "spearhead" of a new historiography[37].

From being counter-commemorative and critical of memory this project turned out to be perverted, according to Pierre Nora himself, by its success, and in this the nostalgia for a national identity strongly rooted in a unified and unifying narrative of the past undoubtedly contributed. The mid-1970s and the intense social,

political and economic changes that marked this period constitute an ideal breeding ground. *Realms of memory* were born out of a "feeling of loss". In certain respects, from the perspective of the most contemporary interests that often carry the interest in memory, they seem relatively appeased: when twenty years later this enterprise was assessed, one could note the absence of the themes of colonization and communism – if not on the Franco-French mode of the duel and the duo of communist and Gaullist memories – or notice that "the Republic" did not refer to the best shared representations of the "Fifth"[38]. Favoured by historians, the problematics of the *Realms* however bears the acknowledgement of the conflict of interpretations, rehabilitates historiography as the history of history and sanctions the return of politics in history in the same movement. The "memories" of an experience are less important than the shared representations of the national past which, in the long term, are supposed to be – not without relevance -, influenced by the teaching of history, "the early inculcation of an affective relation to the past[39]" and other public narrative of the past.

The second paradigm is that of the "work of recollection". It is associated with Paul Ricoeur's name, and its literal phrasing was exported from psychoanalysis. When the largely shared – and spread – uses of this problematics are caricatured, societies, like individuals, can be sick of their past. They have to make an effort to remember, just like someone does a "work of mourning" to reach the "right memory", the right forgetfulness and the reconciliation with the other as well as with oneself. If with Paul Ricœur and Tsvetan Todorov this problematics clearly belongs to the normative register and to philosophical and political thought, however it is not foreign to the earlier thinking of Henry Rousso on Vichy[40] or of Benjamin Stora[41] on Algeria. It went through a strong increase in importance from the 1990s onwards, in reaction to the nonetheless intrusive emergence of the "duty to remember". Though it does not give us any information about the precise dating of this second paradigm, the subject of the 1993 baccalaureat in the regional education authority of Paris, "Is there a duty to remember?", represents a relatively good barometer of the climate of that period and of the spreading of a notion that until then had been restricted to the narrower circles of World War II commemorators[42]. In many respects, this paradigm now overlaps, at least partially, the paradigm of the "Realms of memory", in the sense that it meets the current concern for memorial demands, on the one hand, and the political willingness to settle the scores of the past, to formulate political technologies of appeasement and the resolution of past conflicts, and to reduce resentment, on the other hand. In other

words, the question raised is to know how to influence memory in order to restore, at different levels, the community that has been torn apart by a conflict and its memory.

The third paradigm, which is in the minority or is less visible because it is less directly invested by social and political actors and is more strictly confined to the academic sphere, is the paradigm of the "social frameworks of memory". It is associated with Maurice Halbwachs's name, and it is rather inscribed in sociology, and political sociology in particular. When the political uses of the past and the memorial strategies rely on the shared belief that memory, i.e. the memories lived or handed down by experience, can be influenced; when political concern for reconciliation or the democratic living together is legitimate and is achieved in formulating means of influencing memory, the problematics of the social frameworks of memory chooses as an object to open the black box, to think over the interactions between the uses of the past and memories, to empirically establish what the shared representations of the past are and thus to answer the question which should be raised beforehand: can memory be influenced, and under which conditions?

These three paradigms are superimposed and are not necessarily incompatible. They nevertheless mobilize slightly different definitions of memory, or even contradictory definitions, and focus on empirically distinct objects. At the cost of a misunderstanding on Pierre Nora's explicitly counter-commemorative, critical and genealogical aim, the paradigm of the *Realms of memory* thrives when what is at stake is to strengthen politically, or even to scientifically describe national or collective identities referred to the past[43]. The recurrent concern to identify European *realms of memory* and to contribute to the construction of an improbable common memory[44] evidences this prescriptive dimension. The concern to make a *work of recollection*, an effort to remember, at the cost of an odd reversal between hermeneutics and determinism[45] – considering Paul Ricœur's thought – emphasizes the "trauma" from the past, the victims and the rifts. The privileged scale can be transnational as well as national. Memorial fragmentation, the conflict and competition of memories, and the resulting demands are still condemned. Finally, the paradigm of the *social frameworks of memory* refers back to questions that are only outwardly naive: who, what, when, how, why?

Who: who is the subject of memory or, more exactly of these so-called social or collective memories; what is the relevant scale of the community and consequently of the analysis? What: what are the contents and the objects of social memory? Must the emphasis be put on the "policies of memory" now claimed by the states, on

commemorations and other monuments, or on the memories of lived and/or transmitted experience? When: in which conditions and following which schedule does a shared experience come into presence or become the subject of narratives, or even of uses, particularly political uses, of the past? Is it relevant to dissociate the legitimate regaining of the past by individuals, and the uses by groups, authorized witnesses or spokespeople, which are always likely to turn into the misuse or the abuse of the past? How: how do we go from the multiplicity of the memories of an experience to the unicity of a so-called "collective" memory, or conversely, how do we go – if it is possible – from a "policies of memory" to socially shared representations of the past? Why: this question is undoubtedly the most complex. It often finds a too simple answer in a too narrowly strategic conception of memory. In the polysemy characterizing the use of this notion, several examples of which have already been given, memory is all at once a trace and an evocation of the past, an effect of the past and an effect of the present, an interaction between the memories of an experience and the policies of memory. In conclusion, this expression brings us back to Halbwachs. His complex thinking on the movements of thought, which are "as invisible as the air we breathe" and constitute the facts of memory, and his analysis on the evolution that makes us go, in Gurvitch's words, from "the transcendence to the immanence of memory", always constitutes the best criticism of his own caricature. In the end, Halbwachs enables us to think the social conditions of evocation and the expression of past experiences. Otherwise, "memory does not explain anything"[46] and can be explained with difficulty.

We can now summarize the position or point of view which organized the attempt to order the different connotations of the notion of memory in the French context. This quick detour via the sociology of memory[47] invites us to consider that the notion of "memory," as first defined by the usage historians make of it, must absolutely not be confused with that of "collective memory," strongly connoted by recollection and the trace of actual experience. That doesn't mean that" collective memory boils down to adding up memories stored by individuals. It is a socialized process of concentrating the diversity of possible representations and homogenizing recollections, the interactions between memory policies as formulated by groups – represented by spokesman, authorized witnesses, notables or memory entrepreneurs – and the recollection of actual experience[48]. This definition of "collective memory" is essentially based on Maurice Halbwachs' and Roger Bastide's ideas but it also takes into account progress in the history of memory, in that the latter has brought to light institutional forms of the presence of the past[49], which Maurice Halbwachs had in fact neglected. If this

definition is accepted, then the major question for the sociology of memory involves investigating the modalities of this interaction between memory policies and living memory or recollections. In other words, the question is to what degree do memory policies influence shared representations of the past or, even more precisely, to what extent are memory policies, easily identifiable and observable, likely to act on the recollection of actual or handed down experience.

Clearly, the first two paradigms identified, which choose the political uses of the past and the political technologies of appeasement as an object or interest, are not only *internationalized* but can easily be *globalized* whenever the scale of the analysis is that of the States, the Nations and the transnational. The concepts related to these conceptions of memory are also the most easily acceptable for the political actors who formulate the national or transnational narratives of the past or for the aforementioned experts of the techniques of pacification or reconciliation. The third approach, which favours the scale of individual representations, of continuity and the intergenerational handing down of lived experience, is not for all that less relevant for our object from the moment that the question of globalization is also the question of the circulation of categories giving meaning to historical experiences.

Notes

[1] Rousso, Henry. 2007. "Vers une mondialisation de la mémoire." Vingtième siècle. Revue d'histoire 94:p. 3–10.

[2] Racine, Jean-Luc. 2007. "Présences du passé. Mémoires et sociétés du monde contemporain." Musée du quai Branly. The articles can be seen on the following website: http://www.archivesaudiovisuelles.fr. The inaugural lecture has been published: Lavabre, Marie-Claire. 2008. "Paradigmes de la mémoire." Transcontinentale.

[3] The following text partly takes up the thoughts started in the aforementioned article: Lavabre, Marie-Claire. 2008. "Paradigmes de la mémoire." Transcontinentale.

[4] Halbwachs, Maurice and Lewis A. Coser. 1992. On collective memory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[5] Todorov, Tzvetan. 1998. Les abus de la mémoire. Paris: Arléa.

[6] Lavabre, Marie-Claire and Sarah Gensburger. 2005. "Entre devoir de mémoire et abus de la mémoire: la sociologie de la mémoire comme tierce position." In Histoire, mémoire et épistémologie: A propos de Paul Ricoeur ed. Bertrand Müller. Lausanne: Payot.

[7] Rozenberg, Danielle. 2003. "Espagne. La mémoire retrouvée: 1975–2002." Matériaux pour l'histoire de notre temps 70.

[8] Kaes, René. 1989. "Ruptures catastrophiques et travail de la mémoire." In Violence d'état et psychanalyse, ed. Janine Pujet. Paris: Dunod.

[9] Martin, Jean-Clément. 2007. La Vendée et la Révolution: Accepter la mémoire pour écrire l'histoire. Paris: Librairie Académique Perrin.

[10] Halbwachs, Maurice and Lewis A. Coser. 1992. *op. cit.*

[11] Nietzsche, Friedrich, Giorgio Colli, Mazzino Montinari and Pierre Rusch. 1992. Considérations inactuelles. [Paris]: Gallimard.

[12] Joutard, Philippe. 1977. La légende des Camisards: une sensibilité au passé. Paris: Gallimard. See also: Joutard, Philippe. 1983. Ces voix qui nous viennent du passé. Paris: Hachette.

[13] Martin, Jean-Clément and Xavier Lardière. 1992. Le massacre des Lucs. Vendée 1794. Vouillé: Geste Éditions.

[14] Finley, Moses I. and François Hartog. 1981. Mythe, mémoire, histoire: les usages du passé. Paris: Flammarion.

[15] Bastide, Roger. 1978. The African religions of Brazil: toward a sociology of the interpenetration of civilizations. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press., and Bastide, Roger. 1970. "Mémoire collective et sociologie du bricolage." L'année sociologique 21:65–108.

[16] Gensburger, Sarah. 2004. "La création du titre de Juste parmi les Nations 1953–1963." Bulletin du Centre de Recherche Français de Jérusalem 15:15–35.

[17] Bazin, Anne. 2006. "La construction d'une expertise de la réconciliation: l'Institut Georg Eckert de recherche sur les manuels scolaires" In Après le conflit, la réconciliation ? Actes révisés des journées d'étude organisées par l'institut des sciences sociales du politique, ed. Sandrine Lefranc. Paris: Michel Houdiard.

[18] The title of a book by Peter Howard, the leader of Moral Re-Armament, quoted by Lefranc, Sandrine. 2008. "Du droit à la paix: La circulation des techniques internationales de pacification par le bas." Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales 174:49–69.

[19] *Idem.*

[20] *Idem.*

[21] Assmann, Jan. 2002. Das kulturelle Gedächtnis Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen. 4. Aufl. Edition. München: Beck.

[22] Nora, Pierre. 1984. Les Lieux de mémoire I/ La République. Paris: Gallimard.; Nora, Pierre. 1986. Les Lieux de mémoire II/La nation. Paris: Gallimard.; Nora, Pierre and Maurice Agulhon. 1992. Les Lieux de mémoire III/ Les France. Paris: Gallimard.

[23] Ricœur, Paul. 2000. La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli. Paris: Seuil.

[24] Halbwachs, Maurice and Lewis A. Coser. 1992. *op. cit.* Also see: Halbwachs, Maurice and Gérard Namer. 1994. Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire. Paris: Albin Michel. and Halbwachs, Maurice. 1971. La topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte; étude de mémoire collective. 2. éd. Edition. Paris,: Presses universitaires de France.

[25] Ricoeur, Paul. 1990. "Evénement et sens." In L'espace et le temps, Actes du XXIIème congrès de l'Association des sociétés de philosophie de langue française Dijon: Vrin.

[26] Halbwachs, Maurice and Gérard Namer. 1994. op. cit.

[27] Lavabre, Marie-Claire. 1995. "Entre histoire et mémoire: à la recherche d'une méthode." In La guerre civile entre histoire et mémoire, ed. Jean-Clément Martin. Nantes: Ouest Editions.

[28] Halbwachs, Maurice and Lewis A. Coser. 1992. op.cit.

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] Becker, Annette. 2003. Maurice Halbwachs, un intellectuel en guerres mondiales (1914–1945). Paris: Agnès Viénot Editions.

[31] See the contribution of both Pierre Nora and Youri Afanasiev, «Mémoire», *in* Afanassiev, Youri and Marc Ferro eds. 1989. 50 idées qui ébranlent le monde: Dictionnaire de la Glasnost. Paris: Payot.

[32] Ricœur, Paul. 2000. *op. cit.*

[33] Nora, Pierre. 1984. 1986. 1992. *op. cit.*

[34] Etienne, François and Schulze Hagen eds. 2007. Mémoires allemandes. Paris: Gallimard.

[35] Isnenghi, Mario. 2006. L'Italie par elle-même. Lieux de mémoire italiens de 1848 à nos jours. Paris: Éd. Rue d'Ulm.

[36] Lavabre, Marie-Claire. 1994. "Usages de l'histoire, usages de la mémoire." Revue Française de science politique:480–492.

[37] Nora, Pierre. 1978. "La mémoire collective." In La nouvelle histoire, ed. Jacques Le Goff. Paris: Retz-CEPL.

[38] See the virtual seminar «Histoire et mémoire: regards croisés» on www.anamnesis.fl.ulaval.ca.

[39] Ansart, Pierre. 1981. "Manuels d'histoire et inculcation d'un rapport affectif au passé." In Manuels d'histoire et mémoire collective. Université de Paris VII.

[40] Rousso, Henry. 1987. Le syndrome de Vichy: 1944–198. Paris: Seuil. see also: Rousso, Henry and Philippe Petit. 1998. La hantise du passé: entretien avec Philippe Petit. Paris: Éditions Textuel.

[41] Stora, Benjamin. 1991. La gangrène et l'oubli: la mémoire de la guerre d'Algérie. Paris: La Découverte.

[42] Lavabre, Marie-Claire and Sarah Gensburger. 2005. op.cit.

[43] Rousso, Henry. 2004. "Das Dilemma eines europäischen Gedächtnisses." Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History 1 (Online-Ausgabe).

[44] See in particular Gouez, Aziliz. 2005. "La question de l'identité européenne dans la construction de l'Union." In Reconnaître ce qui nous lie: l'identité européenne: http://www.notre-europe.eu/fr/axes/visions-deurope/travaux/publication/la-question-de-lidentite-europeenne-dans-la-construction-de-lunion/. See also Rousso, Henry. 2004. op. cit.

[45] Laplanche, Jean. "Entre déterminisme et herméneutique, une nouvelle position de la question", *in* Laplanche, Jean. 1992. La Révolution copernicienne inachevée, travaux 1965–1992. Paris: Aubier.

[46] Confino, Alon. 2006. Germany as a culture of remembrance: promises and limits of writing history. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

[47] For further discussion of this topic, see Marie-Claire Lavabre, 1998, "Maurice Halbwachs et la sociologie de la mémoire," *Raison présente*, no. 128.

[48] Lavabre, Marie-Claire, 1994, Le fil rouge, sociologie de La mémoire communiste, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po. See also on this point Michael Pollack's illustration in 1990, L'expérience concentrationnaire, Essai sur le maintien de l'identité sociale, Paris, A.M. Métailié.

[49] See in particular on this point Henry Rousso's considerations, 1987,Le syndrome de Vichy, Paris, Seuil.