While reading Freud’s list of what he calls “conditions for forgetting a name with faulty recollection”, I could not help but notice that while the second and third conditions—suppression and the possibility of association—are explained in a fair amount of detail, the first, a “certain disposition” toward forgetting the name, is relatively unexplored (11).

From his example of Signorelli-Botticelli-Boltraffio, it is not familiarity or lack thereof that makes a name less than memorable, and much of the excerpt is spent contemplating the ways the other names could have arisen as substitutes. In contrast, there is little mention of how he could have been disposed toward forgetting that particular name beyond remembering the incorrect thing, and even that falls under his third condition, the outer association. In short, what qualifies as a disposition toward forgetting a name, and is it even distinguishable from the other two conditions?

* Freud studied people’s lives rather than going with old treatment methods
* *On the Psychic ‘Mechanism of Forgetfulness’*
* “Proper names are commonly forgotten, some more so than others.” – average psychologist
* false recollection = not random
* Example of names of Signorelli, Botticelli, and Boltraffio
  + He forgot Signorelli’s name but immediately discounted the other two as not what he was looking for
  + Forgetfulness is not because a name is more strange or less familiar than others
  + Prior discussion implanted certain words (*Herr*, Bosnia, Herzegovina) in his mind
  + Boltraffio –pronunciation possibly came from a message he received while in Trafoi
  + You remember what you try to forget; he wanted only to remember the name of the master of Orvieto
* Conditions for faulty recollection of a name:
  + Disposition to forget the name (it’s easy to forget)
  + Suppression happens right before
  + Possibility of an outer association between the concerned name and the element previously suppressed
* This mode of forgetting is motivated by repression

To Simmel, it appears that the everyday is “monotonous” and “one-sided”, and yet it is precisely the monotony of industry that helps produce many of the rich and exciting things that appear in fairs (120). He argues that the showiness of advertising influences to no small degree how people perceive the exhibitions, which raises the question: If a worker on an engine-making assembly line were shown the completed product at a fair, would it still hold the same charm as an identical engine from elsewhere?

* Sociation comes with the sociable meaning of society
* Example: fairs
  + All about amusement
  + Small sacrifice of payment = stimulation for a thrill, inflates the value
* ^ civilization = ^ specialization
* Man’s monotonous, single-job role in labor is compensated by consumption and more heterogeneous excitements
* Through its own production, Berlin represents itself as a copy and sample of the manufacturing forces of world culture that it’s displaying
* Temporary buildings aren’t absurd of lacking in style; exhibition is all about the transient
* It’s all about making things visually stimulating in the exhibition