

Ievgeniia Sarapina

MEMORY AS TRACE: A PLACE FOR BRICOLAGE

The article deals with alternative practices of excess to the materialized collective memory. It concerns voyages to the heterotopias of memory on the Ukrainian territory. Such places could to be considered as cultural heritage, but due to their status and use become “historical rubbish”. Being free from imposed stable meanings, these spaces are suitable for bricolage tactics of so called “consumers”.

Keywords: *collective memory, heterotopias of memory, cultural heritage, bricolage, historical rubbish, ruin, practices, non-places, sublime historical experience.*

Over the past decade in Ukraine, trips alternatives to tourist tours became popular. They consist of visiting places across the country with unclaimed elements of its cultural heritage. These are buildings of eighteenth – twentieth centuries which are no longer used for their original purpose: palaces, castles, manors, villas, mills, churches and cathedrals, monasteries, cemeteries, former closed Soviet military objects located in the villages and towns in Ukraine. Today these places exist as heterotopias, according to Michel Foucault, meaning places outside any places even though they are localized in space. There, on the one hand, all orderings of the society are present but on the other, they are challenged [3, p. 353]. Due to the lowering of the status of these objects to the category of ‘historical rubbish’, they avoid institutionalization as illustrations of the collective memory, and therefore remain open to the practices of ‘consumers’ who create a bricolage of their appeal to the past by their choice. Thus, analysis of such practices allows to consider an

unexplored area of collective memory – a level of meanings of the collective past's recipient.

Foucault calls heterotopias a cultural universal. In prehistoric communities, these were the spaces for people in the liminal periods of life, in our time such heterotopias disappear, instead the focus is shifting to heterotopias of deviation – spaces for individuals whose behavior does not meet current social standards (homes for the elderly, psychiatric clinics, prisons, cemeteries etc.). These are totally different places compared with topoi in which we live, unreal, but those that can potentially allow enter beyond their surface [3, p.353]. Mentioned places in Ukraine can be considered as heterotopias in two dimensions – according to their social and memorial functions. Regarding the first, listed topoi function as spaces of exception: mental hospitals, orphanages, and hospitals of a closed type (mainly tuberculosis dispensaries and sanatoriums), institutions for children with special needs, correctional institutions, military units, and others. Regarding their memorial function, these sites are excluded from the official canon of Ukrainian collective memory. Their initial exclusion took place in Soviet times since buildings that embodied capitalist past were not considered as something that the country of proletarians should remember. Therefore they were destroyed or their function was changed to the above-mentioned institutions or boarding and vocational schools. Most of these buildings are not reactualized in the memory canon that has been forming since the times of Ukraine's independence. In addition, to the unclaimed heritage, objects of Soviet period are added as seventy years that preceded the independence of Ukraine are currently in the intensive process of re-interpretation, elimination, and negation, so the buildings of this period are not yet perceived as historical monuments.

An assumption that memory heterotopias represent a case of structural amnesia might in particular be proved by the fact that only a small portion of these buildings was mentioned in 'Monuments of city-building and architecture of the Ukrainian SSR', 1983-1986 (the last official acting register of immovable

monuments on the territory of Ukraine) and thus were under protection according to the law as a part on national heritage. For instance, among twenty samples of the preserved manor architecture in Zhytomyr region, only seven sites were included in the list, among them five without any historical references or names of the previous owners [16, p. 153-156].

As to the popularity of the heterotopia travelling practices on the territory of Ukraine, the third rank in rating among the Ukrainian LiveJournal communities of the one that is dedicated to such trips speaks for itself. However, for this whole situation, a position of Michael De Certeau is more appropriate as he believes that any statistical study stays blind to the trajectories developed by tactics since it is satisfied with classifying, calculating, and creating tables of 'lexical' units, which make up, but to which can not be reduced, practices of so-called 'consumers'. Statistical research captures material of these practices leading it to its own categories and taxonomies; it determines the elements used but not the 'phrases' produced by a 'bricoleur' and not the discursivity that combines them. Due to its ability to division, to analytical fragmentation, statistics captures only homologous and loses sight of issues the search and representation of which it declared [2, p. xviii, 34].

Example of memory heterotopias in Ukraine illustrates Krzysztof Pomian's observation that the history of the cultural heritage development is caused by a series of breaks, changes of collective beliefs, of lifestyles, technological revolutions promoting new lifestyles that are replacing the old ones. Each industrial and almost every political revolution are such turning points. These processes deprive certain artifacts of their functions and determine their demotion to the class of garbage, rubbish, the forgotten [7, p. 24]. Therefore, value is a product of social processes and not an inherent property of things. Assigning objects to a certain rank in symbolic hierarchy is a result of social games with fixed rules, in which the one who controls time, space, and knowledge provides durability to one objects and temporality to the other. According to a simple but

appropriate expression of Gay Hawkins, people assess something as rubbish when they no longer want to be associated with something [5, p.75].

Thus, 'Communist Manifesto' declared that workers have no fatherland. That is why at first Bolsheviks associated their past not with the territory but with revolutionary movements of all times starting from Spartacus. However, in 1931, Stalin proclaimed that from now on workers have a motherland since it had finally been freed from capitalists [13, p. 34]. By the assertion that exploiting classes no longer exist in the Soviet Union, the Constitution of the USSR in 1936 neutralized the concept of class as a criterion for society stratification. Therefore since the late 30's, rehabilitation of nationality as a label of classification had been taking place. Throughout its history, Soviet memory policy sought to combine in its contradictory narrative revolutionary class eschatology and conservative imperial project of essentialistic articulation of ethnic differences. As a result, in cultural geography of the USSR the area of oblivion encompasses capitalist past and everything that contradicts the thesis of 'primordial Ukrainian lands'. That is why the register of immovable monuments of 1986 lacks mentioning of owners and founders of buildings that belonged to the 'exploiting class' or any nation except Ukrainian and Russian.

In periods of resignification of the past, it becomes evident to which extent one needs 'waste' as a category of objects with zero degree value. Formation of value systems is based on the principle of limitation and borders demarcation, that is why the category of waste allows to consider transformations of utilitarian and axiological attitudes to material culture. Without this category, generation of new and unexpected value systems would be impossible as 'garbage' is not subject to control mechanisms (the latter are mainly concerned with public part of the system, with socially appreciated objects) and thus are flexible to unexpected new uses and functions that people assign to them [8, p. 26].

Objects of trips to Ukrainian heterotopias can be correlated with the category of 'garbage' as currently at national scale, they have zero value. As Foucault notes,

such places usually possess a well defined function in society; however, one of the characteristics of heterotopias is that they can be made function in an absolutely different way without changing their status [3, p.353].

That is what happens during the trips to ‘forgotten’ sites in Ukraine because the purposes of these journeys are the building currently unintended for tourist visits. Visitors are not expected neither in the former Tereshchenko estate in Chervone village, where after the eviction of the technical college, a nunnery of Moscow patriarchate resides; nor in the former Radzivils residence in Olyka, Volyn’ region, where a mental hospital has been situated since the Soviet times. In fact, the practices if their visiting can hardly be considered as tourism per se as they are closer to independent travelling. During organized tours and museum visits, places are arranged into ‘spatial narratives’ when through a series of codes, established routes, and restrictions, regulation of promotion in space is established. Such narrative structures function as spatial syntax that organizes places into the linear or interconnected series. A chain of spatial operations produces representations of sites through appropriation and manipulation of ‘right’ names. Thus, through a genealogy, a differentiation of places, and demarcation of borders of significant and insignificant, semantic hierarchy and installation of semantic order are established [2, p. 104-115].

At the official tourist destinations a ‘reversal of gaze’ of a future traveler is accomplished by numerous travel publications that offer in advance images of a future trip. Directly on the spot, a visitor might be proposed such ‘educational tools’ as an audio guide, an organized guided tour or a guide book that would substitute a direct presence here and now with simplified tourist information. That is why official topoi tend to turn into ‘non-places’ in the terminology of Mark Augé. This is a negative quality of place, an absence of place caused by the name imposed on it. These are the spaces where the social is not produced and where individuals are dealt with only at entrance and exit. Modern non-places are determined by words and texts, though which they suggest visitors to interact with

the space and with each other. These service instructions might be prescriptive, prohibitive or informative. Sometimes they are encoded as ideograms or maps. Individuals are supposed to interact only with texts that are proposed to them not by other individuals but by institutions: establishments or ministries, the presence of which is often directly acknowledged on plates or vaguely guessed from messages that numerous 'supporting tools' – signs, screens, posters, ads [1, p. 96].

However, as Michel de Certeau remarks, redundancy of nominations can convert a place into a desert, when, for instance, technocratic government takes everything under control and deprives space of any ambiguity [2, p. 106]. In a certain sense, the only thing that can be said about officially sacralized places is repeating what has already been said about them earlier. Such transformation took place with Baturyn, Chernihiv region. Since the beginning of twentieth century, Kyrylo Razumovsky's palace has been a ruin. However, after the implementation of the program of monuments reconstruction called 'Hetman's Capital' in 2009, the former heterotopia becomes a national park, after which the then president took care.

Renovation erases from the town buildings tactile traces of time that used to contribute to a sense of authenticity, while construction around the new 'attractions' (such as a Cossack citadel of Baturyn fortress) of monuments and memorials transforms this place from the space free for practices and interpretations of visitors into a visualized message of the project's authors – an evidence of Ukraine's statist traditions.

Redundancy of maintenance, of guidebooks and brochures descriptions deprives places of a distance to viewers that is necessary for the work of their imagination. An object attracts by its inherent lack as, according to Jean Baudrillard, at the basis of the seduction a mechanism of uncertainty lies. But when desire is operationalized, it loses reality since it is deprived of the imaginary dimension. Seduction is a game of appearances that overthrow all systems of meaning and power. This game is not about duplicating reality (like the captions

beneath four objects) but about isolation, taking away one dimension in real space because excess blocks fantasy.

It turns surrounding into a hyperreality, an absolute evidence when all the time, people are given more than it is necessary, when there is nothing to add from themselves and nothing to give in return. In hyperreality, a distance necessary for perception is reduced to zero, that deprives a viewer from a required minimum of analytical perception [12, p. 25-102]. Unlike museum space where everything should be codified, accumulated, and registered, at memory heterotopias sites, lack and ambiguity as a result of time and uncertainty of their current status are always present. Foucault notes that in regards to the rest of spaces, heterotopias operate between two poles creating the space of illusion that frees real space as even more illusory and forming another, 'ideal' space in the chaotic real world. That is how heterotopias are connected with pieces of time. He calls it a 'pure symmetry of heterochronism': heterotopia functions at full capacity if a person feels a full break with his/her familiar, traditional time [1, p. 354]. In such spaces, a traveler becomes a detective trying to reconstruct the past from the traces that were not addressed to descendants and were not designed for long-term preservation in time. The work of the imagination is here no less important than archive research as imaginary is not identical to fiction but rather to the contrary, it is a production, a discovering – it is the work of construction that lies at the basis of everything cultural. Besides, as Aleida Assmann mentions, such recollections, which occur with a help of imagination, often betray themselves in weak codings through half-erased traces and permanent threat of loss [11, p 92, 123]. And that is exactly the state of places that we call memory heterotopias.

Actually, interest in ruins emerges in eighteenth – nineteenth centuries when it was a popular form of strengthening the presence of the past in the present. Georg Simmel describes ruins as objects on the edge of nature and culture that produce problematic, exhilarating, often unbearable effect on people when they see objects that falls out of active life becoming its passive frame. Through the ruins,

an awareness of a distance, of a time gap comes in a material form. Thus, a ruin evokes memories because it is a remnant of what has disappeared [14, p. 227–233].

That is why such places can provoke "ahnung" (Ger. 'anticipation') of Johan Huizinga, a contact with the past that can not be reduced to anything outside itself, an entrance to the world that belongs only to it [9, p. 180]. This is the category of 'sublime historical experience' by Franklin Ankersmit, through which he offers to resist hierarchisation of the past reality on the basis of what is random using a famous Leopold von Ranke's guideline to experience the 'joy of specific and singular' without thinking how the whole reflects in it [10, p. 360]. The notion of 'experience' includes not only sensual experience but also 'intellectual experience' as mind can function as a repository of experiences better than eyes or fingers. Therefore, historical experience is how we experience the past, how its experience occurs at the moment of the simultaneous uncovering and renovation of the past: a disclosure of the reality that once has 'detached' from the present and seeks to restore itself by overcoming the barrier between the past and present [9, p. 27-32]. Historical experience proposes breaks of the sublime in the grid of meanings and contexts. It gives confidence in its authenticity through the ability to lock all its sources of meaning, to possess 'a fullness in itself' that guarantees freedom from the slightest hint of semantic dependency on the context. And vice versa, the context usually kills authenticity. At the moment of sublime historical experience everything outside the axis 'past – present' – the context of our personal past and art or historical context of the object – do not matter [9, p. 390].

So, often, institutionalized places of memory due to the excess of disciplinary signifying practices turn into non-places that create neither singular identity, nor social relations but only loneliness and similarity. Instead, according to Mark Augé's observations, in Western societies, an individuals want more and more to be a world in itself, strives to interpret the information they receives by themselves [1, p 37, 103]. That refers to the individual production of sense, to the signifying practices, the trajectories of which consumers-bricolaires produce

according to their own logic. These are unpredictable sentences drawn from the vocabularies of established languages (television, newspapers, museums etc.) according to established syntactic forms (temporal modes of schedules, paradigmatic orders of spaces). These trajectories indicate tricks and gimmicks of interests and desires neither determined, nor captured by the systems in which they have appeared [2, p. xviii]. In the area of Ukrainian collective memory, such trajectories exist regarding the category of 'historical rubbish'. One can be blind to the materiality of everyday objects, might take them for granted, however, these objects do not just occupy the sphere of materiality, they transmit human interests, transfer desires, and transform strategies. For John Frow, function derives from the object's application, and potential ways of things' application ('appropriate' and 'inappropriate' ones) are infinitely variable. That is why, things and people co-produce one another: things are simultaneously the products of social relations and influence the latter [4, p. 36].

Future fate of memory heterotopias in Ukraine remains uncertain. They could remain in the zone of oblivion, or might be transferred from garbage to something of value, and that is always a process of two borders crossing – between non-valuable and valuable, between closeness and publicity [8,p.26]. Transformation of the status of waste (reframing rubbish) usually begins with the fact that it is noticed. Before the games of values and usage are activated, one has to acknowledge rejected objects not as passive and obsolete context of our lives but as a mobile and living sphere open for reformatting. Things become visible when they are in a state of transition, in the process of reanimation and resignification. Generally, a thing is noticed when its objectification disappears, when it seems that the object falls out from all systems that used to give it meaning and value [5, p. 79-81]. On the non-institutional level, this is already happening with memory heterotopias in Ukraine. For instance, an old mansion on the outskirts of the provincial settlement at first attracts attention as a thing that falls out of the general structure of the post-Soviet regional center with its typical housing system. Then it becomes a break in time that offers direct access to the past through the tactile

traces of time on its surface, like the secrets that it had once overheard and can now transmit without an intermediary to the traveler. This contact with objects rejected by modern culture defamiliarizes the latter putting a traveler into a position of 'non-agglutination' with the imposed meanings. Certainly, a new objectification of the mentioned places currently situated on the margins of the structural order can be assumed. However, now it is essential to pay attention to the singularity factors of objects, groups, their members, and places as the singularities of all types compose a paradoxical counterpoint to the procedures that reduce the unitary to the generalized [1, p. 37]. Finally, reinterpreting rubbish is reinterpreting all practices that make us blind to the reality and opportunities of things that have preserved in time [5, p. 81].

This potential reality could be defined in different ways. It is, according to Pierre Nora's dictum, a decryption of who we are now in light of who we no longer are [15]. It is also a reality of unsymbolized historical experience that avoids fixation in stable narratives and therefore presents an alternative to the official version of collective memory. For instance, in regards to ethnic grounds heterotopia objects that were once created by the Poles, Hungarians, Germans, Ukrainian, Russian etc, indicate a dialogue of cultures on the territory of Ukraine, a dialogue that the construction of national identity is always striving to lead to a monologue of one nation. Applying a felicitous phrase of Teresa de Lauretis, 'identity is an active construction and discursively mediated political interpretation of one's history' [6, p. 12]. It is at the stage of preliminary deconstruction of collective identity while the new one is still undeveloped when the constructivist character of identity and tradition creations becomes explicit.

Literature

1. Augé M. *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity* / Mark Augé ;[translated by John Howe] – London, New York : Verso, 1995. – 122 p.

2. Certeau M. *The Practice of Everyday Life* / Michel de Certeau ; translated by Steven Rendall. – Berkeley : University of California Press, 1984. – 232 p.
3. Foucault M. *Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias* / Michel Foucault // *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory* ; [edited by Neil Leach] – London: Routledge, 1997. – P. 350–358.
4. Frow J. *Individious Distinction* / John Frow // *Culture and Waste: The Creation and Destruction of Value* ; edited by Gay Hawkins, Stephen Muecke. – Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003. – P. 25-39.
5. Hawkins G. *The Ethics of Waste: How We Relate to Rubbish* / Gay Hawkins. – Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006. – 151 p.
6. Laretis T. *The Essence of the Triangle or, Taking the Risk of Essentialism Seriously: Feminist Theory in Italy, the U.S., and Britain. Differences* / Teresa de Laretis // *A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 1 (Summ 1989): 3-37.
7. Pomian K. *Collectors and Curiosities: Paris and Venice, 1500-1800* / Krzysztof Pomian ; translated by Elizabeth Wiles-Portier. – Oxford : Polity Press, 1990. – 348 p.
8. Tompson M. *Rubbish Theory: The Creation and Destruction of Value.* – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979. – 240 p.
9. Анкерсмит Ф. *Возвышенный исторический опыт* / Франклин Рудольф Анкерсмит ; [пер. с англ. И.В. Борисова, Е.Э.Лямина, М.С.Неклюдова, А.А.Олейникова, Н.Н. Сосны]. – М. : Европа, 2007. – 612 с.
10. Анкерсмит Ф. Р. *История и тропология: взлет и падение метафоры* / Франклин Рудольф Анкерсмит; [пер. с англ. М. Кукарцева, Е. Коломоец, В. Кашаев] – М. : Прогресс-Традиция, 2003. – 496 с.
11. Ассман А. *Простори спогаду. Форми та трансформації культурної пам'яті* / Аляйда Ассман ; [пер. з нім. К.Дмитренко, Л.Доронічева, О.Юдін] – К. : Ніка-Центр, 2012. – 440 с. – (Серія «Зміна парадигми»; Вип. 15).
12. Бодрийяр Ж. *Соблазн* / Жан Бодрийяр ; [пер. А. Гараджи] – М: Ad Marginem, 2000. – 318 с.

13. Єкельчик С. Імперія пам'яті: російсько-українські стосунки в радянській історичній уяві / Сергій Єкельчик. – К.: Критика, 2008. – 303 с.
14. Зиммель Г. Руїна // Избранное. Пер. с нем. в 2 томах / Георг Зиммель ; [пер. с нем. М.И.Левина, Л.Г.Ионин; отв. ред. Л.Т.Мильская; сост. С.Я.Левит, Л.В.Скворцо] – М. : Юристъ, 1996. – т. 2. Созерцание жизни. – С. 227–233. – (Лики культуры).
15. Нора П. Между памятью и историей. Проблематика мест памяти / Пьер Нора, Мона Озуф, Жерар де Пюимеж, Мишель Винок ; [пер. с франц. Д. Хапаевой под научн. ред. Н.Копосова] // Франция – память. – СПб.: Изд-во С. - Петерб. ун-та, 1999. – С. 17–50. – (Новая петербургская библиотека. Коллекция "Память века").
16. Памятники градостроительства и архитектуры Украинской ССР. Иллюстрированный справочник-каталог в четырех томах / [ред. Н.Л. Жариков]. – К.: Будівельник, 1983-1986. – 1200 с.

Сарапіна Є. В.

ПАМ'ЯТЬ-СЛІД: МІСЦЕ ДЛЯ БРІКОЛАЖУ

Статтю присвячено альтернативним практикам долучення до матеріалізованої колективної пам'яті. Розглянуто мандрівки до гетеротопій пам'яті на території сучасної України – місць, що складають культурну спадщину, проте за своїм статусом і використанням стають «історичним непотребом» – як простір вільний від нав'язаних усталених значень, а отже відкритий до тактик «споживачів»-бріколерів.

Ключові слова: *колективна пам'ять, гетеротопії пам'яті, культурна спадщина, бріколаж, історичне сміття, руїна, практики, не-місця, піднесений історичний досвід.*

