



REMEMBERING & FORGETTING Workshop Report

This event, the first of the four subject-focused Workshops of the ESF-COST Synergy 2009-10 *Cultural Literacy in Contemporary Europe*, was held on 14-16 December 2009 at the Institute of Germanic & Romance Studies, University of London. It was coorganised by Naomi Segal (IGRS) and Daniela Koleva (Sofia). The report below details the 18 position papers delivered and the discussions of the 3 break-out sessions, which were summarised in reports given to plenaries. This report has four Appendices:

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>CONTENT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Appendix 1a	List of delegates attending + biographical details) – <i>these include four who were unable to attend, see below</i>	14
Appendix 1b	Distribution of delegates by nationality etc	15
Appendix 1c	Biographical details of delegates	16
Appendix 2a	Programme of the Workshop	22
Appendix 2b	List of break-out groups	24
Appendix 3	Pre-workshop comments sent by these delegates (+ by those unable to attend: Crownshaw, Kelleher, Kvietkauskas and Rév) and Position Papers delivered at the Workshop (sent by attachment after the Workshop)	25

REPORT

The Workshop was preceded by all delegates receiving the following definition of the ESF-COST Synergy project:

The proposed ESF-COST synergy will identify, highlight and advance the contribution made to European society and intellectual culture by the body of contemporary research grouped around 'literary studies'. The focus of the project centres on the policy and broader social relevance of this research. In the past 40 years, the research pursued by academics trained in philological, literary-historical and allied fields has broadened out to include a wide range of interdisciplinary domains. It is proposed to refer to this field of research as 'literary-and-cultural studies' or LCS.

LCS research has a new range of objects of study. No longer restricted to the study of printed books or other fictional genres, LCS researchers focus on cultural objects or 'text-like structured artefacts' which have one or more of the following elements in common:

- *TEXTUALITY: in both the philological and the metaphorical sense of the term. When Clifford Geertz used the term metaphorically to describe the intricate structures which constitute culture(s), the operational content of this term derived much of its weight from the philological techniques used by both linguists and literary scholars to describe, explain and contextualise the structures constituting a written artefact as a text;*
- *RHETORICITY: the usage of conventions like topoi, metaphors etc., the notion of aesthetics having been developed from the ancient Greek concept of rhetoric and still deriving much of its meaning and functions from the uses of language and other forms of communication prescribed by it;*

- *FICTIONALITY: the issue of the relation between art and 'the real' in view of the fact that fictionality is part of every form of communication, so that the relationship between art and 'the real' is not organized by a categorical difference between truth and untruth but by a varying mixture of the two, ie when historiography imposes order on real events by narrating them in a certain sequence;*
- *HISTORICITY: the fact that texts and text-like structured artefacts derive their meaning both from their synchronous historical contexts and from their position in the diachronous process of epistemological change of which they are a part.*

LCS researchers use a variety of research methodologies. These include traditional philological research focused on analytical close reading and/or archival research seeking in-depth contextual knowledge of the production, dissemination or consumption of historical or contemporary cultural objects.

LCS researchers ask a range of research questions of interest beyond the philological or textimmanent level. They represent a status quo in literary and cultural theory according to which cultural existence as such, independent of the disciplinary domain or domains an individual is active in professionally, requires what our project has termed 'cultural literacy', ie the ability to recognize, reflect on, use and potentially modify the complex and manifold set of interacting cultural artefacts – including texts and other media – which enables and embeds cultural existence. These questions are the focus of this proposal and are grouped into the four areas of interest listed below which are the main fields of research that this ESF-COST synergy will explore. These topics have been selected in order to enhance the policy contribution of LCS.

They were then asked to send in comments on their own angle on cultural memory: where it is now and where it is going; how LCS works in this field; and their responses to the following four issues:

- The truth of memory: fact & fiction;
- Regimes of memory: spaces, texts, objects, bodies;
- Trauma and memory;
- The politics and ethics of memory.

Responses can be found in Appendix 3. In addition, they were asked to prepare a 10-minute position paper (see Appendix 4) and to be prepared for three break-out sessions on three 'Core Issues' (see below). NB Because of timetabling constraints for one delegate, Core issue 2 was discussed first.

Core issue 1: what are (and what may be in the future) the relations between LCS and cultural memory studies?

- *Theoretical concepts*
- *Methodologies*
- *Research questions*

Core issue 2: Interdisciplinarity: what do LCS/CM have to say to / ask of other academic fields?

- *Individual interdisciplinarity*
- *Adjacent fields*
- *Sciences*

Core issue 3: How can LCS/CM change the world?

- *Education*
- *Institutions*
- *Civil society*

Day 1 (Mon 14 December)

The proceedings began with a *tour de table* followed by introductions to ESF, COST and the current project.

SESSION 1: After that, the first session of position papers: **1, 2, 3 & 4: Connerton, Crawshaw, Radstone and de Medeiros**, followed by discussion.

- i. RC: There are two ways in which LCS relates to the past: by studying how texts were produced/consumed or by 'the dialogue of lit with itself'. No work of lit is hermetic; it always has its context.
- ii. PdM: Films just tell audiences 'what happened'; novels can problematise relation between history & memory. But fewer people actually read.
- iii. SR: we must consider the politics of reading. In the UK, stress on power & subjectivity: new kinds of autobiography.
- iv. PC: migrant cultures may eg combine travelogues with recipes → intellectual history.
- v. AK: lit is limited in relation to memory: the latter is multi-layered.
- vi. RC: lit is not a privileged medium, but one medium among others. We need to re-examine the conditions of the literary artefact; return to methodology.
- vii. TJ: what is the kind of memory that lit organises & which fails to assemble in other discourses? It gets sedimented in various genres (eg trauma or revolution). Readers' memory of the novel: connected to capitalism. Or archiving of short stories. Not just thematics but genesis (rhetoricity). Eg J.-P. Vernant: genre of tragedy implements a social process. Literature is not just a container of political ideas; it can change political agendas: memory in the form of generic conventions can re-organise social/political agendas.
- viii. VR: → Paul: you raised the issue of silence; what's the role of lit in relation to silence? → Susannah: is articulation always cure?
- ix. PC: lit unearths silences where they don't exist; psychoanalysis is verbose, but verbose talk can be a form of silence. SR: I'll be polemical: the stress on silence is problematic; as tho silence were ineffable. Gillian Rose in *Modernity and the Jew: on Schindler's List and The Remains of the Day: secrets*.
- x. JF: There is what texts do: what effect they have – the story that needs to be told. Literary studies produce a kind of 'capital' effective in other fields as well.
- xi. RV: Visual culture, eg photos in boxes may 'speak more'.
- xii. PC: I know intellectuals who, after psychoanalysis, are much less articulate.

SESSION 2: The second session of position papers: **5, 6, 7 & 8: Friedrich, García, Irzik & Segal**, followed by discussion.

- i. AK → AGR: what is memory for? Preserving models & values, and transcending time. The normativity of memory. Remembering injustices & putting them right. Fedorov: common deeds resurrect the dead & destroy past suffering (though manipulated). After Freud, memory is a burden.
- ii. AGR: priority of politics over philosophy.
- iii. RV: the body remembers some kinds of pain but not all.
- iv. SR: Politics, ethics and narrativity.
- v. PC: Ethics of memory at the end of the 20c is the result of the 20c's atrocities.
- vi. RC: NS said literature can be a vicarious other for understanding individual memory. But SI says literature takes form to encapsulate collective consciousness. Do these two strands run in parallel? What is memory studies anyway? → JF: talking about 'spaces outside history'?
- vii. SR → RC: The question whether literature is heuristic or a representation of the collective

consciousness is where the heated debates in memory studies have been. Can we talk of collective consciousness and what is the methodology to approach it?

viii. PdM: we must not forget the power of language.

Day 2 (Tue 15 December)

SESSION 3: The third session of position papers: **9, 10 & 11: Jukić, Pizzi & Kiossev**, followed by discussion.

- i. SR → AK: Loss of common language: do we lose things that quickly? What about 'hauntings' (Derrida)?
- ii. AK: Agree it's more complicated: you can see subversive languages'. Every usage is idiosyncratic. In the post-communist situation, there are remnants of both ideological and subversive languages, and their uses are chaotic, idiosyncratic.
- iii. NKH: In Poland language was not lost in this way. The opposition to Stalin had a strong publication culture: samizdat, Catholic church, intellectuals had their own discourse.
- iv. LHS: Poetry in Poland. Was this the same in Bulgaria?
- v. AK: No samizdat in BG before 1989: lack of alternative cultural repertoires.
- vi. PdM: 'hauntology': Derrida claims he's forgotten the opening of the *Communist Manifesto*. The problem of forgetting is at the heart of Derrida on Marxism.
- vii. TJ: literature as scene of instruction: Stanley Cavell: lit/film as scene of philosophising. Will the European tradition merge with US? Can we afford a European strategy without taking into account 'hostile' traditions? EU was unified by the 'spectre' of Communism.
- viii. SR: if literature is instructive: a) shd we distinguish between literature & other cultural modes; b) literature as heuristic/individual vs collective. I wd propose that literature is not individual – collective comes first. Literary consciousness is instinctive normativity.
- ix. TJ: Cavell writes about *European* film-makers in the US. Re Derrida: 'instruction' & 'injunction' (Austin).
- x. AK : 2 questions → TJ: a) you say ex-Yugoslavia was the only place where the Revolution was internal, connected to WW2; if there had been no WW2, wd the Yugoslav Revolution not have happened? B) what about the level of ideas vs the level of the everyday?
- xi. TJ: I can't answer a), but socialism in Yugoslavia worked for 30y. after WW1, Austro-Hungary – & Serbian empire: unique nations with state-space.
- xii. KP: also a reaction to the Nazi regimes during & after WW2.
- xiii. TJ: racial laws in Croatia against Jews & gypsies. High culture vs 'normal life' – in early Yugoslav Yugoslavia society: literacy for all → expansion of higher ed [HE]. In 1948 leaders of Yugoslavia declared break with Stalinism (colonial). Influence of Russian formalism.

SESSION 4: The fourth session of position papers: **12, 13 & 14: Koleva, Petrović & Reid**, followed by discussion.

- i. NS: on the question of individual vs collective: example of Camus' *La Peste*, use of 1st-person plural as 'collective witnessing from within one body'; or Sartre, *Les Mots*: exemplary bcs both specific & universal (cf Rousseau etc): 'one and a million';
- ii. PdM: narrative strategy: 1st-person vs 3rd-person; Paul Auster's *Invisible* goes into 3rd person: autobiography saying 'This is not about me'.
- iii. SR: 'Is this me?' becomes undecidable. This is where cultural memory [CM] offers new ground to LCS, eg Annette Kuhn, *Family Secrets*: both psychoanalysis (personal) & drawing on film-frame which is not her.
- iv. PdM: why avoid politics?
- v. DK: only bcs of time; of course politics is there whenever memory is concerned – the choice of

- what to remember and how, is a political one.
- vi. PC: the question of avoiding politics is crucial: CM studies of 'transitional justice' (1980s, 1990s, South Africa or Latin America): more democratic.
 - vii. TJ: New media: cinema was a spectral new medium, both communal & communalising; a vehicle to process WW2 and Revolution traumas.
 - viii. AK: transitional justice produces its own paradoxes: not really 'voice of the powerless'. Networks? Facebook etc – effective in virtual space – does it build 'real communities'?
 - ix. HR: Obama used it: grassroots democracy.
 - x. TP: they use eg texting for raves, demonstrations; so does Al Qaeda.
 - xi. DK: agree about transitional justice in relation to CM. Also feminism. A question → AGR: is memory *per se* always good? Doesn't it take a generation to begin *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* [overcoming the past]? Ethics of memory: Ricœur, Habermas. Laws of forgetting.
 - xii. SR: How the troubled past is dealt with is one of two issues. Theory of CM, in UK too, derived from Holocaust. Also oral history (eg Rwanda, Argentina, Chile etc).
 - xiii. JF: re the USA elections – Sarah Palin withdrew herself from the old media, campaigned solely on the internet.
 - xiv. NS: if we talk about the 2nd generation, they are not actually remembering/forgetting; the memories are their parents'. *Lieux de mémoire* are transgenerational, contested, but also intergenerational, implying a common language.
 - xv. RV: the 2nd generation has to ask the questions.
 - xvi. KP: silence in lieu of trauma eg the Risieri di San Sabba.
 - xvii. DK: trauma of the *perpetrators* is what's silenced; eg workers in Bulgarian prison-camps were well paid.
 - xviii. KP: booming silence eg in mass graves.
 - xix. RC: literature used for community-building (eg now in UK). New media: people come to place: sense of collective consciousness as part of soc/pol agenda, ie the extent to which individuals identify with the collective past. Not really bottom-up. Publishers are also building this. Interaction between these 2 forms of literature: migrant writing.

SESSION 5: The fifth session of position papers: **15, 16, 17 & 18: Roberts, Ghillebaert, Svensson & Vidal**, followed by discussion.

- i. PdM → HR: I'd resist the distinction betw aesthetic & pragmatic – don't separate *dulce & utile*.
- ii. HR: in 16c they were meant to be combined but stress was on *utile*. Cultural industries: a policy of producing pleasure.
- iii. PdM: we shd not forget: literature is astonishingly powerful.
- iv. LHS: in the Swedish Research Council we are setting up a programme on *The need for fiction* (including medicine, psychology etc).
- v. AK: We shd be 'delicately aggressive' (LHS: 'proactive!') eg inform policy-makers about the history of the united-Europe project: Dante. Schlegel, Chateaubriand; or in 1930s Curtius, Spitzer etc. European heritage of the Latin Middle Ages. Lit created the imagination – not the memory – of Europe. *Fiction* leaps across this difference. Literature bridges the gap between memory and imagination through fiction.
- vi. PdM → CG: false distinction between political science & literature. Eg for minorities it allows a transnational view.
- vii. VR: not to forget the body & pleasure.
- viii. NKH: In Warsaw there was nothing there before 'community building' period. Pre-war was idealised time.
- ix. RV: In Berlin, the Palace of Culture is now reconstructed as the old Prussian Stadtschloß.
- x. AK: shd we preserve a huge building that everyone hates?
- xi. NKH: my children don't hate the Stalinist palace of culture in Warsaw; for that generation it's interesting.

- xii. NS: again the question of other people's memories.
- xiii. NKH: NB ESF-SCH project on National Histories in Europe 19c/20c. Of interest to this topic?

SESSION 6: First break-out, on: *Core issue 2:* (NB Because of timetabling constraints for one delegate, Core issue 2 was discussed first.)

Core issue 2: Interdisciplinarity: what do LCS/CM have to say to / ask of other academic fields?

- *Individual interdisciplinarity*
- *Adjacent fields*
- *Sciences*

Following the break-out, a Plenary session collected the following reports:

CORE ISSUE 2, GROUP A

Individual Interdisciplinarity

- Historian + theory from English + Western Marxist social theory, Lukács and Frankfurt School + sideways: social memory + French anthropologists
- French literature and philosophy + Renaissance studies including medicine, history
- Comparative literature + English literature + literary theory + visual and film studies + philosophy and psychoanalysis
- English + Hungarian literature + adaptation theory + postmodernism + cultural memory

Adjacent fields

- *All humanities – especially feminist theory, postcolonial theory, the emerging field of performance studies, musicology*
- *History, Social theory, Philosophy, Social and Political Sciences, Anthropology, Psychoanalysis, Psychology, Cognitive Sciences*
 - Literary studies have a vantage-point from which they can discuss issues where these disciplines come together around certain focal issues;
 - We can play a negotiating role in bringing these fields together – our ability to analyse their discourses can be helpful in showing their strengths and weaknesses;
 - Our strength and weakness is a willingness to go to the edges, occasionally beyond the edges of our discipline – unlike specialists from adjacent fields;
 - We are offering tools of text-based analysis that make cultural memory studies possible;
 - Tools and methods of analysing, processing, representing roots of/aspects of European identity;
 - adding special insights into individual experience, national experience, including issues like violence, trauma.

Sciences

- As geology paved the way towards Darwinism in the 19th century, natural sciences depend on literature for the description of their discoveries, for creating a plausible narrative representing their findings. LCS can offer frameworks of thinking for natural sciences to deploy to bridge the gap between cutting-edge science and the general public;
- Cultural memory – and LCS – will project images and constructs that are currently scientifically unverifiable but open up areas for future studies;
- CM can also take a critical view of disciplinary discourses, pointing out less obvious tendencies and agendas, pointing out discursive strategies in medical sciences, for example (change from military discourse to market discourse).

CORE ISSUE 2, GROUP B**Individual interdisciplinarity**

- Interdisciplinarity consist of an open-minded attitude. Dealing with texts requires an understanding of different theoretical paradigms. No discipline can be represented (even less self-represented) as a closed domain. Rhizomatic vs. Disciplinary.
- Relationship between literary texts and social research. From the point of view of social sciences, literary texts can be used to highlight certain social processes, functioning at a *text-immanent* level and at social levels. Sociology and anthropology use tropes derived from literary analysis. There is a constant terminological interchange.
- Do social scientist use or abuse the texts? Literature conveys certain meaning processes in a unique way and this is what is interesting to social researchers.
- Interdisciplinarity is axiomatic to literary studies because discourse is not *transparent*. Discourse is not transparent but that does not mean that it is divorced from reality.
- The experience of temporality in hermeneutic activity as a conflict of interpretations: a laboratory for social interaction and for creation of commonality.
- The concept of ideology was a crucial instrument in order to acknowledge the social dimensions of texts. Now the concept of inter-subjectivity has replaced those 'old' terms. Methodology is getting more complexity and subtlety to grasp interaction between the individual & the collective. Literature vs. atomistic models. Rhetoricity is an excellent example of this.
- Agency, embodiment, authorship as fantasy.

Adjacent fields

Ethnology, Sociology.

Sciences. *Memory studies and cognitive studies.*

- Sciences are increasingly incorporating literary fantasies.
- Literature can act as a dimension of 'moral imagination': a 'mental experiment' on the uses of technology and science developments.

CORE ISSUE 2, GROUP C

- The imperialist phase of cultural studies is over. It is time for self-revision and to transform ourselves into literary cultural studies [LCS]. We need to engage with disciplines such as the cognitive sciences, anthropology, political history, sociolinguistics, media theory;
- As part of this process, we should add some terms to the four basic ones valid for any social action:
 - Narrative structure
 - The Imaginary/Imagination ('imagined communities')
 - Virtuality
- We should find new disciplines to talk to: medicine, psychology but also go on talking to the traditional ones: anthropology, history, etc.;
- New communicative forms and habits need to be explored just like the disappearance (?) of traditional cultural mediators;
- The relationship between local, national and European literature is not clear;
- The juridical debate over multiculturalism (rights of individuals and groups) should be addressed.

CORE ISSUE 2, GROUP D

- Discussion starts with question by VR on why DK would think mausoleum should be kept – points made on changing function but allowing for memory to be kept. Does this relate to interdisciplinarity?

- RV: well, yes, own work crosses disciplinary boundaries and uses theoretical perspectives from different fields though starting point is from literary studies. This could possibly also be used in reference to the mausoleum. Own research in Berlin asking people to say how they relate to Palace of Republic – many answers actually outside the political realm. Might be interesting to see what artists would do with it.
- PdM asks what interdisciplinarity is needed for such research. Several examples give such as Porto, Hamburg and Marseille. For interdisciplinarity: do we need teams of experts from different disciplines or can we have researchers conversant with several methodologies?
- DK: It depends on how subject of research is constructed. If this is done from the beginning from several disciplines, the research will be different.
- RV: Usually talks to architects and artists. Also films streets and finds methods of other disciplines very useful.
- VR says that DK mentioned some difficulties when dealing with oral histories.
- DK: yes, sometimes talking with interviewees the situation of the researcher comes closer to that of an analyst and this causes problems. Transference for instance is problematic and sometimes people get distressed and then it is good to have someone with expertise in therapy. Sometimes researcher can refer person to specialised support.
- SI: Well, when considering political issues in literature need for a political scientist has never been especially felt. Political science of course is not just monolithic. Simplistic approaches to interdisciplinarity do tend to look at another discipline as just a reservoir of knowledge or a toolkit of methodologies. But there are no such ready-made solutions. Maybe literary studies has had a special kind of significance through literary theory as it provided a large repertoire of methodologies for other disciplines.
- VR: well, yes, in a sense it is privileged because it can take elements for instance from Freud or Klein and look at the texts/representations without needing to be concerned with personal issues. However, when dealing with cultural memory, recent history, testimonies this can be more complicated.
- PdM: what are close or far disciplines? Answers: linguistics, history, philosophy can be seen as close, art (critique), media studies, *Kulturwissenschaft*, communication studies, translation studies, cultural anthropology, sociology, gender studies.
- Discussion of ways in which literary studies contribute to other fields such as medicine (medical poets, diseases that depend on their textual construction), law (confessions, case law etc.)
- RV: Interesting possibility for research on cultural memory of institutions.

Points:

- LCS/CM can provide metadiscursive tools for analysing ways in which other disciplines proceed in their practice.
- Although individual interdisciplinary research has been on the rise, participation in interdisciplinary teams by LCS/CM scholars should be encouraged.
- LCS/CM should insist that interdisciplinary collaboration should be solidly grounded in the various methodologies.
- Interdisciplinary collaboration should result in more than a sum of distinct disciplinary perspectives; questioning of disciplinary boundaries is the most productive.

Day 3 (Wed 16 December)

SESSION 7: Second break-out, on: *Core issue 1:*

Core issue 1: what are (and what may be in the future) the relations between LCS and cultural memory studies?

- *Theoretical concepts*
- *Methodologies*
- *Research questions*

Following the break-out, a Plenary session collected the following reports:

CORE ISSUE 1, GROUP E

Question 1

1. Theoretical Concepts

- **Identity** as link between LCS and CMS – LCS can analyse narrative, temporal and rhetorical ways in which individuals and groups construct identity/ies through textual artefacts of various kinds, leading to their preservation and/or expression and their transformation, in turn providing materials for CMS;
- **Time and temporality:** (re)constructing history through texts – displaced, minority etc. groups creating alternative histories;
- **Narrative:** cultural memory very often a narrative (eg myth, art, literature, etc. and their institutional presentation in museums, galleries, educational policy, etc.) – LCS offers conceptual tools to analyse this narrative;
- **Rhetorical repertoires of memories:** intellectual history (archaeology)/understanding current use and misuse of rhetoric in the mediation of cultural memory;
- **Experience and historicity:** histories of modelling of experience in texts of all kinds;
- **Imagination:** both the personal (eye-witness testimony, potentially influenced by imagination, personal memory not always being reliable) and the communal (eg the construction of an historical myth to form collective imagination), the latter influencing the former;
- **Point of view and dialogical principle** in memory construction of memory – memory being both perceptual and embodied and influenced by significant other/s – particularly as related to race and gender;
- **Performance:** Memory as performed and felt emotionally;
- **Ethics and politics:** Close attention to language in history and its effect in creating dominant and counter-dominant discourses.

2. Methodologies

- **Historical** investigation of texts and contexts;
- **Close reading/hermeneutics** (attention to rhetorical de/construction of texts and hence of cultural memory);
- **Psychology:** investigation of 'false memory' in testimony.

3. Research questions

- How do texts 'fill in' cognitive hiatuses (ie inconsistencies between different historical narratives)?
- How do texts construct, disseminate and then undermine identities?
- What are the consequences of new forms of textuality for cultural memory? Who owns cultural memory (eg Google)?
- What are the specific narrative, rhetorical and textual repertoires of memory in a given context and how do these change over time?

CORE ISSUE 1, GROUP F

- Where do you place CM studies? Centres desirable. Works well also in institutional frameworks in order to bring together disciplines in an interdisciplinary fashion. CM works as common denominator across disciplines. CM is a research project but requires anchoring in a subject. In some countries

- (eg Hungary), the 'motherhouse' is English studies but it is gradually being opened up to include a broader field. CM theories provide routes, pathways into other areas.
- But how do we define CM? How do we distinguish it from history or literature? Should we seek such a distinction? Historians are now interested in 'the uses of history', which may include CM – even though historians tend not to include CM in their discourse. CM asks different types of questions from history. It also interrogates literature, arts and other disciplines. We need to explore ways in which literary studies interrogate and learn from other disciplines. We need to be aware of the risk of amateurism, a higher risk in the humanities than maybe in the sciences. We should not prefabricate all the frameworks but throw up questions, problematise our LCS fields, especially for students and early-career researchers. CM should be understood as a resource, as an opportunity, rather than a hindrance.
 - As far as LCS is concerned, CM studies are very close to interdisciplinarity almost by definition. Traditional literature departments may want to use CM studies to push interdisciplinarity.
 - How do we define CM studies? What do we include? What do we leave out? Who decides? This applies to countries as well – countries with a large/uncomfortable cultural heritage: what do we remember? What do we forget? Again: who decides – politicians?
 - Masters: Individual Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities. Very popular, attracts the best students. And yet, employers still prefer to appoint students in traditionally recognisable disciplines. Students on the IGRS MA in CM take it in a reflective mode, or find employment in the heritage industry.
 - Have LCS a special place in CM studies? LCS (and history) talk about *what* rather than *how* you remember, whether individual or collective truths, often lacking official recognition. What do LCS bring to CM? This is a crucial point.
-

CORE ISSUE 1, GROUP G

What is CM studies?

- Nora, Halbwachs
- Erll – field is in flux
- Cultural heritage
- Relationship to postcolonial studies

Forgetting should be studied more.

- Semantically conditioned memory
- Memory hard-wired into the body – binary concepts of understanding the world: above-below; in front-behind; inside-outside; left-right
- Nothing that is not an utterance – readability of themes

Theoretical concepts and methodologies

- Somatically and semantically conditioned memory. Memory hardwired into the body – binary concepts of understanding the world: above-below; in front-behind; inside-outside; left-right; linguistic structures related to spatial orientation (→ prepositions);
- problem of authorship; memories are always narrated; the interpretation of intentional objects;
- the question of individual and collective memory – the claim of generality while it's always a particular story;
- the interpretation of narration in its relation to truth/fiction/intentionality;
- the importance of forgetting and theorizing 'forgetting'; 3 types of memory: autobiographical, cognitive, habit – but forgetting is much more complex and complicated to categorize

Research questions

- Law and forgetting

- Handing on memory to the next generation – the literary allowing for memory to be accessed; fiction as a way to talk about unpleasant memory; fiction as a way of speaking
- Transnational memory (eg 9/11; fall of Berlin Wall; Sputnik; moon landing)
- Memory and postcoloniality → memory of the perpetrator.

CORE ISSUE 1, GROUP H

Cultural memory/literary and cultural studies

Much cultural studies has become 'presentist'. We think that cultural studies at its best begins with cultural memory but this is not always (or often) the case these days. *Four 'buts'...*

- But is memory studies the answer to what has happened to cultural studies?
- But does memory studies itself suffer from presentism?
- But we also shouldn't idealise memory studies because it may have a particular relation with present discourses of which it is unaware.
- But also presentism can be used in a new historicist sense – to consider the relation of past events to the present as well as how the present shapes understandings of the past.

Three versions:

- **Presentism a)** the occlusion of the past by present concerns: the worst version of cultural studies. Its claim to interest in the past is in fact only a way of legitimising its present strategies/policies.
- **Presentism b)** the impact of past events on the present – neglect of memories that don't fit with present concerns or problematise present concerns. An acknowledgement of perspectivism.
- **Presentism c)** If we think about this from the perspective of temporality, then wouldn't presentism c) have a more dialectical relationship between the past and the present (↔)

Presentism could be defined as legitimizing one's own strategy by using the past as the seat of legitimation whereas cultural memory wants to excavate the terrain of cultural memory as a contested field – a field of struggle...

Literary studies

- Interpreted broadly, they provide a stage for the study of cultural memory. Does the literary have a privileged relationship to cultural memory? Some interesting discussion – does 'the literary' structurally and inevitably include reflexivity? Need to formulate the *what*, the *how* and the *to what end* of the relationship – how can LCS best be combined with memory studies?
- How to relate presentism and loss – how cultural memory studies can avoid losing sight of these losses that are actually defeats, obliterations, detritus. And LCS as a field in which such losses can be studied.
- But the worst side of memory studies – over-emphasis on trauma, loss, redemption...
- What you recover is never the same as what has been lost.

Methodology

We want to emphasize that the isolation of texts and of textual analysis is generating heuristics.

SESSION 8: Third break-out, on: *Core issue 3:*

Core issue 3: How can LCS/CM change the world?

- *Education*
- *Institutions*
- *Civil society*

Following the break-out, a Plenary session collected the following reports:

CORE ISSUE 3, GROUP I**1. EDUCATION**

Memory should be integrated in undergraduate courses (context is not favourable at all; reducing costs).

Existing MAs using CM:

- in Utrecht there is a compulsory CM seminar within 'Western literature and culture' MA
- Other possibilities: IEP?

MAs on CM: we should advocate the creation of such MAs

- IGRS MA;
- *Summer schools:* eg one 'Memory, Empire and Technology' summer school in June 2010

Workshops

- existing example) funded workshop in Utrecht on 'Transnational memory' taking place 1/month, the participants (senior researchers + Ph students + invited lecturers) share current research projects: a presentation then comments/questions then break-out groups

2. INSTITUTIONS

- political institutions:
 - European Parliament
 - Cross-national institutions: eg *euregions*
 - Regional/local institutions
- research or research-related institutions
 - Institutes of School of Advanced Study eg Warburg: establish channels of communication
- Foundations:
 - Expl: Gulbenkian Foundation = very much involved in sciences
 - Leverhulme Foundation
 - Getty Foundation

3. CIVIL SOCIETY

- tourism industry: offices, museums
- oral history
- opening up new channels of communicating conflict: eg Armenian massacre in Turkey (several initiatives currently carried out) to use memory as a way of implicating people instead of making feel apart from one another

CORE ISSUE 3, GROUP J

Impact of memory studies: democratising society – questioning and relativising knowledge-power relations. Importance of personal experience/background in educational process; literature as a bridge between individual, generational and collective;

- What memory research contributes in debates on multiculturalism: it always brings understandings the dynamics of cultural power;
- What memory research contributes to school curricula and museums: providing case studies of narratives/experiences revealing multiple and diverse makeup of history and identity.

In order for these goals to be achieved, it has to have the space and the resources to make available the raw materials (including digitisation of archives) for memory research. Then, there has to be the space and resources available to treat these raw materials.

- The process of collecting and processing should also be democratised;

- CM research should problematise the power relations in knowledge transfer: ensure knowledge transfer becomes knowledge exchange;
- Making tools of CMS available through working in collaboration with national archives; providing criteria for uses of information so as to promote models of memory work conducive to social coexistence and new modes of democracy
- Language learning and translation make cultural memory accessible transculturally and increase transcultural understanding

CORE ISSUE 3, GROUP K

Civil society:

- restore access to the past & give voice to communities /groups whose access to the past would otherwise be lost/limited/denied;
- provide opportunities for memories of the past to be shared for the enhancement of the quality of life in contemporary society;
- enable reconciliation;
- Memory of policymakers, eg Munich, Vietnam or Iraq – policymakers in US have various models of these which have impact upon the nature of foreign policy.

Against the voyeuristic analysis of victims and perpetrators that is exploited by all kinds of evil forces. Memory is a dangerous instrument.

Education:

To be aware of these dangers; young people should learn how history works (human beings continue to do wrongs to each other by way of history).

- Importance of presentism in the best sense: any look in the past should take the future into account. MS looks into the past and not the future but non-considering one of these perspectives is crucial. Educational mode differs from civil society mode. In education: we romantically hope that by teaching past injustices we educate young people not to repeat them. Inventing metaphors to make CMS more attractive is only good insofar as it improves the quality of life of people here and now.
- Education needs to be situated in different cultures; need to expand on positive memories and neutral memories as well. (Secondary education and history teaching in UK – Germany reduced to Nazi-Zeit.) Postcolonial memory studies eg Indian historians around *Subaltern Studies* – reappropriation of the past by the colonised peoples. Avoid Eurocentric discussion! Expand beyond Europe in terms of memory. Gaining insights into processes that are not Europe-specific. Memory is not only about building large blocks. Jack Goody *The Theft of History*; Marc Ferro, *The Use and Abuse of History: How Children Are Taught History Throughout the World* (treatment of suppressed narratives).
- Language & memory – the importance of being translated into 'big' languages (Kadare, Pamuk). CMS and inter/transculturalism are complementary. Migration, mobility, comparative literature, analysis of processes of translation and interpretation.
- What academy can do – space for debate; conducting research into the way in which the legacy is integrated, appropriated, etc. – a kind of counter-discourse to the powers. Such conversations are going on, definitely in architecture education. The way the past is integrated into the urban landscape is a way to a better understanding of how the past can be incorporated into everyday life.

Institutional structures:

- Restructuring in university education in UK: humanities regrouped often into a single faculty, enhancing the role of centres (research rather than teaching). CM ought to fit into research centres.
- Institutions of memory: schools, laws, museums, commemorations, archives, media (traditional and new). Laws of memory and their role in edifying memory although each of them is problematic. Institutionalisation of memorial processes is a process into which academics can contribute: design,

marketing, funding. Tourism marketing & heritage industry – CM can contribute with a critical analysis of legacy industry.

CORE ISSUE 3, GROUP L

We propose to establish:

Small-scale organisations, which will seek public funding (they could be independent bodies, or departments of universities, museums, libraries, churches, other cultural institutions).

General functions and tasks:

- public visibility of research and produced knowledge translating research results into publicly visible messages
- critical monitoring of the policies and of the functioning of public institutions
- identifying public interests, hot social and cultural problems
- participating in public debates, raising awareness on crucial issues
- initiating and coordinating research
- creating a crucial public culture sensitive to rhetoric and language usage.

Specific tasks connected to LCS and CM studies

- Initiating public debates on conflict situations and traumatic memories
- Critical analysis of manipulation of collective memory and myth-making, questioning Grand Narratives, discourses of heroisation and victimisation.
- Debates on ethical problems of memory
- Initiating programs for teachers
- Research on professional and institutional memories and their function inside the institutions. Cultural memory person-in-residence eliciting the story of the institutions.
- Research in public images of institutions in literary and journalistic texts
- Producing expertise and certifiable experts in cultural memory

APPENDIX 1a List of delegates

name	title	email	affiliation	nation	field	Initials for ref
Connerton, Paul	Dr	Paul.connerton@ukonline.com	Cambridge	UK	social anthropology	PC
Crawshaw, Robert	Dr	r.crawshaw@lancaster.ac.uk	Lancaster	UK	transculture	RC
Crownshaw, Rick	Dr	r.crownshaw@gold.ac.uk	Goldsmiths, UoL	UK	Eng lit, CM	[absent]
de Medeiros, Paulo	Prof	Paulo.deMedeiros@let.uu.nl	Utrecht	NL	Portuguese, conflict	PdM
Friedrich, Judit	Dr	friedrich.judit@gmail.com	Budapest	HU	LCS, post-communism	FJ
Garcia Ruíz, Alicia	Dr	algaruz@telefonica.net	Barcelona	ES	Phil, lit & pol	AGR
Ghillebaert, Pierre-Christian	Mr	christianpierre_59@hotmail.com	Paris	FR	Politics, translation	PCG

Irzik, Sibel	Prof	sibeli@sabanciuni.v.edu	Sabancı	TU	Comp lit	SI
Kancewicz-Hoffman, Nina	Dr	nhoffman@esf.org	ESF	FR	Polish lit	NKH
Jukić, Tatjana	Dr	tjukic@ffzg.hr	Zagreb	HR	Comp lit, theory	TJ
Kelleher, Margaret	Prof	margaret.kelleher@nuim.ie	Maynooth	IE	Irish lit, CM	[absent]
Kiossev, Alexander	Prof	akiossev@gmail.com	Sofia	BG	CS, post-socialism	AK
Koleva, Daniela	Prof	daniela@sclg.uni-sofia.bg	Sofia	BG	CM oral history	DK
Kvietkauskas, Mindaugas	Dr	kvietkauskas@liti.lt	Vilnius	LT	urban studies, poet	[absent]
Petrović, Tanja	Dr	TanjaPe@zrc-sazu.si	Slovenian Acad	SI	Anthropology, Linguistics	TP
Pizzi, Katia	Dr	Katia.pizzi@sas.ac.uk	IGRS	UK	Italian lit/CM	KP
Radstone, Susannah	Dr	s.radstone@uel.ac.uk	UEL	UK	CM, film	SR
Reid, Victoria	Dr	V.reid@french.arts.gla.ac.uk	Glasgow	UK	French 20c	VR
Rév, István	Prof	revist@ceu.hu	CEU	HU	History, CM	[absent]
Roberts, Hugh	Dr	h.g.a.roberts@exeter.ac.uk	Exeter	UK	French early mod lit	HR
Segal, Naomi	Prof	naomi.segal@sas.ac.uk	IGRS	UK	LCS, psy, gender	NS
Svensson, Lars-Håkan	Prof	lars-hakan.svensson@liu.se	Linköping	SE	LCS, classics	LHS
Vidal, Ricarda	Dr	Ricarda.vidal@sas.ac.uk	IGRS, UoL	UK	Lit & visual culture	RV

APPENDIX 1b Distribution of delegates

(This list includes both delegates who did not attend & those who did, as in Appendix 1a: 23 in all. LCS = Literary & cultural studies)

<u>Nation of affiliation (CEE: 6)</u>		<u>Nation of origin</u>		<u>LCS/other</u>	
BG (Bulgaria)	2	1 from NL is PT (Medeiros)		LCS	14
ES (Spain)	1	1 from UK is DE (Vidal)		Other	9
FR (France)	2	1 from UK is IT (Pizzi)			
HR (Croatia)	1	1 from FR is PL			
HU (Hungary)	2				
IE (Ireland)	1				
LT (Lithuania)	1				
NL (Netherlands)	1				
SE (Sweden)	1				
SI (Slovenia)	1				
		<u>Sex</u>			
		f	13		
		m	10		
		<u>early-career researcher/senior</u>			

TU (Turkey)	1	ECR	7
UK	9	senior	16

APPENDIX 1c Biographical details of delegates

Biographical details

PAUL CONNERTON

Paul Connerton was initially trained as a historian but subsequently became a social theorist. He is Research Associate in the Department of Social Anthropology at the University of Cambridge, and an Honorary Fellow in the Institute of Germanic & Romance Studies, in the University of London. His main publications in this field are: *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge, 1989); *How Modernity Forgets* (Cambridge, 2009); 'Cultural Memory', in *A Handbook of Material Culture*, ed by Chris Tilly, Webb Keane, Susanne Kuchler, Mike Rowlands, Patricia Spyer (London, 2006); 'Seven Types of Forgetting', *Memory Studies*, Vol 1 (2008); 'Some Functions of Collective Forgetting', *Proceedings of the British Academy* (2009) ed by Clive Gamble & Robin Dunbar.

ROBERT CRAWSHAW

Dr. Robert Crawshaw is a graduate of the Universities of Exeter, Paris and Cambridge. He is currently Senior Lecturer in French and European Studies and Director of Research in the Department of European Languages and Cultures at Lancaster University. His interest in comparative literature, culture and society goes back to his postgraduate studies in Paris in the mid-1970s. It has been reflected latterly in his work in the field of Intercultural Studies, both from a linguistic/pragmatic perspective and as mediated through literature. Recent publications have included articles on Kadare, history and ethnography, Sebald and Nora, and on space-time compression in the works of migrant writers in Manchester as part of the AHRC project *Moving Manchester* (2006-2009) of which he was the principal architect and co-director.

RICK CROWNSHAW (not attending)

I currently lecture in the Department of English and Comparative Literature, Goldsmiths, University of London. I also teach on and convene one strand of the MA in Cultural Memory, at the Institute of Germanic & Romance Studies (IGRS), University of London. At Goldsmiths I teach mainly American literature from the seventeenth century to the present. At the IGRS I teach Holocaust memorialization. My research interests are more international than my current teaching. I've just completed a monograph, *The Afterlife of Holocaust Memory in Contemporary Literature and Culture* (forthcoming with Palgrave Macmillan), which is a scrutiny of theory and practice of vicarious acts of witnessing the Holocaust. (In particular, the monograph examines mainly American trauma theory, the fiction of Bernhard Schlink and W. G. Sebald, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, and German countermonumental architecture.) I am also the author of a number of articles and chapters on Holocaust-related literature and memorialization, as well as co-editor of *The Future of Memory* (forthcoming with Berghahn). My current research is in the area of transcultural memory, which will entail an investigation, via American, European and Australian literature, of the ways in which cultural memories of different atrocities and 'limit events' relate to each other. (The framework for this project is informed by recent historiographical work that maps the structural continuities and discontinuities between modernity's extreme events, for example, between slavery, colonialism, and acts of genocide.) Transcultural memory is the topic of a conference that I'm co-organizing along with colleagues at Goldsmiths and the IGRS for February 2010. I'm also a member of the Steering Committee for the Centre for the Study of Cultural Memory, IGRS, and a co-organizer of the Cultural Memory Seminar Series hosted by the IGRS.

PAULO DE MEDEIROS

Paulo de Medeiros (1958) studied at the Universities of Lisbon, Massachusetts-Boston, Freiburg and Massachusetts-Amherst, from where he received a PhD in Comparative Literature. Since 1998 he has held the Chair of Portuguese Studies at the University of Utrecht in the Netherlands. He has edited several thematic issues of international journals such as the *Luso-Brazilian Review* and the *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, and volumes of essays by diverse authors such as *Postcolonial Theory and Lusophone Literatures* (2007). In 2000 and 2001 he co-coordinated (with Ann Rigney) two PhD seminars on Cultural Memory for the Dutch Research School of Literary Studies, with selected essays appearing in two volumes of *Frame: Tijdschrift voor literatuurwetenschap*. He has published variously on comparative literature and Portuguese-language authors such as 'Postcolonial Memories' (*European Review*, 2005). His current research interests touch on hauntings and post-imperial representations.

JUDIT FRIEDRICH

My current project concerns the novels of Tibor Fischer, an English author of Hungarian extraction, who came to be known for his first novel, *Under the Frog*, a comic treatment of the 1956 revolution in Hungary. His works in general and this novel in particular are interesting for their discussion of issues of cultural memory (personal and political, tragic and comic, trauma and survival etc) and I particularly like the double cultural perspective they offer in terms of both outlook and language. In the longer term, I hope to move the notion of fictional representation of historical and cultural trauma closer to home and examine the work of a prominent Hungarian author, Péter Esterházy. My contention is that his iconic status is due as much to his aristocratic lineage as to his postmodernist prose; and that his autobiographical/fictional treatment of the character of his father, an aristocrat turned into informer under the communist regime would offer material for a much needed revision of how we remember our past decades of history in Hungary. My general field of research is postmodernist fiction, especially that of John Barth and Erica Jong, and literary theory, especially feminist theory. I also teach courses on English fiction from the 18th century, on the culture of Europe and English fiction in 1928, and on the current forms of printed and on-line literary and critical publication. I am head of department at the DES, SEAS, ELTE, Budapest.

ALICIA GARCIA RUÍZ

Alicia García, born in 1974, has two BAs in Philosophy and in Political Science and Sociology. She also holds two PhDs: one in Political Sciences & Sociology (University of Granada) and the other in German and Romance Languages (The Johns Hopkins University). Also, she is finishing a PhD in Philosophy (University of Barcelona). Her research interests are Contemporary Philosophy and Critical Theory. She is currently working on two research lines. The first line is an approach to current political philosophies dealing with the figure of Community and their contemporary debates. She is trying to connect the problems of Intersubjectivity as they were posed by the debate between Liberals and Communitarians in the United States to the so-called new European Philosophies of Community, which work under a Poststructuralist perspective. The second line is a Critical Philosophy of History. This post-metaphysical approach to metahistorical reflection seeks to examine the conditions, practices and policies of representation connected to contemporary historical consciousness as well as to investigate the subject-formation processes associated with these new perceptions of historicity.

CHRISTIAN GHILLEBAERT

Christian-Pierre Ghillebaert achieved a PhD in political science (2007) after graduating from the Institute of Political Studies in Lille (2000) and from the University of Lille II (2001). He also graduated as an English teacher (2006). He taught different subjects related to social sciences such as sociology (in the Universities of Dunkirk and Lille I) and history of French law and institutions (in the University of Paris XIII), as well as English (in secondary schools and in the University of Lille 3). He was granted the official accreditation to lecture in political science and also regional languages and cultures in 2009. He currently holds a position as an English teacher in the University of Lille I and he gives lectures in political science at the Institute of Political Studies in Lille.

As a member of both the Centre of Political Studies on Northern Europe and the Centre of Administrative, Political, Social Research and Studies (Lille), he has been carrying out research on issues connected with nationalism, regional and minority languages and cultures, literature and art, radicalism, small parties. He has also specialised in Flemish culture in France and in the West-Flemish dialect. As a member of the academic network and association *Les Lettres Européennes*, he concerns himself with literature in non-standard languages and with the Europeanness and Europeanisation of national literatures. He regularly takes part in academic conferences and workshops in political science, sociology and literary studies in France and abroad.

SIBEL IRZIK

Sibel Irzik received her BA in English Literature from Boğaziçi University, and her MA and PhD in Comparative Literature from Indiana University. She taught in the English Departments of Istanbul University and Boğaziçi University. She is currently teaching in the Cultural Studies Program of Sabancı University. She is the author of *Deconstruction and the Politics of Criticism* (NY&London: Garland Publishing, 1990) and the co-editor of *Relocating the Fault Lines: Turkey Beyond the East-West Divide*, a special double issue of the *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 2003. She has also edited the selected writings of Mikhail Bakhtin and a collection of articles on gender and literature in Turkish. Among her more recent publications are an article on Orhan Pamuk's *Black Book*, published in *The Novel, Volume 2: Forms and Themes* (ed. Franco Moretti, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), a book chapter on Turkish *coup d'état* novels in *Betraying the Event* (ed. Fatima Festic, New Castle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), and a chapter on Pamuk's *Snow* in *Europe and its Boundaries* (ed. Andrew Davison and Himadeep Muppidi, Lenham: Lexington Books, 2009). She is currently working on a comparative study of military coup literatures and a study of the political novel in Turkey.

TATJANA JUKIĆ

Tatjana Jukić received her PhD from the University of Zagreb in 2000. She has been a member of the English Department at the same University from 1994, and is currently Associate Professor (2006-); she also teaches in the doctoral programs of Comparative Literature and of Croatian literature and culture. She is the author of *Zazor, nadzor, svidjanje. Dodiri književnog i vizualnog u britanskom 19. stoljeću* (*Liking, Dislike, Supervision. Literature and the Visual in Victorian Britain*, Zagreb, 2002).

She was a Visiting scholar at the Universities of Oxford (July 1997) and Cambridge (Oct-Nov 1998) and Guest Professor at the University of Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina (2003-05). She is a member of the Publishing Council of the Zagreb Centre for Women's Studies (2003-) and of the Editorial Board of *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia* (2004-). She was President of the Croatian Semiotic Association (2005-07), during which time she coordinated 'Trauma and Identity', a program of lectures and workshops on the subject.

Her research interests include 19th- and 20th-century literature; genealogies of the cinematic; philosophy and cultural and literary theory. She is currently coordinating a research project on the limits of literary memory and is working on a book about the intersections of revolution and melancholia in literature, philosophy and psychoanalysis.

NINA KANCEWICZ-HOFFMAN

Nina Kancewicz-Hoffman is Senior Science Officer, Head of the Humanities Unit in the European Science Foundation in Strasbourg, France. She studied Polish philology at Warsaw University, German philology at University of Tübingen and was awarded a PhD in Slavic languages and literatures at Columbia University (New York) in 1986. Her research interests covered different aspects of 20th-century Polish literature including the Polish literary avant-garde movement of the interwar period in the European context as well as relations between literature and politics in Communist Poland.

Nina Kancewicz-Hoffman joined ESF in 2003 where initially her main areas of responsibility were quality assurance of peer review and research funding processes and ESF Forward Looks. Before moving to ESF she worked in Poland with the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Research developing and managing EU and other international organisations assistance programmes for reforms in higher education and research sectors. Between 1997 and 2003 she was Director for University Advancement at Warsaw University.

MARGARET KELLEHER (not attending)

Margaret Kelleher is the director of An Foras Feasa: the Institute for Research and Cultural Traditions, an interdisciplinary research institute at NUI Maynooth, Ireland. She is the chairperson of the International Association for the Study of Irish Literatures (c. 700 members) and former President of the Society for the Study of Nineteenth-Century Ireland. In 2002-3 she was the Burns Visiting Professor at Boston College and in 2006-7 the O'Brien Visiting Scholar at Concordia University, Montreal. She is the Irish representative on the Standing Committee for the Humanities, European Science Foundation. Her research areas include the fields of literary history, women's writings and nineteenth-century Irish studies. She was the editor (with Philip O'Leary) of the *Cambridge History of Irish Literature* (2006) and (with Laurence Geary) of *Nineteenth-Century Ireland: A Research Review* (2005). With specific reference to this workshop, and to her research interests in this regard (see below), she has published a study of literature of the Great Famine entitled *The Feminization of Famine: Expressions of the Inexpressible* (Cork and Duke UP, 1997) and also a study of Irish famine memorials in Ireland and the United States, 'Hunger and History: Monuments to the Great Irish Famine', in *Textual Practice* 16 (2002). She has also contributed an essay on 'The Irish Famine: History and Representation' to a recent Palgrave collection, *Palgrave Advances in Irish History*. Her current project is a study of bilingualism in nineteenth-century Ireland.

ALEXANDER KIOSSEV

Alexander Kiossev is associate professor in the History of Modern Culture at the University of Sofia. His research interests are in the spheres of cultural history of cultural and literary institutions, construction of identities, space and imaginary geographies. He has published a book on the history of Bulgarian literature and another two on cultural history of the transition period in Eastern Europe. He was editor of the collective volume *Post-Theory, Games and Discursive Resistance* (SUNY Press: Albany, 1995) and the collective volume *борникът 'Rules' and 'Roles'. Fluid Institutions, Hybrid Roles and Identities in East European Transformation Processes (1989–2005)*, Alexander Kiossev and Petya Kabakchieva (eds). Berlin: LitVerlag, 2009. Many of his essays have been translated into English, German, French, Dutch, Ukrainian, Czech, Polish, Romanian, Serbian and Macedonian. Since 2000 he has been a leader of several international research projects dedicated to the Balkan cultures.

DANIELA KOLEVA

Daniela Koleva received her MA from the University of St Petersburg and her PhD from the University of Sofia. Currently, she is associate professor at the Department for History and Theory of Culture, University of Sofia. Her research interests are in the field of oral history and anthropology of socialism and post-socialism, biographical and cultural memory, biographical methods, social constructivism. She has published a monograph on the 'normal life course' in communist Bulgaria (*Biography and Normality*, 2002, in Bulgarian) and a number of book chapters and articles in peer-reviewed journals in English, French and German. Her current work is on vernacular memory of socialism in Bulgaria, everyday ethnic identities and inter-ethnic tensions in mixed population regions (part of the FP6 MICROCON project) and an AHRC/ESRC funded project on religious and secular life-course rituals in the UK, Romania and Bulgaria.

MINDAUGAS KVIETKAUSKAS (not attending)

Mindaugas Kvietkauskas (b. 1976) acquired his PhD at the Department of Lithuanian Literature, Vilnius University, in 2006. His doctoral thesis *The Multinational Literary Modernism in Vilnius 1904-1915* was awarded The Gerhard Ruef Stiftung Prize for the Best 2006 Doctoral Dissertation in Lithuanian Humanities and Social Sciences. Dr. Kvietkauskas is a lecturer of Multilingual Literature of Lithuania and Urban Studies at Vilnius University. In 1999-2008 he was an editor of literary criticism at the main Lithuanian literary journal *Metai*. In February 2008, Dr. Kvietkauskas was appointed a Director of the Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, the major literary research institution in Lithuania. Dr. Kvietkauskas pursued his Jewish studies at Vilnius University (Vilnius Yiddish Institute) and at the University of Oxford, Oriental Institute and Yarnton Centre for Hebrew and Judaic Studies (2002-2003). He did his research as an academic visitor at the YIVO Institute in New York, the University of Cracow,

the Moses Mendelssohn Centre in Leipzig. His study *The Counterpoints of Vilnius Literature. Early Literary Modernism 1904-1915* was published in 2007 by the Lithuanian Writers' Union Press. It is now being translated into Polish by the publishing house Universitas in Cracow, Poland. Mindaugas Kvietkauskas is also a poet and a translator of poetry.

TANJA PETROVIĆ

Tanja Petrović (Scientific Research Centre Ljubljana: tanja.petrovic@zrc-sazu.si) received her B.A. and M.A. degrees from the Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, and her PhD degree from the Ljubljana School of Humanities. Currently, she is a Research Fellow at the Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Science and Arts in Ljubljana and the Institute for Balkan Studies in Belgrade. She also teaches graduate and postgraduate courses in linguistics and anthropology at the University of Nova Gorica. Her main academic interests are in the field of intersection of linguistic, social and cultural phenomena in the Balkans and Central Europe, with emphasis on ideologies and remembering. Her publications include: 'The territory of the former Yugoslavia in the mental maps of former Yugoslavs: Nostalgia for space', *Sprawy narodowosciowe* 31 (2007), 263-273, 'When We Were Europe': Socialist Workers in Serbia and Their Nostalgic Narratives. The Case of the Cable Factory Workers in Jagodina', in: *Remembering Communism: Genres of Representation*, ed. Maria Todorova (New York: Social Science Research Council, Columbia University Press, 2009); 'Nostalgia for the JNA? Remembering the Army in Former Yugoslavia', in: *Post-Communist Nostalgia*, eds. Maria Todorova, Zsuzsa Gille (Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, 2010); 'Becoming Real Men in Socialist Yugoslavia: Photographic Representation of the Yugoslav People's Army Soldiers and Their Memories of the Army Service', in *Rules and Roles in Shifting Sands*, Alexander Kiossev, Petia Kabakchieva (eds) (LIT Verlag, 2009).

KATIA PIZZI

Katia Pizzi has a BA from the University of Bologna and a PhD from the University of Cambridge. She was Lecturer in Italian at the University of Kent 1994-2004 and is currently Senior Lecturer in Italian Studies at the IGRS. She has published books, chapters & articles in the UK, the US, Italy, Slovenia, Hungary & Iceland on modern Italian literature and culture, including the north-eastern borders of Italy (especially TRIesty), the Futurist *avant-garde* and children's literature & illustration. Her current research projects are on the literary identity of European cities, Pinocchio's mechanical body, Futurism & technology.

SUSANNAH RADSTONE

Susannah Radstone is Reader in Cultural Theory in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of East London. Her publications include *The Sexual Politics of Time: Confession, Nostalgia, Memory* (2007) and several edited collections, including *Memory and Methodology* (2000) and, with Katharine Hodgkin, *Memory Cultures* (2003/2005) and *The Politics of Memory* (2003/2005). She is currently completing a new monograph, *Getting Over Trauma*, and her co-edited volume *Memory: Theories, Histories, Debates* will be published by Fordham University Press in Spring 2010. Her current research focuses on two areas: her monograph develops new approaches to trauma theory and she is also beginning a comparative project looking at the different approaches to memory research in different national contexts.

VICTORIA REID

Victoria Reid is Lecturer in French at the University of Glasgow. Her research interests are early 20c French literature, in particular André Gide, and contemporary French culture, notably the representation of ageing in the literary & visual arts in the wake of the 2003 heat-wave; her work is informed by psychoanalysis, hauntology theory & reception studies. Her publications include *André Gide and Curiosity* (2009) and a chapter in *The Reception of Oscar Wilde in Europe* (2010). She is currently coediting a book on cultural exchanges between France and the UK 1880-1930 and preparing for publication two articles on ageing in French culture: 'Representing the *canicule* 2003 in literature, film & documentary' and 'Houellebecq, Beauvoir and ageing'.

ISTVÁN RÉV (not attending)

István Rév is a historian, professor of history and political science at Central European University, Budapest. Director of Open Society Archives, besides the Hoover Archive, the largest Cold War archive in the world. He is the author of , most recently, *Retroactive Justice; prehistory of postcommunism* (Stanford and Feltrinelli). He works on historical issues related to death, the dead, forgetting, the notion of the archive, the practice of preserving the traces of the past. He is the founding editor of the *Budapest Review of Books*, and a member of the academic editorial board of Open Humanities Press and Archival Science.

HUGH ROBERTS

I am Senior Lecturer in French at the University of Exeter. I specialize in French Renaissance studies. My book, *Dogs' Tales: Representations of Ancient Cynicism in French Renaissance Texts* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006), analyses the ways in which a wide range of Renaissance authors respond to the often scandalous antics of the ancient Cynic or 'dog' philosophers, to explore paradoxical ideas in engaging ways. Between 2007 and 2009, I coordinated an international and interdisciplinary research network of some 30 participants, funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (UK), on obscenity in the French Renaissance. Two publications of the network are forthcoming, a special issue of the US journal *Early Modern France* and a coauthored book to be published by Droz. I also have an interest in comic texts and nonsense writing, principally focusing on the works of the early seventeenth-century French comedian known as Bruscombille, whose works I am coediting with Dr Annette Tomarken, with the support of the British Academy and a Research Fellowship of the Leverhulme Trust (UK). My article on what Bruscombille discovers when he chops off his head and searches inside – 'La tête de Bruscombille et les métaphores mentales au début du XVII^e siècle', *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 107 (2007), 541-57 – was joint winner of the 2007 Malcolm Bowie Prize for the best article of the year published by an early career researcher in French Studies. Other publications include articles in *French Studies*, *Modern Language Review*, and *Sixteenth Century Journal*, as well as several chapters in coedited books.

NAOMI SEGAL

Professor Naomi Segal is Director of the Institute of Germanic & Romance Studies, University of London, which runs seminars, conferences, fellowships, postgraduate degrees, research training and publications in the interdisciplinary field covered by the five languages: French, German, Italian, Spanish & Portuguese. She has chaired or served on numerous national and international committees including the Association of University Professors and Heads of French, the Arts and Humanities Research Council, the British Academy Panel for Europe and the Standing Committee for the Humanities of the European Science Foundation. She is the author of eleven books, most recently *Consensuality: Didier Anzieu, gender and the sense of touch* (2009), *Indeterminate Bodies* (2003, coedited), *Le Désir à l'Œuvre* (2000, edited), *André Gide: Pederasty & Pedagogy* (1998), and *Coming Out of Feminism?* (1997: coedited). Her research is in comparative and cultural studies with a focus on psychoanalysis, gender and sexuality. She has published on the French *récit*; the novel of adultery; triangular desire; Gide and Barrie; film, sculpture, love, loss, phantom limbs, and Princess Diana. She is currently coediting four collections: two on psychoanalysis and the arts & humanities, one on French 19c-20c literature and one on opera and the exotic.

LARS-HÅKAN SVENSSON

I did my undergraduate and postgraduate work at Lund University (with a year at Oxford) where for many years I taught English (as Associate and later Full Professor of English Literature) until I took up my current position as Professor of Language and Culture at Linköping University in 2002. At Linköping I work closely with colleagues in linguistics and comparative literature. I began as a classical scholar but later switched to English literature. My main scholarly interests are in Renaissance poetry (I am currently engaged in a project involving Edmund Spenser) and modern and contemporary literature, especially American and Irish poetry. Nearly all my research has been of a Comp Lit character and centred on the textual dimension of literature, often involving the relations of English-language literature to classical, French and Italian literature. In recent years, I have become increasingly interested in the various contexts in which texts are written, printed, read and translated, which has led me in the direction of

Translation Studies and Cultural Memory. I am interested in the ways in which poets use translation or intertextual echoing as an integral part of their original work. Two questions which I find very interesting are: what is a translation and what is the difference between translation and imitation? I have been a member of the Swedish Research Council since 2005.

RICARDA VIDAL

Ricarda Vidal is Lecturer in Visual Culture at the IGRS. Her research interests lie in 20th/21st-century visual and literary culture. She wrote her PhD (London Consortium, University of London) on the obsession with speed and the fascination with the car and its crash in 20th-century Western culture. While she continues to work on (and dream her own) automobile dreams she is currently also exploring the recent gentrification of London's East End and the critical response of artists to the new environment. Further she is interested in the presence of the ghostly in contemporary cultural practice. Ricarda's articles explore the legacy of Modernism and Romanticism, speed, the car and driving as cultural phenomena as well as artist film and video. Apart from her academic work, she also works as curator for video art and is founding director of the international shortfilm competition 'Betting on Shorts: More than a Eurovision of Shortfilm' (www.bettingonshorts.com)

APPENDIX 2a

Programme of the Workshop

Monday 14 December

IGRS, Stewart House, 32 Russell Square, room STB7

2-2.30	arrival+ coffee	
2.30-3.30	<i>tour de table</i> & introduction to ESF & COST Nina Hoffman & Daniela Koleva	
3.30-3.50	introductions to the Cultural Literacy Project Naomi Segal & Daniela Koleva	
3.50-5	Position papers: 1, 2, 3, 4	chair: Naomi Segal
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Connerton • Robert Crawshaw • Susannah Radstone • Paulo de Medeiros 	
	DISCUSSION x 30m	
5-5.20	tea	
5.20-6.30	Position papers: 5, 6, 7 & 8	chair: Daniela Koleva
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judit Friedrich • Alicia Garcia Ruiz • Sibel Irzik • Naomi Segal 	
	DISCUSSION x 30m	
8/8.15	dinner at chez Gérard, 8 Charlotte St	

Tuesday 15 December
IGRS, Stewart House, 32 Russell Square, room ST274/5

9.30-9.50	arrival+ coffee	
9.50-11	Position papers: 9, 10 & 11	chair: Victoria Reid
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tatjana Jukić • Katia Pizzi • Alexander Kiossev 	
	DISCUSSION x 30m	
11-11.20	coffee	
11.20-12.30	Position papers: 12, 13 & 14	chair: Sibel Irzik
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tanja Petrović • Daniela Koleva • Victoria Reid 	
	DISCUSSION x 30m	
12.30-1.30	sandwich lunch	
1.30-2.40	Position papers: 15, 16, 17 & 18	chair: Robert Crawshaw
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hugh Roberts • Christian Ghillebaert • Lars-Håkan Svensson • Ricarda Vidal 	
	DISCUSSION x 30m	
2.40-3	tea	
3-4	Break-out groups x 4 (ABCD) <i>Core issue 2: Interdisciplinarity: what do LCS/CM have to say to // ask of other academic fields?</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Individual interdisciplinarity</i> • <i>Adjacent fields</i> • <i>Sciences</i> 	
4.15-5.15	plenary reports & discussion 1	chair: Lars-Håkan Svensson
7-9	dinner at Rasa Samudra, 5 Charlotte St	

Wednesday 16 December
IGRS, Stewart House, 32 Russell Square, room ST 274/5

9.30-10 arrival + coffee

10-11	Break-out groups x 4 (EFGH) <i>Core issue 1: what are (and what may be in the future) the relations between LCS and cultural memory studies?</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Theoretical concepts</i> • <i>Methodologies</i> • <i>Research questions</i> 	
10.15-11.15	plenary reports & discussion 2	chair: Tatjana Jukić
11.15-11.30	coffee	
11.30-12.30	Break-out groups x 4 (IJKL) <i>Core issue 3: How can LCS/CM change the world?</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Education</i> • <i>Institutions</i> • <i>Civil society</i> 	
12.30-1.30	Sandwich lunch	
1.30-2.30	plenary reports & discussion 3	chair: Ricarda Vidal
2.30-3	tea	
3-4.30	Plans for future: report, publication etc	chairs: Daniela Koleva & Naomi Segal
5	Workshop ends	

APPENDIX 2b Break-out groups

*(These groups are as on the day – 18 in all, and redistributed to cover; **group rapporteur)*

Group A (room 276)

Connerton
Friedrich**
Jukić
Roberts

Group E (room 276)

Kiossev
Garcia
Ghillebaert
Koleva
Roberts**

Group I (room 276)

Pizzi
de Medeiros
Irzik
Ghillebaert**

Group B (room 275)

Crawshaw
Garcia**
Pizzi
Petrović
Segal

Group F (room 275)

Kancewicz-Hoffman
Friedrich
Svensson
Pizzi**

Group J (room 275)

Friedrich
Garcia
Radstone**
Petrović
Roberts

Group C (room 274)

Svensson**
Ghillebaert
Kiossev **
Kancewicz-Hoffman

Group G (room 274)

Segal**
Connerton
de Medeiros
Vidal

Group K (room 274)

Crawshaw
Connerton
Koleva**
Vidal

Group D (room 268)

de Medeiros**
Irzik
Koleva
Reid
Vidal

Group H (room 268)

Crawshaw
Irzik
Radstone
Petrović**
Jukić

Group L (room 268)

Kancewicz-Hoffman
Jukić
Svensson
Kiossev**
Segal

APPENDIX 3 Pre-Workshop comments on key issues and Position Papers delivered at the Workshop

Participants were asked to set out preliminary points on:

- their own angle on cultural memory: where it is now and where it is going; how LCS works in this field;
- their responses to the following four issues:
 - ❖ The truth of memory: fact & fiction;
 - ❖ Regimes of memory: spaces, texts, objects, bodies;
 - ❖ Trauma and memory;
 - ❖ The politics and ethics of memory.

For the full text please follow the links www.esf.org/remembering

[PAUL CONNERTON](#)

[ROBERT CRAWSHAW](#)

[RICK CROWNSHAW](#)

[PAULO DE MEDEIROS](#)

[JUDIT FRIEDRICH](#)

[ALICIA GARCIA RUÍZ](#)

[CHRISTIAN GHILLEBAERT](#) – position paper not available

[SIBEL IRZIK](#)

[TATJANA JUKIĆ](#)

[MARGARET KELLEHER](#)

[ALEXANDER KIOSSEV](#)

[DANIELA KOLEVA](#)

[MINDAUGAS KVIETKAUSKAS](#)

TANJA PETROVIC

KATIA PIZZI – pre-workshop comments not available

SUSANNAH RADSTONE

VICTORIA REID

ISTVÁN RÉV

HUGH ROBERTS

NAOMI SEGAL

LARS-HÅKAN SVENSSON

RICARDA VIDAL