

Can drugs that disrupt memory also help people remember?

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis.

An influential theory about the malleability of memory comes under scrutiny in [a new paper](#) in the Journal of Neuroscience.

The '[reconsolidation](#)' hypothesis holds that when a memory is recalled, its molecular trace in the brain becomes plastic. On this view, a reactivated memory has to be 'saved' or consolidated all over again in order for it to be stored.

A drug that blocks memory formation ('amnesic') will, therefore, not just block new memories but will also cause reactivated memories to be forgotten, by preventing reconsolidation.

This theory has generated a [great deal of research interest](#) and has [led to speculation](#) that blocking reconsolidation could be used as a tool to 'wipe' human memories.

However, Gisquet-Verrier et al. propose a fundamental re-evaluation of the whole phenomenon. They propose that amnesic drugs don't in fact block reconsolidation, but instead add an additional element to a reactivated memory trace. This additional element is a memory of the amnesic itself – essentially, 'how it feels' to be intoxicated with that drug.

In other words, the proposal is that amnestics tag memories with 'amnesic-intoxication' which makes these memories less accessible due to the phenomenon of [state dependent recall](#). This predicts that the memories could be retrieved by giving another dose of the amnesic.

Read full, original post: [Time to Rethink the Reconsolidation Theory of Memory?](#)