

UDC 316.93

**THE CONCEPT OF HISTORICAL MEMORY IN THE CONTEXT OF
HISTORICAL AND HUMANITARIAN STUDIES**

Kyubek Zhangylsyn Zhadetkyzy
kiyubek@gmail.com

Doctoral student of the Faculty of International Relations,
specialty "Regional studies", L.N.Gumilyov ENU, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan
Supervisor – Nurbaev Zh.E.

Annotation: In the theoretical part of the study the main issue was to determine the basis of the concept of historical memory. The study showed the differences between history and historical memory. The views of sociologists and historians on the problem of memory from the beginning of the twentieth century to the present day, the work of other researchers on introducing

the concept of cultural memory into interdisciplinary research are presented. In conclusion, the importance of studying memory and its role in understanding historical events of the past is revealed.

The "memorial boom" in the social and humanitarian sciences of recent decades has led many researchers to the conclusion that today a new paradigm of social and humanitarian research has been formed (or is being formed), associated with the concepts of "memory", "remembrance", "oblivion". The corresponding discursive space was formed gradually. Even during the 1980s, many subjects that later became fundamental for "memorial studies" were considered as part of the study of tradition, heritage, political mythology, etc.

The flow of work that can be attributed to the field of "memory research" in various fields of science during the 1980s and 90s increased avalanche-like. A large number of terms have been proposed to denote the collective dimension of memory: "collective memory", "social memory", "cultural memory", "popular memory", "public memory". Most of them have not yet received any unambiguous definitions, their mutual relationship also remains a subject of discussion.

Sociologist Maurice Halbwachs wrote about the nature of collective memory long before this topic attracted the attention of historians, almost a hundred years ago. Between the two World Wars, Halbwachs wrote a series of articles about the driving forces of collective memory. His works, rejected for a

long time, are now perceived with great enthusiasm by historians who have discovered in his theory the guiding principles of their own research. Often quoted by historians dealing with the politics of memory, Halbwachs is now understood more fully than when he worked [1].

Memories of the past are constantly being reviewed, so they are extremely unreliable for describing what really happened, and their images must be interpreted taking into account hidden motives. Thus, Halbwachs's works on the social foundations of collective memory provided a reliable theoretical basis for studying the politics of memory, which modern historians are engaged in with passion [2].

Halbwachs's theoretical position on the problem of memory/history is most easily captured in the summary that he proposed in his book "Collective Memory", published in 1950. Here he refers to "the ultimate opposition between memory and history". With this formula, he intended to emphasize the difference between the types of the past that they restore. Memory asserts the similarity between the past and the present. There is a magic of memory that is invoked because it conveys the past as if it had become alive again [3].

It can be noted that neither the absence of a single universally recognized theory of memory, taken in its collective dimension, nor the variety of terms prevent us from talking about the "memory paradigm" in modern sociohumanitarian knowledge. The presence of a common "memorial" perspective, which allows us to consider diverse and still little related phenomena from a single angle, is quite sufficient reason for this. H.L. Rediger and J.V. Wertsch wrote about it this way: "We believe that memory studies is too vast a field for any comprehensive theories to bring it to unity and try to explain all the huge number of phenomena of interest. Rather, as it seems to us, a situation similar to that which takes place in the psychology of memory will develop here. There are many theories of memory coexisting there, each of which tries to explain a rather modest and strictly defined circle of facts and phenomena. Undoubtedly, the same will be true for memory studies as long as they mature as a research field. New concepts and terms will arise, new theories will be created" [4].

Currently, the attention of researchers is attracted by more and more new types of memory carriers. From this point of view, architectural structures, monuments, works of art, language, films, school textbooks, art and scientific literature are considered. Properly, it is the fact that the "memorial" angle of view allowed us to consider in interrelation a huge complex of cultural phenomena, until then little connected in scientific discourse, is the main argument in favor of the

"paradigmaticity" of the memory studies research field. This aspect of the memorial problem has found the most extensive continuation in modern French historiography. In the 1980s and early 1990s, the collective project "Places of Memory" was implemented under the leadership of P. Nora. "Places" can be both symbolic and physically specific. The main thing is that these are such "places" in which society concentrates what it considers important, integral to its individual appearance and worthy of preservation [5].

In the XIX–XX centuries, the purposeful use of history and collective memory in the assertion of dominant political discourses and the formation of a system of loyalties became an integral part of the domestic and foreign policy of states, a means of forming and legitimizing nations, an instrument of political mobilization [6]. The "invention of traditions", ideological unification and mobilization, the achievement of a certain level of cultural homogeneity necessary to ensure collective loyalty to the nation and the state, the conduct of modern warfare would be impossible without the manipulation of history and "collective memory".

"Historical memory" is a relatively stable set of interrelated collective ideas about the past of a particular group, purposefully constructed by means of historical policy, codified and standardized in social, cultural, political discourses, stereotypes, myths, symbols, mnemonic and commemorative practices [7].

Recognizing the loss of the presence of the past, historical memory carried with it traces of sentimentality. The commemoration recognized the limitations of memory's ability to reconstruct the past. But when perceiving the reality of a particular past, it was necessary to remember exactly the connection with it. The present could be different from the past, although it remained connected to it through evolutionary lines of succession. In memory, you can place the beginnings and trace the stages of development. The growing awareness of the fact that memorization was a special moment of memory led, therefore, to the emergence of a historical view that separated knowledge in the present from knowledge of earlier traditions. The past of living memory, understood as a continuum extending from the present to the vague horizons of the past, has given way to historical memory, which places the events of the past and present inside fictional chronologies. Thus, historical cognition begins to take possession of memory, and in the process changes its meaning. Historical memory depends less on inherited wisdom, more on reconstructive interpretation. In the past, it was now possible to find yourself traveling through time in order to visit outlandish places that you had to learn how to handle. The task was to reconstruct the consciousness of the past as well as one can imagine. Thus, historical memory reached distant horizons in order to reconstruct the imagination of an earlier era [8].

The correlation of history and memory is another important area of discussion both in historical science proper and in memory studies. M. Halbwachs's idea that the image of the past is socially constructed has proved to be extremely popular with modern researchers. At the same time, Halbwachs himself stood on firm positivist positions in this regard and clearly opposed historical science and memory. History, in his opinion, should be an objective, impartial, impersonal, absolute picture of the past — such as it was "in fact", memory is its direct opposite. It is subjective, selective, biased, connected with the interests of groups. History for Halbwachs begins where memory ends [9].

Memory research is primarily an interdisciplinary field of modern science and, as in any interdisciplinary project, research perspectives and resources depend on the nature of the dominant discipline. For the current research, such a theoretical, centering factor is the philosophical and anthropological principles of the study of culture as a multi-actor dynamic system, where the processes of various kinds of social interactions, symbolic and situational communications, yielding to the influence of dominant power discourses and everyday attributions intersect in the concepts of culture practice. The factors that influenced the applied nature of the research are more or less related to the methodologies of social and cultural anthropology. As a result, the concept of

practices is considered as epistemological, as a language of self-description, actualized by the collapse of the Soviet, reformatting of state independence; as a possibility of the restoration of the repressed, and the legitimization of not only regional, generic, but also diverse aspects of identity; also as a reaction to the traumatic experiences of the twentieth century.

List of sources used:

1. Dialogues with time: memory of the past in the context of history. Edited by L.P. Repina. – Moscow: Krug, 2008. – 800 p.
2. Assman Y. The Long shadow of the past: Memorial culture and historical politics / Y. Assman – Moscow: New Literary Review, 2014. – 328 p.
3. Halbwachs M. The social framework of memory / M. Halbwachs — M.: New Publishing House, 2007. – 348 p.
4. Roediger H. L. (III), Wertsch J. V. Creating a new discipline of memory studies // Memory Studies. 2008. Vol. 1 (1). P. 18-19.
5. Nora P. Between memory and history. Problematics of places of memory // France-memory – St. Petersburg, 1999. P. 17-50
6. Patrick H. Hutton. History as the Art of Memory / X. Patrick. —St. Petersburg: publishing house "Vladimir Dal", 2004. – 422 p.
7. Kasyanov G. Ukraine and neighbors: historical politics 1987-2018 / G.Kasyanov – M: UFO, 2019. – 282 p.
8. Empire and nation in the mirror of historical memory: collection of articles, Moscow: New Publishing House, 2011. — 416 p
9. Riker P. Memory, history, oblivion / P. Riker - Moscow: Publishing House of Humanitarian Literature, 2004. – 728 p.