

Vlaho Kovačević

University of Split, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

<https://doi.org/10.5937/int-themed-bg25195K>

Media and collective memory in late modernity

Abstract

At the phenomenological level, this paper examines the relationship between the media and collective memory in a networked society. The aim is to trace, in a temporal context, the unfolding historical transformations that signal the emergence of a new world. The perception of time shows a new and unfamiliar world marked by contours and shifts that are only beginning to be discerned. This emergent world requires new forms of knowledge and is governed by new rules, both of which are reflected in changing individual attitudes toward temporality. The sociology of time indicates changes in attitudes towards time, including changes in how the past is understood. By exploring modern social and cultural forms and the conceptual apparatus through which we acquire knowledge about these forms, sociology reflects on the importance of memory. Memory contributes to the ability to understand and attribute meaning to phenomena and circumstances, thereby situating collective memory as one of the areas of sociological research. In the introduction, it will be argued that after the emergence of new communication media and altered social relations to the past, collective memory leads to the transfer of memories in late modernity. After analysing several key characteristics of social relations between media and collective memory in late modernity, the paper will demonstrate how late modernity creates new challenges for collective memory. Finally, the conclusion will assess the extent to which media reshape the terms through which collective memory is conceptualized and its role understood in late modernity.

Keywords: social memory, social relations, media culture, information society, community of memory.

Introduction

Accepting Maurice Halbwachs's (1985: 121) thesis on the social conditionality of memory, the phenomenological approach highlights the inherently social dimension of collective memory. Social memory presupposes the presence of others, manifesting itself through interaction and communication, and can scarcely be disentangled from communicative processes. The study of memory has long been central to cultural studies, significant-

ly advanced by the work of Jan Assmann. In *Cultural Memory*, Assmann (2005: 43) argues that “memory lives and is maintained in communication; if it is interrupted, that is, if the connecting frames of the communicated reality disappear or change, the consequence is forgetting.” In late modernity, forgetting becomes particularly evident through the erosion of community bonds and the destabilization of identity formation.

To reconstruct the relationship between media and collective memory, it is necessary to account for the transformations undergone by societies in late modernity, as well as the foundational concepts from memory studies (Žanić, 2017: 10). In this regard, a new paradigm within cultural studies has emerged around the category of memory, offering fresh perspectives on the role of the media. With the advancement of science, and especially the rise of information and communication technologies, the media have assumed a pervasive role as constructors of social thought, deeply implicated in the mediated production of social reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Hromadžić, 2014).

The mass media permeate both society and culture, the world of objects, images, and information, as well as the related hedonistic, permissive, and psychological values, thereby influencing the formation of collective memory. The culture of the spectacle illustrates how the media replace reality with simulations (Debord, 1999). At the same time, the media introduce novel forms of behavioural control and foster an unprecedented diversification of lifestyles. As Paić (2020: 13) observes, “Very often, such discourses are covert or even open forms of commercial and political interests that generate profit or social influence.” Manipulation and seduction within the sphere of media activity have advanced to such a degree (William, 2005) that they have precipitated the systematic destabilization of collective memory, particularly in the domains of private life, belief systems, and social roles, thus constituting a new phase in the history of Western individualism.

In *Wasted Lives: Modernity and Its Outcasts*, Bauman (2004: 133) reflects on this condition by asking: “is the game of inclusion/exclusion the only way in which human life together can take place and the only conceivable form that our common world can take – give – as a result?” In this context, it becomes essential to investigate the reciprocal dynamics of individualization, the reconfiguration of temporality, and the transformation of remembrance practices in late modernity (Žanić, 2017:10). Consequently, there arises a need to analyse media content and media culture in relation to collective memory. Probing the complex entanglement of media and memory reveals the novel status that memory assumes in late modernity.

1. Media and reconstruction of the past in the context of collective memory

Scholars have become increasingly attentive to the problem of time and to the relationship between media and social memory – specifically, collective memory, within which significant transformations can be observed. The development of technology must be considered from a temporal perspective, for it is technology that has driven media convergence and facilitated the temporal independence of users. As Barbara Misztal (2021: 162) observes in *Theories of Social Remembering*, “with the disintegration of the old-time order, in which the past and future have been replaced by an extended present and in which linear time is replaced by current time, memory does not seem to matter.” A similar perspective is articulated by Halbwachs (1985: 368) in *Collective Memory*, where he argues that “the forgetting or deforming of certain memories can also be explained by the fact that these frames change in transitions from one period of time to another.”

In this respect, it is necessary to consider how the dynamics of modernity shape the potential transformations of collective memory in late modernity (Žanić, 2017: 10). Rapid shifts – manifested in constant changes in work, life conditions, and social as well as material circumstances – appear to render the memories of previous generations less relevant to younger population. As individuals participate in multiple events simultaneously and experience the accelerated pace and fluidity of time, the demand for private time and the desire to reassert control over one’s own temporal experience also intensify. As Misztal (2021:162) notes, “the consequences of constant change, the pursuit of innovation, the growing pressure and speed of time, lead to the need to develop new mechanisms of balance between novelty, repetition, and the past.”

Memory or collective remembering, whether conceptualized as cultural, social, or collective (Szpunar, 2012: 1202), is intrinsically connected to the formation of collective identity (Hall, 1999). In this regard, as Giddens emphasizes, the late modern social world does not erase the relevance of tradition (Jakelić, 2010: 196) nor can it completely abolish the significance of the past (Žanić, 2017: 10). Authors such as Casanova (2006) and Eisenstadt (1999, 2000) similarly defend the persistence of vital collectivist memories in late modernity. They not only reject the “notion of a modern radical break with tradition” but also advance the idea of “essential modern continuity with tradition” (Casanova, 2006: 14), situating this within Eisenstadt’s framework of “multiple modernities” (1999: 285; 2000: 2). Thus, late modernity is characterized by a dynamic relationship to memory, one

that is continuously reinterpreted in light of emergent social phenomena (Žanić, 2017).

This dynamic, however, introduces new challenges for tradition, which must be rethought. As Giddens (2002) argues, individuals must be seen not only as beings situated in time but also as actors aware of the passage of time, which is inseparable from the nature of their social institutions. Accordingly, individuals construct their identities through representations of the past and the narration of the self over time. For Giddens (1991), the self is neither a fixed entity nor a mere collection of attributes; rather, it must be continually recreated. Identity, therefore, lies in the capacity to sustain a coherent narrative by integrating external events and representations into an unfolding story of the self. Within this process, memory and collective remembering are interwoven, emerging from both individual and collective experiences of the past. They are part of our identity as a personal narrative we believe in and as our interpretations of everyday interactions with family and friends (Meyen & Pfaff-Rüdiger, 2014).

In their works *Inventing Tradition* (Hobsbawm, 2012) and *Places of Memory* (Nora, 1996), the authors reflect on the effects of turbulent social changes, which result in fractures, interruptions, and discontinuities with the past. Consequently, collective memory cannot be understood as mere knowledge; it must be continuously reviewed and revised, as Szpunar (2012: 1202) argues, and memory is inherently procedural (Zelizer, 1995). Collective memory and remembering are sustained through family conversations, photo albums, the writing of history books, and the enactment of commemorations (Nora, 1996). Yet, as Kansteiner (2002) and Zelizer (2008) note, contemporary mass media often neglect researching remembrance, even though journalists are deeply involved in shaping processes of remembrance. By covering the past, mass media do not merely provide signs of memory (Aleida Assmann, 1995; Jan Assmann, 1995), social frameworks (Halbwachs, 1985), or what Zelizer (1995) calls “detectives of the past,” “facts” or path to historical “knowledge” (Meyen & Pfaff-Rüdiger, 2014:6). In doing so, as argued by Meyen and Pfaff-Rüdiger (2014), the mass media simultaneously influence and participate in the contest over the power to define cultural memory.

In this context, the relationship between memory and history emerges as a central question, particularly in relation to the value of understanding the “community of memory.” Within such communities, collective remembering provides a framework through which members conceptualize shared action and reaffirm belonging, thereby shaping a common understanding of identity. As Assmann (2005: 45) notes, every community seeks to establish and preserve spaces that serve “not only as sites of interaction

but also as symbols of identity and repositories of memory.” Building on this, Misztal (2021) emphasizes that the meaning of collective or social memory lies in its capacity to illuminate how the guarded sense of self is negotiated in everyday coexistence with members of other communities. While memory is ultimately rooted in individual mental acts, it is simultaneously embedded within culture and constrained by social context. An intersubjectivist approach implies: although media and collective memories are socially organized and mediated, individual memory actively interacts with and contributes to the collective. From this perspective, the sociology of memory highlights the distinctiveness of collective memory, which cannot be reduced to the aggregate of individual recollections. As Zerubavel (1997) argues, collective memory encompasses only those memories that are *commonly held* within the group.

2. Collective memory as a social transmission of memories in late modernity

In his introduction to *How Societies Remember*, Paul Connerton (2004) observes that “We generally hold that memory is an individual gift. On top of that, there are quite a few thinkers who agree that there is such a thing as a collective or social memory.” As Misztal (2021) notes, the phenomenon of memory has long fascinated scholars, as it constitutes a fundamental human capacity to interpret and make sense of experiences and circumstances. Similarly, Terdiman (1993) argues that memory is embedded in every act of perception, intellect, and language. It is also intimately connected to emotion, both because emotions often reference the past and because memories themselves can evoke them.

According to Misztal (2021), memory is central to understanding what it means to be human and functions as the primary medium through which identities are constructed by addressing questions such as: Who are we? Where do we belong? Where are we going? As Nussbaum (2001: 177) argues, “A complete separation of the self from memory would mean a complete loss of self – and therefore of all activities for which the meaning of one’s own identity is important.” In this sense, memory serves as a guardian of difference, enabling us to retain and preserve the multiple images of ourselves that we acquire throughout our unique lives (Wollin, 1989: 40).

While media provide significant benefits, it is equally crucial to acknowledge and address the challenges they introduce. Ensuring that media remain constructive for individuals, society, and future generations requires a conscious engagement with memory. The capacity to construct

and preserve facts, events, and persons in memory reflects an active orientation toward the past – an act of “thinking things through in their absence” (Warnock, 1987: 12). Thus, memory can be conceptualized as “an experiential process” (Warnock, 1987), or, as Lash (1999) suggests, a distinctive form of “dialogue with the past.”

In his sociological account of collective memory in modern societies, Misztal (2021: 18) defines it as “a representation of the past, which at the same time is shared by the whole group and which defines its collective identity, gives meaning to its present and vision to its future.” The central role of memory in social life lies in the fact that “collective memory is part of the cultural apparatus that has the role of giving – meaning” (Schwartz, 2000: 17). Our inherent need for meaning – that is, the need to participate in something capable of transforming personal behaviour – underscores the significance of collective memory. As Schwartz (2000: 17) notes, it “offers a compelling picture of the world making even the most intricate things meaningful.”

In this light, Misztal (2021: 27) argues that “collective memory not only reflects the past but also shapes the present reality by providing people with understandings and symbolic frameworks that enable them to give meaning to the world.” Thus, the past can be understood as “a healing for the pathologies of modern life” (Huyssen, 1995: 6). By mediating and expressing both past and present, and by providing analogies through which the present may be interpreted, collective memory assumes a strategic role in shaping contemporary life. As Misztal (2021: 27) emphasizes, “by looking for ways to give reality a meaningful order, we rely on memory to provide us with a symbolic representation and frames that can influence and organize both our actions and our perceptions of ourselves.”

Accordingly, “memory simultaneously reflects, programs, and shapes the present” (Schwartz, 2000: 18). Moreover, collective memory is fundamental to the construction of identity (Misztal, 2021: 27). Shils (1981: 135–136) characterizes it as the guardian of social identity, grounded in ritual symbols that unify the community. Giddens (1984: 16, 133) further develops this perspective (not limiting himself to it), suggesting that social structures themselves constitute visible traces of memory, continuously reproduced through social practices. In this sense, such structures may be said to exist within memory (Misztal, 2021: 16).

3. Media image of the world and the role of collective memory in late modernity

In late modernity, media have become the primary mediators of reality to the extent that reality itself is almost inaccessible without their interpretive framework. Virtual reality often assumes the status of reality itself (Castells, 1997). As a defining feature of the network society, virtual reality generates new opportunities for communication, creativity, and research. At the same time, however, it calls for critical reflection regarding its broader implications, particularly the risks of deepening social inequalities, fragmenting identities, and undermining authentic interpersonal connections. While committing and limiting ourselves to virtual reality, we often distance ourselves from direct, face-to-face communication and are distracted from lived, present experience.

Media and collective memory in late modernity are components of and interact with an inclusive and culturally dynamic social system. Critical engagement with media practices for sharing information is essential if authentic collective memory is to be preserved. The rapid circulation of information and trends risks fostering forgetfulness and superficiality within collective memory. As Garber (1998) and Hegemann (2000–2001) observe, contemporary society is marked by unstable gender roles, the enigma of sexuality as a utopian frontier in Western culture, the erosion of authority in intergenerational relations, and the rise of narcissism and depression as characteristic psychosocial afflictions of the “society of the spectacle.” Similarly, Paić (2005: 103) contends that “discomfort with culture as a new ideology of global capitalism arises when society is fully cultured, when it is no longer possible to distinguish the primordial nature from the simulacrum of post-industrial society in the virtualization of derealised reality.”

The production of media content, therefore, carries profound responsibility. Media increasingly appear as a new ideology rather than serving as autonomous domains of expressing the self-purpose of human survival through art, religion, science, or play. Reflecting on the long-term consequences of media practices requires attention to the specificity of media reality in all its forms, origins, and developmental trajectories. As Paić and Purgar (2018) argue, such reflection is necessary to avoid a reductive relationship between the theory and the practice of the new, including information, communication, media, sign, identity, the transformation of language into image, etc.

As instruments/purpose of identity formation, media can play an affirmative role in addressing the question of who we are and how we might live a “good life” in alignment with the ethical ideals of contemporary social

communities. Yet, this process unfolds in the context of an ongoing, unfinished separation of the postmodern subject from its natural environment, amidst the proliferation of cultural and identity constructs (Garber, 1998; Hegemann, 2000–2001). Within this context, social networks have emerged as crucial channels for the creation, preservation, and transformation of collective history. They offer opportunities for strengthening connections between the past and the future. Conscious sharing and responsible action can shape a rich and true collective memory that will enrich culture and identity, preserve collective memory, and promote deeper understanding and intergenerational and general human connection. This can offer the opportunity to take care of each other in a time of mass connection, leaving room for humanity, solidarity, and empathy towards vulnerable social groups.¹

Since collective memory possesses an affective dimension generated through the repeated performance of rituals (such as emphasizing the significance of home, maternal bonds, or national and religious symbols), i.e., through rhythmicity and the establishment of collective emotional energy, collective memory may be understood primarily as a value category (Vidović Schreiber et al., 2020: 4450). Consequently, it is difficult to regard it as devoid of value judgments. What attaches individuals to the places in which they live are emotions, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours. A space becomes a place only when it is conceived, represented, interpreted, and experienced in a particular way. From a sociological perspective, place is constituted through individuals connected by networks of shared responsibility, occupations, culture, and interests (Zeman & Zeman, 2010: 76). This suggests that space itself does not generate the dynamics of social relations; rather, cultures and social interactions bestow meaning upon space, transforming it into place (Zeman & Zeman, 2008: 380).

In contemporary society, however, media intervene in the very fabric of lived reality, reorganizing social behaviour through signs and codes. Modern individuals are increasingly bound not to other people but to the products they consume and the environments in which those products are displayed. Shopping and consumption occupy an ever-expanding portion of human life, often replacing direct social interaction. As Baudrillard (2016) argues, relationships with products tend to supplant relationships with people. He interprets this transformation as a shift from primitive societies – structured around genuine cultural worlds and symbolic exchange – towards a modern order characterized by the dominance of simulation and the erosion of originality (Baudrillard, 2017). The seduction of simula-

1 Rayan Ray, Halt and Catch Fire [<https://youtu.be/-yVosy3k75g> (05/09/2019)].

tion, operating at the level of illusion, immerses the observer in a hyperreal domain where meaning and significance dissolve (Baudrillard, 2013). Walter Benjamin, in turn, regards capitalism itself as a form of religion – one reduced exclusively to cultic practice, without dogma or theology (Löwy, 2009: 60–73). In this sense, capitalism denies transcendence while continuing to invoke God formally, thereby positioning God as *the main witness* of this denial. Its remarkable adaptability has allowed capitalism to endure as a vital and long-lasting social force (Löwy, 2009: 60–73).

Conclusion

Applying an intersubjectivist perspective on the concept of the self (Misztal, 2021), this paper underscores the need to recognize the boundaries of the media and the information society, i.e., a certain relativization of media despite their apparent dominance. Insights into the challenges of the media and information society reveal their function as both social and cultural institutions. These insights, even when implicit, are rooted in responses to the broader social crisis of modernity, within which emerges a profound anthropological crisis: the crisis of human identity.

The study of collective memory calls into question current sociological conceptions of how social identities are constructed, revealing the ever-shifting features of contemporary reality. This crisis, as Supićić (2010: 167) argues, can be interpreted as an unparalleled crisis of the spirit of Western civilization. Inter-subjectivity of memory, as Zerubavel (1997: 96) notes, applies only to those memories that are “*commonly held*.” In this sense, collective memory represents the integration of diverse individual pasts into a great memory shared by the community.

When analysing the relationship between collective memory and media, it becomes evident that after the emergence of new communication media and altered relations to the past, collective memory leads to the transfer of memories in late modernity. The analysis of the social and political space of the media and their relationship to collective memory in this paper is reflected in the trials of collective memory as a social and cultural community.

After analysing several key characteristics of the relationship between media and collective memory in late modernity, we explored how late modernity creates new challenges for collective memory. While Baudrillard (2017) contends that primitive societies, once sustained by symbolic exchange, have given way to modern societies dominated by simulations,

these simulations are ultimately fake things. Baudrillard (2013) believes that the modern world is increasingly under their domination.

Simulation represents a substitution of reality by the artificial and constructed. The simulacrum, as Baudrillard describes, is “the truth that hides the fact that there is no truth.” In this process, the distinction between representation and reality dissolves; the sign becomes detached from what it once referred to. Baudrillard believes the original cultural world is imbued with symbolic exchange, fascination, and magic. However, over time, society has disenchanted. The simulations that characterize the modern world cannot produce magic-induced enthusiasm, at least not in the sense in which Baudrillard uses these terms.

This simulated world is disenchanted, and even shameful, in comparison to the primitive, original world. The pervasive simulation experience is the main cause of the disappearance of the difference between real and imaginary, true and false. In other words, in modern society, there is no truth and there is no reality. And if there is no truth and reality, then it can be argued that we exist entirely within simulation (Baudrillard, 2001: 68).

In contemporary society, the real and the true are becoming increasingly elusive, seemingly swallowed by an avalanche of simulations. The search for the “essence” of things is rare, and those who attempt to look beyond the surface of simulation are often met with disappointment. Beneath the layers of representation, one finds not reality but only further layers of simulation. Reality shows exemplify this process, as they draw viewers into a mediated world where the screen itself substitutes for lived experience. We are confronted with gaps, absences, and separations – entering life as if through a screen. As Baudrillard (2001: 68) observes, “we dress our own lives like a digital suit.”

In conclusion, this paper has examined the role of memory in fostering a “community of memory” and considered the transition from the paradigm of the information society to that of collective memory in late modernity. Within this paradigm shift, media assume a central role in the spectacularisation of the past, and they can promote memory policies, democratising memories or reshaping historical narratives.

Thus, the multiplicity of temporal experiences reflects the changing role of time in culture and society, as well as shifting attitudes toward it. The sociology of time, as a distinct field of research, sheds light on these transformations, including altered relationships with the past. This emerging context poses new challenges for sociology, which can be addressed by conceiving of individuals not merely as beings who exist in time, but as actors who possess a reflexive awareness of its passage, which is intrinsically connected to the nature of their social institutions (Giddens, 2002).

References

- Assmann, A. (1995). *Erinnerungsräume. Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. Beck.
- Assmann, J. (1995). Collective memory and cultural identity. *New German Critique*, 65, 125–133.
- Assmann, J. (2005). *Kulturno pamćenje*. Biblioteka Tekst.
- Baudillard, J. (2001). *Inteligencija zla ili pakt lucidnosti*. Naklada Ljevak.
- Baudrillard, J. (2013). *Simulacija i zbilja*. Jesenski i Turk, Hrvatsko sociološko društvo.
- Baudrillard, J. (2016). *The consumer society: Myths and structures*. Sage.
- Baudrillard, J. (2017). *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. Sage.
- Baumann, Z. (2004). *Wasted lives: modernity and it's outcasts*. Polity Press.
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Anchor Books.
- Bilić, P. *Sociologija medija. Rutine, tehnologija i moć*. Jesenski i Turk.
- Casanova, J. (2006). Rethinking Secularization: A Global Comparative Perspective. *The Hedgehog Review*, 8(1–2), 7–22.
- Castell, M. (1997). *The Power of Identity*. Blackwell Publisher.
- Connerton, P. (2004). *Kako se društva sjećaju*. Antibarbarus.
- Debord, G. (1999). *Društvo spektakla*. Arkzin.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1999). Multiple Modernities in an Age of Globalization. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 24(2), 283–295.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (2000). Multiple Modernities. *Daedalus. Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 129(1), 1–28.
- Garber, M. (1998). *Symptoms of Culture*. Routledge.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society*. Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity. Self and society in the late modern age*. Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (2002). *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*. Profile Books.
- Halbwachs, M. (1985). *Das kollektive Gedächtnis*. Fischer-Taschenbuch-Verlag.
- Hall, R. B. (1999). *National collective identity: social constructs and international systems*. Columbia University Press.
- Hegemann, C. (2000–2001). *Kapitalismus und Depression. I und II*. Alexander Verlag.
- Hobsbawm, E., & Ranger, T. (2012). *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hromadžić, H. (2014). *Medijska konstrukcija društvene zbilje: Socijalno-ideološke implikacije produkcije medijskog spektakla*. A.G.M.
- Huyssen, A. (1995). *Twilight Memories. Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*. Rotledge.
- Jakelić, S. (2010). *Collective Religions, Religion, Choice, and Identity in Late Modernity*. Routledge.

- Kansteiner, W. (2002). Finding meaning in memory: A methodological critique of collective memory studies. *History and Theory*, 41(2), 179–197.
- Lash, S. (1999). *Another Modernity: A Different Rationality*. Blackwell.
- Löwy, M. (2009). Capitalism as Religion: Walter Benjamin and Max Weber. *Historical Materialism*, 17(1), 60–73.
- Meyen, M., & Pfaff-Rüdiger, S. (2014). Mass media and memory: The communist GDR in today's communicative memory. *Media Studies*, 5(9).
- Misztal, A. B. (2021). *Teorije društvenog sjećanja*. Kršćanska sadašnjost.
- Nora, P. (1996). *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past. Vol. 1. Conflicts and Divisions*. Columbia University Press.
- Nussbaum, C. M. (2001). *Upheavals of Thought*. Cambridge University Press.
- Paić, Ž. (2005). *Politika identiteta. Kultura kao nova ideologija*. Antibarbarus.
- Paić, Ž., & Purgar, K. (2018). *Teorija i kultura mode. Discipline, pristupi, interpretacije*. Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Tekstilno tehnološki fakultet.
- Schwartz, B. (2000). *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory*. Chicago University Press.
- Shills, E. (1981). *Tradition*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Supićić, I. (2010). *Za univerzalni humanizam. Prema potpunijoj čovječnosti*. Kršćanska sadašnjost.
- Szpunar, M. P. (2012). Collective memory and the stranger: remembering and forgetting the 1918 Finnish civil war. *International Journal of Communication*, 6, 1200–1221.
- Terdiman, R. (1993). *Present Past: Modernity and the Memory Crisis*. Cornell University Press.
- Vidović Schreiber, T.-T., Kovačević, V., & Malada, D. (2020). “Baby Shark” as a Social and Artistic Phenomenon. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(10), 4449–4458. DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2020.081012
- Warnock, M. (1987). *The Philosophy of Sartre*. Hutchinson Radius.
- William, M. (2005). *Baudrillard and the Media. A Critical Introduction*. Polity.
- Wollin, S. S. (1989). *The presence of the Past*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Zeman, M. G., & Zeman, Z. (2010). *Uvod u sociologiju (održivih) zajednica*. Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar.
- Zelizer, B. (1995). Reading the past against the grain: the shape of memory studies. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 12(2), 214–239.
- Zelizer, B. (2008). Why memory's work on journalism does not reflect journalism's work on memory. *Memory Studies*, 1(1), 79–87.
- Zerubavel, E. (1997). *Social Mindscapes: An Invitation to Cognitive Sociology*. Harvard University Press.
- Žanić, M., (2017). *Kultura sjećanja između emocija i institucija*. Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar.

Медији и колективно памћење у касној модерности

Исitraживачи из разних дисциплина указују на то да постоје различити доживљаји времена, истичући променљиву улогу времена у култури и друштву, као и променљиве ставове према времену. Социологија времена, као посебно поље истраживања, освештава промене у нашим односима према времену, укључујући и промене у односу према прошлости. Овај процес постојања изазове пред социологију. На њих може да се одговори схватањем људи не само као бића која живе у времену, већ, према Гиденсу, и као бића са свешћу о пролазности времена, која је повезана са природом њихових друштвених институција. Поједино је људе посматрати у односу према њиховим представама о прошлости и разумети соство као нешто што се изражава кроз време. У таквим условима историја има мало значаја, а убрзана садашњост постоје све важнија. У информационом друштву облици комуникације или организације постоје важнији од садржаја. Обичаји и друштвене институције губе своје значење, али задржавају форму, а форма сваке поруке утиче на њен садржај – односно мења га. Људи могу да разумеју да је ова хиперстварност симулација, али да и даље буду њоме фасцинирани, чинећи је делом свој живота и тако претварајући добар део стварности у симулацију. Слалним понављањем овој процеса долази до значајној технолошкој напредака и до јачања утицаја технологије на друштвени живот. Другим речима, дигитализација колективног памћења довела је до нове фазе у историји заједног индивидуализма.

Електронски медији нарушавају однос према прошлости и производе хаотичан, изразан свет лишен историјске меморије. Постмодерност прекида не само са модерношћу, већ и са било каквим осећајем континуитета са прошлим догађајима. Међутим, како социологија постоје све свеснија постојања времена и колективног памћења, називају се знаци промене. Према Гиденсу, касномодерни друштвени свет не брише значај традиције. Аутори попут Касанове и Ајзенштајна не само да одбацују „идеју радикалној модерној раскида са традицијом“, већ уводе „идеју суштинској модерној континуитета с традицијом“ у доба „вишеструких модерности“. Циљ овој рада јесте да анализира однос колективног памћења и медија у неколико корака. У уводном делу показује се како у касној модерности, након појаве нових комуникационих медија и промена у нашем односу према прошлости, колективно памћење доводи до промена у начину на који разумемо прошлост. Након анализе неколико кључних карактеристика односа медија и колективног памћења у касној модерности, биће објашњено на који начин касна модерност ствара нове изазове за креативну будућност. У закључку, рад ће се осврнути на улогу памћења у стварању „заједнице памћења“ и на прелазак са парадигме информационој друштву на нову парадигму колективног памћења у касној модерности.

Кључне речи: друштвено памћење, друштвени односи, медијска култура, информационо друштво, заједница памћења.

Media i pamięć zbiorowa w późnej nowoczesności

Badacze z rozmaitych dyscyplin podkreślali, że ludzie doświadczają różnych odczuć czasu, co uwydatnia zmieniającą się rolę temporalności w kulturze i społeczeństwie, a także ewoluujące postawy wobec zagadnienia czasu. Socjologia czasu, jako odrębne pole badań, uwydatnia te zmiany, zwłaszcza w sposobie, w jaki rekonfigurowane są postawy wobec przeszłości. Takie podejście wprowadza nowe wyzwania dla socjologii, które można rozwiązać poprzez rozumienie ludzi nie tylko jako istot żyjących w czasie, ale także jako podmiotów posiadających refleksyjną świadomość jego upływu – świadomość, która, jak twierdzi Giddens (2002), jest nierozzerwalnie związana z naturą ich instytucji społecznych. W tym sensie jednostki należy rozumieć w odniesieniu do ich reprezentacji przeszłości, a jażn pojmować jako coś wyrażanego i kształtowanego w czasie. W tych warunkach historia traci na znaczeniu, podczas gdy przyspieszona teraźniejszość staje się dominująca. W społeczeństwie informacyjnym forma komunikacyjna lub organizacyjna przeważa nad treścią. Zwyczaje i instytucje tracą swoje znaczenie, zachowując jednak formę, a forma każdej wiadomości kształtuje jej treść. Chociaż jednostki mogą rozpoznać hiperrealność jako symulację, pozostają nią zafascynowane, włączając ją w swoje życie i w ten sposób przekształcając dużą część samej rzeczywistości w symulację. W takich warunkach historia traci znaczenie, a przyspieszona teraźniejszość staje się coraz bardziej dominująca. Stałe powtarzanie procesów mediowanych napędza szybki postęp technologiczny i wzmacnia wpływ technologii na życie społeczne. W tym sensie destabilizacja pamięci oznacza nowy etap w historii zachodniego indywidualizmu.

Media elektroniczne rozmywają więź z przeszłością, tworząc fragmentaryczny, chaotyczny świat pozbawiony pamięci historycznej. Postmodernizm w tym sensie oznacza nie tylko zerwanie z nowoczesnością, ale także z jakimkolwiek poczuciem ciągłości z wydarzeniami przeszłymi. Jednocześnie socjologia coraz bardziej dostrzega centralną rolę czasu i pamięci, co wskazuje na możliwość zmiany. Giddens (2002) twierdzi na przykład, że późnonowoczesny świat społeczny nie likwiduje znaczenia tradycji. Podobnie uważają Casanova i Eisenstadt, którzy nie tylko odrzucają „pojęcie radykalnego zerwania z tradycją”, ale wprowadzają także „pojęcie istotnej nowoczesnej ciągłości z tradycją” w czasach „wielorakich nowoczesności”. Celem niniejszego artykułu jest analiza relacji między pamięcią zbiorową a mediami w kilku etapach. W części wprowadzającej pokazane zostanie, jak wraz z pojawieniem się nowych mediów komunikacyjnych i zmianą relacji wobec przeszłości pamięć zbiorowa prowadzi do przekazywania wspomnień w późnej nowoczesności. W kolejnych częściach przeanalizowane zostaną kluczowe cechy tej relacji, ukazując, w jaki sposób późna nowoczesność stwarza nowe wyzwania dla kreatywnej przyszłości. W części końcowej zaś zaakcentowana zostanie rola pamięci w budowaniu „społeczności pamięci” i refleksja nad szerszym przejściem od paradygmatu społeczeństwa informacyjnego do paradygmatu pamięci zbiorowej w późnej nowoczesności.

Słowa kluczowe: pamięć społeczna; relacje społeczne; kultura medialna; społeczeństwo informacyjne; wspólnota pamięci.

Mediji i kolektivno pamćenje u kasnoj modernosti

Istraživači iz različitih disciplina sugeriraju da postoje različiti osjećaji za vrijeme. Ukazuju na promjenjivu ulogu vremena u kulturi i društvu te promjenjive stavove prema vremenu. Sociologija vremena kao posebno područje istraživanja osvjetljava promjene u našim odnosima prema vremenu, uključujući promjene u našim odnosima prema prošlosti. Ovaj pristup stvara nove izazove za sociologiju. Na njih se može odgovoriti tako da ljude shvatimo kao one koji ne samo da žive u vremenu, nego i kao one, kako ističe Giddens, koji imaju svijest o prolaznosti vremena, a ona je povezana s prirodom njihovih društvenih institucija. Odnosno, da stavimo ljude u odnos prema njihovom prikazu prošlosti i shvatimo sebstvo kao nešto što se izražava kroz vrijeme. Pod takvim uvjetima povijest ima malo značaja, a užurbana sadašnjost postaje sve važnija. U informacijskom društvu komunikacijska ili organizacijska forma postaju važnije od sadržaja. Običaji i društvene institucije gube svoje značenje, no zadržavaju formu, a forma svake poruke utječe na njezin sadržaj, tj. mijenja ga. Ljudi mogu shvatiti da ova hiperstvarnost jest simulacija, ali i dalje biti njome fascinirani čineći hiperstvarnost dijelom svojih života i tako pretvoriti mnogo od te stvarnosti u simulaciju. Stalnim ponavljanjem ovog procesa dolazi do značajnog tehnološkog napretka i utjecaja tehnologije na društveni život. Drugim riječima, destabilizacija kolektivnog pamćenja dovela je do nove faze u povijesti zapadnog individualizma.

Elektronički mediji uništavaju odnos prema prošlosti i stvaraju kaotičan, prazan svijet lišen povijesne memorije. Postmodernost prekida ne samo s modernošću, nego i s bilo kakvim osjećajem kontinuiteta s prošlim događajima. Zahvaljujući činjenici da sociologija sve više postaje svjesna problematike vremena i pitanjem kolektivnog pamćenja, naziru se znakovi promjene. Prema Giddensu, kasnomoderni društveni svijet ne briše važnost tradicije. Autori poput npr. Casanova i Eisenstadt ne samo da odbacuju "pojam modernog radikalnog raskida s tradicijom", nego uvode "pojam suštinskog modernog kontinuiteta s tradicijom" u vrijeme "višestrukih moderniteta". Cilj ovog rada jest analizirati odnos kolektivnog pamćenja i medija u nekoliko koraka. U uvodnom dijelu, pokazat će se kako u kasnoj modernosti nakon pojave novih komunikacijskih medija i promjene u našim odnosima prema prošlosti, kolektivno pamćenje dovodi do promjena u našim odnosima prema prošlosti. Nakon analize nekoliko ključnih karakteristika odnosa medija i kolektivnog pamćenja u kasnoj modernosti, protumačit će se na koji način kasna modernost stvara nove izazove za kreativnu budućnost. U zaključnom dijelu, rad će se osvrnuti na ulogu pamćenja u stvaranju "zajednice pamćenja" i prijelaza s paradigme informacijskog društva na novu paradigmu kolektivnog pamćenja u kasnoj modernosti.

Ključne riječi: društveno pamćenje, društveni odnosi, medijska kultura, informacijsko društvo, zajednica pamćenja.