

## MEMORY AND HISTORY

“Memory and history are far from synonymous, we recognise they are opposites. Memory is alive, always carried by the living and in this respect, memory is in a permanent state of evolution. It is open to the influence of remembering and of amnesia, the unconsciousness of repeated distortions, vulnerable to all kinds of controls and manipulation, susceptible to long inactivity or sudden rekindling. History is always the difficult and incomplete reconstruction of what is no longer. Memory is always a current phenomenon, a living link to an eternal present. History is a representation of the past. Because it is emotional and magical, memory tolerates only those details which support it and is fed by memories that are vague, overlapping, general or flexible, individual or symbolic, sensitive to all selective memory, censure or projections. Because history is an intellectual and worldly exercise it calls for analysis and critical discourse. Remembrance places memory in the realm of the sacred. History scrutinises it, always unembellished. Memory arises from the group that it bonds together. It is like saying, as Halbwachs did, that there are as many memories as there are groups of people. So by definition, they multiple and are multiplying, plural and individualised. History, on the other hand, belongs to everyone and to no one, and it aspires to be universal. Memory is rooted in the tangible, in space, gesture, image and object. History is only linked to continuity over time, to evolution and to the relationship between things. Memory is an absolute and history only knows the relative. »

Pierre Nora

Presentation of the works « Places of remembrance »  
Between Remembrance and History  
The analysis of place – 1. The end of Remembrance and History

Published in three volumes, Quarto Gallimard 1997