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Foreword

Active and Developing Patterns: Remembering into the Future

Jaan Valsiner

This book is a carefully crafted monument to one of the most profound thinkers in twentieth-century psychology. Frederic Bartlett’s name in psychology is usually associated with his 1932 book *Remembering*, and in psychologists’ habitual discourses about their own field of knowledge his contributions are located in the domain of the so-called ‘memory research.’ Of course, combining the terms ‘memory’ and ‘research’ has all the allure of basic science. ‘Research’ is the unquestionably glorious central term in the social discourses about science, and the value of ‘memory’ for our everyday lives goes undisputed for anybody who is worried about finding one’s parked car in a humungous parking lot of an equally grandiose shopping center. Pressures upon our ordinary psychological capacities are not necessarily reduced in the ‘Internet age.’

Yet there is a twist. While at first glance that label seems very clear – we all worry about how not to forget important events of the past – the content of this category of ‘research’ is extremely wide. Everything ranging from the neuroscientific study of retaining the information at neuronal levels to that of countries’ maintenance of their national identities may end up labeled as ‘memory research.’ Yet when a certain corpus of perspectives is grouped together as ‘X-research,’ it is likely to be seen as a conglomerate of empirical presentations (‘the literature’) and dismissive of theoretical integration efforts, and often opposed also to ‘practice.’ Such dependence on ‘research’ is detrimental to any science where theoretical goals come first, and practices determine if the empirical investigations are of any real value.

The value of ideas prevails over classifications. I would claim here that Frederic Bartlett was never involved in ‘memory research,’ even if – for his intellectual interests – the phenomena of remembering were of utmost importance. As the reader of the present book soon understands, Bartlett’s actual contributions to science are much wider and more multi-faceted than their usual presentation in history of psychology narratives has been. As the reader can discover from Brady Wagoner’s careful analysis of Bartlett’s intellectual history, he can be
seen as one of the revered and mis-presented (as well as misunder-
stood) scholars in psychology who are considered ‘classics,’ while their
constructive ideas are left to gather intellectual dust on the pages of
introductory textbooks-dominated knowledge base of the field.

What is at stake in the case of Bartlett’s contributions is the study of
human processes of construction of novelty. This is the core issue for
all developmental perspectives in the biological, social, and human
sciences (for detailed coverage, see Carré et al.\(^1\)). In this, Bartlett’s
thinking resonates well with the major developmental thinkers of the
twentieth century – James Mark Baldwin, Lev Vygotsky, and Hans
Driesch. Yet Bartlett was unique, linking the ideas coming from social
anthropology of his time with the best of psychology of his time.
Uniting the intellectual input from his Cambridge interlocutors with
the best of German psychological heritage – the introspective focus of
the Würzburg tradition of Karl Bühler and Oswald Külpe – Bartlett was
educated by the life-worlds of the (at that time labeled) ‘primitive’ peo-
ple of the Torres Straits and other far corners of the world. Variations
in cultural practices between different societies were the basis for
Bartlett to work toward creating a general science of the human psyche.
All human beings are involved in the universal process of negotiating
the adoption of new ways of living while trying to adhere to their estab-
lished historical traditions. The tension on the border of the tradition
and innovation is what Bartlett studied. That issues of memory are
important on that border goes without saying. But equally important is
the future – pre-knowable only through imagination.

The place where the history of a society and its future are collectively
under the process of re-negotiation is its folklore and traditions of mate-
rial culture. Hence Bartlett’s basic interest is on how images and stories
become reconstructed from generation to generation, across persons in
a society, and – ultimately – in any person’s reconstruction of the
socially relevant myth stories. Social conventionalization of newly re-
constructed traditions is a universal process that is both necessary and
inevitable. As the readers of this book find out, that is what remembering
is about – it is memory needed for the future, rather than the test of accu-

of the tensions on the border of past and future. Bartlett did not have to face the naïve normativity of his colleagues who could ask “how big was your sample?” to evaluate his work. Generalization based on single cases was the accepted scientific norm in Bartlett’s time – only to vanish from psychology in the second half of the twentieth century. It is only in our time that it is coming back to its appropriate relevance for psychology as science.\(^2\) All basic knowledge in history of psychology has come from careful analysis of single cases, even if subsequent efforts have been made to replicate these on samples. These would necessarily fail because of the non-ergodic character of psychological phenomena.\(^3\) Mathematical proof of non-ergodicity leads to one – but fundamental – epistemological conclusion: *inter-individual variability is not isomorphic with intra-individual variability* in case of the open systems. This has profound significance on how psychology as science needs to operate: inference from samples (inter-individual variability) to the organization and development of individuals over time (intra-individual variability) is in principle impossible. All the empirical work conducted on samples and extrapolated to interpret the functioning of individuals is consequently useless. Empirical research practices – supported by social norms of what is called ‘good methodology’ (i.e., large samples, random sampling, etc.) – are rendered mute because of the wrong starting axiom (that of ergodicity). Psychology, as science, needs to return to careful analysis of single cases, in new ways.

The contrast between non-developmental and developmental views on the processes of remembering is best exemplified on the simple issue – what is an ‘error’? Researchers who have tried to continue Bartlett’s work have demonstrated their own non-developmental axiomatic stances by projecting the notion of ‘error’ into the accounts persons give in the Bartlettian re-telling experiments. Omitting some detail from a re-told story is de facto indeed an ‘error’ until it becomes linked with a confabulation that introduces a novel extension to the old. Here the omission – forgetting – works for the future. Movement through ‘erring’ in relation to what was the case in the past is potentially
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the starting point for innovation. The whole of the human mind works at the intersection of ‘erring’ and imagining. The basic principle introduced by James Mark Baldwin over a century ago (‘persistent imitation’) – “trying, erring, and trying again … and so on!” – guarantees the uniqueness of human striving for a better future.

This book also illustrates the short-sightedness of orthodoxies in science. Not only can (dead) authors be dealt with as such, but also their ideas can be declared ‘dead.’ This happened to Bartlett’s schema concept in the 1970s, and has happened – directly by declaration or indirectly through omission – to many other fruitful perspectives in psychology. Introspection as the core for psychological investigation is a good example – dismissed over the whole twentieth century, it necessarily re-emerges in new forms when psychology moves toward the study of higher psychological processes that indicate what being human is.

In our multitude of feelings into the world, we live, love, kill one another, pardon the violence under the banners of national heroism, and gossip about our neighbors. The mundane, the monstrous, and the sacred are deeply intertwined in our ordinary lives, where we are making our ways of being, relating the desired or dreaded imagination of the future with the selective reconstructions of the past. A return to the heritage of Frederic Bartlett is actually an act of remembering into our futures.

Last (but not least), I have deep personal satisfaction in seeing the present book published. Its author has been my student and friend whom I consider to be the most careful analyst and further developer of my own scientific oeuvre. His careful and constructive elaboration of ideas is visible from the first to the last page of this book. Contemporary academic scholarship would have much to learn from the present book and its author, and I hope the readers will appreciate the deep scholarship they encounter on the pages of this book. Through such work, remembering the ideas from the past is illuminating the future of a discipline that is in great need for constructive innovation.
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