

Pre-workshop comment

TATJANA JUKIĆ

What interests me about **cultural memory** – also what informs the concept itself of cultural memory as it emerges in the twentieth century – is how it inherits psychoanalysis and Marxism, given that both psychoanalysis and Marxism form precisely around critical interventions into existing memory regimes.

Literature enters all these formations (all these primal scenes?) as a scene of instruction, since both psychoanalysis and Marx's philosophy rely heavily on literature to articulate the critique they form around. This procedure or assemblage is exemplified most vividly perhaps by the trajectory *Hamlet* organizes between Lacan's psychoanalysis and Derrida's philosophy, where Lacan's writing is to acknowledge its memory of Freud and where Derrida acknowledges the memory of Marx as the promise of philosophy.

This impoverishes any memory which takes into account the binary of **fact and fiction**, because psychoanalysis and Marxism privilege what is spectral about memory: towards a position in fact where literature's structural demand always to challenge this binary is privileged, precisely as a scene of instruction.

The same applies to the set of problems defined here as '**regimes of memory: spaces, texts, objects, bodies**' insofar as regimes themselves stand to be deconstructed as that politics of memory which aims at hegemonizing what both psychoanalysis and Marxism, forming as they do around critical interventions into existing memory regimes, promise as an emancipating gesture. In which case spaces, texts, objects and bodies perform as a kind of battleground to what in memory is reducible to controlling legacies, or perhaps to legacy as such. In other words, spaces, objects, texts and bodies labour for memory primarily where they cannot but organize it in terms of a legacy.

While this proposition seems to be calling for a more detailed discussion of **the politics of memory**, precisely where it addresses the issue of control, it foregrounds memory in terms of economy, or else memory as an economic problem. This in turn invokes again the mnemonic logic of Marxism and psychoanalysis, not least where both define their critical interest as that of economy (psychic economy, political economy). It is also from here that a discussion of **trauma** ensues, almost logically, where the labour of trauma constitutes in fact the economic problem of memory itself.

Position paper

What interests me about **cultural memory** – and what informs the concept itself of cultural memory as it emerges in the twentieth century – is how it inherits psychoanalysis and Marxism, given that both psychoanalysis and Marxism take form precisely around critical interventions into existing memory regimes.

Literature enters all these formations (all these primal scenes?) as a scene of instruction, as both psychoanalysis and Marx's philosophy rely heavily on literature to articulate the critique they form around. This procedure or assemblage is exemplified most vividly perhaps by the trajectory that *Hamlet* organizes between Lacan's psychoanalysis and Derrida's philosophy, where Lacan's writing is to acknowledge its memory of Freud and where Derrida acknowledges the memory of Marx as the promise of philosophy.

This impoverishes any memory which takes into account the binary of **fact and fiction**, because psychoanalysis and Marxism privilege the aspects of memory that are spectral: towards a position in fact where literature's structural demand to always challenge this binary is privileged, precisely as a scene of instruction.

The same applies to the set of problems defined here as '**regimes of memory: spaces, texts, objects, bodies**' insofar as regimes themselves stand to be deconstructed as that politics of memory which aims to hegemonize what both psychoanalysis and Marxism, taking form as they do around critical interventions into existing memory regimes, promise as an emancipating gesture. In which case spaces, texts, objects and bodies perform as a kind of battleground to what in memory is reducible to controlling legacies, or perhaps to legacy as such. In other words, spaces, objects, texts and bodies labour for memory primarily where they cannot help but organize it in terms of legacy.

While this proposition seems to be calling for a more detailed discussion of **the politics of memory**, precisely where it addresses the issue of control, it foregrounds memory in terms of economy, or else memory as an economic problem. This in turn again invokes the mnemonic logic of Marxism and psychoanalysis, not least where both define their critical interest as that of economy (psychic economy, political economy). Also, it is from here that a discussion of **trauma** ensues, almost logically, where the labour of trauma constitutes in fact the economic problem of memory itself.