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UNIT-I
SIGNIFICANCE OF HISTORIOGRAPHY
IN THE WRITING AND TEACHING OF HISTORY

Historiography is the study of how history itself is written or handed down throughout the ages. It takes into consideration the various means by which a historical source is formed, such as the credibility of the sources used, the motives of the author composing the history, and its authenticity. Historiography can be regarded as a form of meta-history. The word history comes from the Ancient Greek "historia," which means "inquiry, knowledge acquired by investigation." The existence of historical sources provides valuable information concerning the past. Historiographers tend to differentiate these sources in terms of written and oral histories. Oral history is a more dynamic because it is spread by word of mouth, while written history is fixed and emphasizes the recording of facts.

Historiography tries to place these various sources into a specific context. This means that the historiographer does not merely accept the content of a source at face value, but traces the source looking for various motifs in its formation. One can understand a historical source as conceived from within a certain perspective and with a precise objective tied to its very production. Historical events can be seen as biased by the particularities of their recording and presentation. The historiographer acts like a history detective, seeking to unravel the logic of the production of history.

One of the questions the historiographer must ask is how some facts remain included or excluded from a history. Inclusions or exclusions can be found by comparing different accounts of a single event. In contrasting these sources, one can understand not only the event from a less biased perspective, but identify the precise perspective of the composer of the source.

According to this perspective, historiography delineates the influence of cultural or ideological tropes within any given source. Historiographers can thereby classify history in terms of categories such as a Christian historiography or an Ancient Greek historiography. This allows the historiographer to look for trends in historical writing within a certain framework that illuminates a particular way of writing history. For example, Christian history tends to suggest that there is some great plan to historical events in its emphasis on the existence of God, while Marxist history suggests an appropriation of history as a history of class struggle. Historiography therefore does not conceive history as the objective recording of events, but as a medium which elucidates the way of life of the producer of the historical source.

Historiography, the writing of history, especially the writing of history based on the critical examination of sources, the selection of particular details from the authentic materials in those sources, and the synthesis of those details into a narrative that stands the test of critical examination. The term historiography also refers to the theory and history of historical writing.
Modern historians aim to reconstruct a record of human activities and to achieve a more profound understanding of them. This conception of their task is quite recent, dating from the development in the late 18th and early 19th centuries of “scientific” history and the simultaneous rise of history as an academic profession. It springs from an outlook that is very new in human experience: the assumption that the study of history is a natural, inevitable human activity. Before the late 18th century, historiography did not stand at the centre of any civilization. History was almost never an important part of regular education, and it never claimed to provide an interpretation of human life as a whole. This larger ambition was more appropriate to religion, philosophy, and perhaps poetry and other imaginative literature.

History of historiography

All human cultures tell stories about the past. Deeds of ancestors, heroes, gods, or animals sacred to particular peoples were chanted and memorized long before there was any writing with which to record them. Their truth was authenticated by the very fact of their continued repetition. History, which may be defined as an account that purports to be true of events and ways of thinking and feeling in some part of the human past, stems from this archetypal human narrative activity.

While sharing a common ancestry with myth, legend, epic poetry, and the novel, history has of course diverged from these forms. Its claim to truth is based in part on the fact that all the persons or events it describes really existed or occurred at some time in the past. Historians can say nothing about these persons or events that cannot be supported, or at least suggested, by some kind of documentary evidence. Such evidence customarily takes the form of something written, such as a letter, a law, an administrative record, or the account of some previous historian. In addition, historians sometimes create their own evidence by interviewing people. In the 20th century the scope of historical evidence was greatly expanded to include, among many other things, aerial photographs, the rings of trees, old coins, clothes, motion pictures, and houses. Modern historians have determined the age of the Shroud of Turin, which purportedly bears the image of Jesus, through carbon-14 dating and have discredited the claim of Anna Anderson to be the grand duchess Anastasia, the daughter of Tsar Nicholas II, through DNA testing.

Just as the methods at the disposal of historians have expanded, so have the subjects in they have become interested. Many of the indigenous peoples of Africa, the Americas, and Polynesia, for example, were long dismissed by Europeans as having no pre-colonial history, because they did not keep written records before the arrival of European explorers. However, sophisticated study of oral traditions, combined with advances in archaeology, has made it possible to discover a good deal about the civilizations and empires that flourished in these regions before European contact.
Historians have also studied new social classes. The earliest histories were mostly stories of disasters—floods, famines, and plagues—or of wars, including the statesmen and generals who figured in them. In the 20th century, however, historians shifted their focus from statesmen and generals to ordinary workers and soldiers. Until relatively recent times, however, most men and virtually all women were excluded from history because they were unable to write. Virtually all that was known about them passed through the filter of the attitudes of literate elites. The challenge of seeing through that filter has been met by historians in various ways. One way is to make use of non-traditional sources—for example, personal documents, such as wills or marriage contracts. Another is to look at the records of localities rather than of central governments.

Through these means even the most oppressed peoples—African-American slaves or medieval heretics, for example—have had at least some of their history restored. Since the 20th century some historians have also become interested in psychological repression—i.e., in attitudes and actions that require psychological insight and even diagnosis to recover and understand. For the first time, the claim of historians to deal with the feelings as well as the thoughts of people in any part of the human past has been made good.

None of this is to say that history writing has assumed a perfect or completed form. It will never do so: examination of its past reveals remarkable changes in historical consciousness rather than steady progress toward the standards of research and writing that represent the best that historians can do today. Nevertheless, 21st-century historians understand the pasts of more people more completely and more accurately than their predecessors did. This article demonstrates the scope of that accomplishment and how it came to be achieved.

**Significance of Historiography**

Historiography refers to the development of history as a discipline or to a body of historical works on a specialized topic. In the early modern period the term historiography tended to be used to mean simply the writing of history. It should be noted that historiography is not the study of events in the past directly, but the changing interpretations of those events in the works of individual historians. While history is considered as the ‘study of the past’ in its broadest sense, historiography tries to understand how the past has been studied by different historians and what prompted a particular historian to adopt a particular line of thought in the writing of a particular topic in history.

It as an independent branch of history and as a separate discipline emerged in the 19th century Europe. It came into being as a part of the epistemological resurgence of 19th century European enlightenment. Since then many number of works have been produced on historiography all over the world. These works trace the successive stages of development in historical writing from ancient to the modern period. These include the evolution of ideas of the historian, changing techniques in historical writing and transformation in the attitude towards the nature of history itself. It is the study of the theoretical approach of the historian and the historical context which had prompted him into conceive that particular theoretical approach.
It is a fascinating area of debate and argument about previous and current representations of the past. Understanding historiography is to do with understanding about how the past is represented. It is necessary for the history teachers, to be on top of their professional strata, to have reasonable understanding of how individual topics that they are discussing with the students have been approached in the past and how they are explained in the present. One should have a broader and deeper understanding of the relevant historiography, otherwise advances in historiographical knowledge that has taken place over the past two or three decades may be all but ignored.

The never ending development of historical interpretation is familiar to historians and teachers of history. Most commonly this is revealed as a dialogue ‘between the present and the past’. New generation often interpret evidence in the light of recent events and regularly re-evaluate the thinking of previous generations. Historians also constantly discover new evidence and often historiographical change comes with an increased emphasis on this new information. Historian often emphasis certain aspects of historical events because they study particular topics or figures, resulting in constant process of reinterpretation and considerable debate among historians. In a broader sense, historiographical debates force students to confront the difficult questions of interpretation, the existence of ‘truth’ in history and the different ways historians use evidence. Facts and evidences are critical to historical interpretation. The conflicting emphasis on different forms of evidence can change the meaning of events. Students can understand that historiography is a guide for evaluating their own interpretation of historical events. It helps them structure their own thinking and encourages them to consider different ways of viewing the same evidence.

Some of the common topics in historiography are 1) reliability of sources used in terms of authorship, credibility of the author and the authenticity or corruption of the text, (2) historiographical tradition or frame work. Every historian use one or more historiographical traditions like Marxist, Annals etc. (3) moral issues, guilt assignment and praise assignment, (4) revisionism versus orthodox or conservative interpretations, (5) historical meta narratives. Understanding of the past is a universal human need and the telling of history has emerged independently in the civilizations around the world. The earliest chronologies date back to Mesopotamia and ancient Egypt, though no historical writers in these early civilizations were known by name.

Antecedents

Writing of history in the form of collection of facts and giving it a rational interpretation did not emerge all of a sudden in specific time and space. Instead, it was the culmination of the gradual process from folk literature through a variety of quasi-historical writings. The earliest chronicles prepared in the ancient civilizations are not treated as history proper; however the importance of them could not be disregarded in the development of historical writing. The quasi-historical forms like myth and theocratic history were prepared by the ancient Mesopotamians and Egyptians. Though
theocratic writings are concerned with the activities of human beings, their actions were depicted as controlled by some kind of supernatural divine powers. With a vague sense of chronology, theocratic writings deal the activities of kings and their subordinates and the kings generally treated as the incarnations of God almighty or at least of the faithful assistants of God. The entire characters in myths were God and not concerned with ordinary human beings. The events mentioned in those myths are said to have been occurred in the remote past, none the less a dateless past.

The elements of both theocratic historic and myth are seen in the inscriptions and records of the ancient Egyptians and Mesopotamians. The ancient Hebrew Scriptures also contain a great deal of both theocratic history and myth. While Egyptians and Mesopotamians limited their writings to a specific geographical area, the Hebrew Scriptures treat the control of the divine power as universal.

**Greek historiography**

Greek historiography originated in the activities of a group of writers whom the Greeks called *logographoi* ("logographers"). Logography was the prose compilation of oral traditions relating to the origins of towns, peoples, and places. It combined geographical with cultural information and might be seen as an early form of cultural anthropology. Hecataeus of Miletus, the best known of the logographers, defined his task in his Genealogia (490 BC) as follows: “I write what I consider the truth, for the things the Greeks tell us are in my opinion full of contradictions and worthy to be laughed out of court.” The logographers also served as advocates and speech writers in the courts, and the need to ascertain facts and make arguments clearly influenced their writings.

**Herodotus**

Herodotus was an ancient Greek historian who was born in Halicarnassus, Caria (modern-day Bodrum, Turkey) and lived in the 5th century BC (484–425 BC). He has been called "The Father of History" (firstly conferred by Cicero), and was the first historian known to collect his materials systematically, test their accuracy to a certain extent, and arrange them in a well-constructed and vivid narrative. The Histories—his masterpiece and the only work he is known to have produced—is a record of his "inquiry", being an investigation of the origins of the Greco-Persian Wars and including a wealth of geographical and ethnographical information. Although some of his stories were fanciful, he claimed he was reporting only what had been told to him. Little is known of his personal history.

**Thucydides**

Thucydides (460 – c. 395 BC) was a Greek historian and Athenian general. His ‘History of the Peloponnesian War' recounts the 5th century BC war between Sparta and Athens to the year 411 BC. Thucydides has been dubbed the father of "scientific history" because of his strict standards of evidence-gathering and analysis in terms of cause and effect without reference to intervention by the gods, as outlined in his introduction to his work.
He has also been called the father of the school of political realism, which views the relations between nations as based on might rather than right. His text is still studied at advanced military colleges worldwide, and the Melian dialogue remains a seminal work of international relations theory.

More generally, Thucydides showed an interest in developing an understanding of human nature to explain behaviour in such crises as plague, massacres, as in that of the Melians, and civil war.

**Xenophon**

Xenophon (430 – 354 BC), son of Gryllus, of the deme Erchia of Athens, also known as Xenophon of Athens, was a Greek historian, soldier, mercenary, and student of Socrates. While not referred to as a philosopher by his contemporaries, his status as such is now a topic of debate. He is known for writing about the history of his own times, the late 5th and early 4th centuries BC, especially for his account of the final years of the Peloponnesian War. His ‘Hellenica’, which recounts these times, is considered to be the continuation of Thucydides’ History of the Peloponnesian War. His youthful participation in the failed campaign of Cyrus the Younger to claim the Persian throne inspired him to write about the Persian Empire and its history.

Despite his birth-association with Athens, Xenophon affiliated himself with Sparta for most of his life. His pro-oligarchic views, service under Spartan generals in the Persian campaign and beyond, as well as his friendship with King Agesilaus II endeared Xenophon to the Spartans, and them to him. A number of his writings display his pro-Spartan bias and admiration, especially Agesilaus and Constitution of Sparta. Other than Plato, Xenophon is the foremost authority on Socrates, having learned under the great philosopher while a young man. He greatly admired his teacher, and well after Socrates’ death in 399 Xenophon wrote several Socratic dialogues, including an Apology concerning the events of his trial and death. Xenophon’s works cover a wide range of genres and are written in much uncomplicated Attic Greek. Xenophon’s works are among the first that many students of Ancient Greek translate on account of the straightforward and succinct nature of his prose. This sentiment was apparent even in ancient times, as Diogenes states in his Lives of Eminent Philosophers (2.6) that Xenophon was sometimes known as the "Attic Muse" for the sweetness of his diction.

**Roman historiography**

Roman historiography is indebted to the Greeks, who invented the form. The Romans had great models to base their works upon, such as Herodotus and Thucydides. Roman historiographical forms are different from the Greek ones however, and voice very Roman concerns. Unlike the Greeks, Roman historiography did not start out with an oral historical tradition. The Roman style of history was based on the way that the Annals of the Pontifex Maximus, or the Annales Maximi, were recorded. The Annales Maximi include a wide array of information, including religious documents, names of consuls, deaths of priests, and various disasters throughout history. Also part of the Annales Maximi is the White Tablets, or the “Tabulae Albatae,” which consist of information on the origin of the republic.
The foundation of Roman historiography

The most well-known originator of Roman historiography was Quintus Fabius Pictor, also known as the “Founder of Historiography”. Before the second Punic war, there was no historiography in Rome, but after, it was needed to commemorate this important occasion. Q. Fabius Pictor took up the task and wrote a history of Rome in Greek, not Latin. This choice of writing about the war in Greek arose from a need to address the Greeks and counter another author, Timaeus, who also wrote a history of Rome until the Second Punic War. Timaeus wrote with a negative view of Rome. Therefore, in defense of the Roman state, Q. Fabius Pictor wrote in Greek, using Olympiad dating and a Hellenistic style. Q. Fabius Pictor’s style of writing history defending the Roman state and its actions, and using propaganda heavily, eventually became a defining characteristic of Roman historiography.

Q. Fabius Pictor is known for the establishment of the “ab urbe condita” tradition of historiography which is writing history “from the founding of the city.” After Q. Fabius Pictor wrote, many other authors followed his lead, inspired by the new literary form: Lucius Cincius Alimentus, Gaius Acilius (c. 141 BC), Aulus Postumius Albinus (c. 151 BC), and Cato the Elder (c. 168 BC). Cato the Elder is credited as the first historian to write in Latin. His work, the Origines, was written to teach Romans what it means to be Roman. Like Q. Fabius Pictor, Cato the Elder wrote ab urbe condita and the early history is filled with legend illustrating Roman virtues. The Origines also spoke of how not only Rome, but how the other Italian cities were also venerable, and that the Romans were indeed superior to the Greeks.

The Romans enjoyed serious endeavours and so the writing of historiography became very popular for upper class citizens who wanted to spend their time on worthwhile, virtuous, “Roman” activities. As leisure time was looked down upon by the Romans, writing history became an acceptable way to spend retirement.

Almost as soon as historiography started being used by the Romans, it split into two traditions: the annalistic tradition and the monographic tradition.

The annalistic tradition

The authors who used the Annalistic tradition wrote histories year-by-year, from the beginning, which was most frequently from the founding of the city, usually up until the time that they were living in.

Some annalistic authors:

- Gnaeus Gellius (c. 140 BC) wrote his history from Aeneas until 146 BC.
- Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi (c. 133 BC) wrote trying to figure out why the Roman society had begun to decline. His history chronicled Rome from the foundation until 154 BC, when he believed that the society had hit its lowest point.
- Publius Mucius Scaevola (c. 133 BC) wrote a history from the foundation of the city in 80 books.
- Sempronius Asellio (c. 100 BC) wrote a history from the Punic Wars until c. 100 BC.
- Quintus Claudius Quadrigarius wrote that all Roman wars are just, and that the Senate and all Roman dealings were honorable, in annalistic form.
The monographic tradition

Monographs are more similar to the history books that we are used to today; they are usually on a single topic, but most importantly, they do not tell history from the beginning, and they are not even necessarily annalistic. An important sub category that emerged from the monographic tradition was the biography.

Some monographic authors:

- Gaius Gracchus wrote a biography of his brother, Tiberius Gracchus.
- Gaius Fannius also wrote a biography of Tiberius Gracchus, but showed him in a negative light.
- Lucius Coelius Antipater wrote a monograph on the Second Punic War.
- Sallust wrote two monographs: Bellum Catilinae (also known as De Catilinae Coniuratione), which is about the Catilinarian conspiracy from 66-63 BC, and the Bellum Jugurthinum, which is about the war with Jugurtha which took place from 111 - 105 BC.

Factionalized history

Often, especially in times of political unrest or social turmoil, historians re-wrote history to suit their particular views of the age. So, there were many different historians each rewriting history a little bit to bolster their case. This was especially evident in the 70s BC when the social wars were going on between the populists led by Marius, and the senatorials led by Sulla. Several authors wrote histories during this time, each taking a side. Gaius Lucinius Macer was anti-Sullan and wrote his history, based on Gnaeus Gellius in 16 books, from the founding of the city until the 3rd century BC, whereas Valerius Antias who was pro-Sulla, wrote a history in 75 books, from the founding of the city until 91 BC.

Characteristics

Annals are a year-by-year arrangement of historical writing. In Roman historiography, annals generally begin at the founding of Rome. Proper annals include whatever events were of importance for each year, as well as other information such as the names of that year’s consuls, which was the basis by which Romans generally identified years. The Annal seems originally to have been used by the priesthood to keep track of omens and portents.

The Annales Maximi was a running set of annals kept by the Pontifex Maximus. The Annales Maximi contained such information as names of the magistrates of each year, public events, and omens such as eclipses and monstrous births. The Annales Maximi covers the period from the early Roman Republic to around the time of the Gracchi.
Gracchan Annalist seems to refer to the writers of history in annalistic form who began writing after the time of the Gracchi. Compared to other forms of annalistic history, these seem more fictionalized as Roman historians used their histories to illustrate points about their own time, and were not necessarily out to produce hard fact. Still, Gracchan annalists have produced interesting insight into the writer’s own time, if not necessarily into the time on which they wrote. Sallust and Tacitus are fair examples of Gracchan Annalists.

A monograph is a comprehensive work on a single subject. The monograph could be written about a single event, a technique, rhetoric, or one of any number of other subjects. For example, Pliny the Elder once published a monograph on the use of the throwing-spear by cavalry. Monographs were among the most common historical works found in Roman writings.

_Ab urbe condita_, literally “From the founding of the city”, describes the Roman tradition of beginning histories at the founding of the city of Rome. For examples, see Tacitus, Livy, Sallust, et al. In Livy’s _Ab Urbe Condita_, much time is spent on the early history of Rome, and on the founding of the city itself. In Sallust’s histories, the founding and early history of Rome is almost reduced to a single sentence. Thus, the _ab urbe condita_ form is extremely variable while continuing to mold Roman histories.

“Senatorial History” describes history written by or with information from a Roman Senator. Senatorial histories are generally particularly informative due to their “insider’s” perspective. A general pattern of Senatorial histories is that they seem to invariably contain a reason that the author is writing histories instead of remaining involved in politics.

Sullan annalists politicized their past. They were partisans of the Sullan faction who carried on the Marius and Sulla conflict through their histories, often rewriting them to fit their own agenda. Some Sullan annalists may have been sources for Livy. Valerius Antias (fl. 80-60 BC) was a Sullan annalist but he was not viewed as a credible historian. He seems to have been trying to counter the Marian historian, C. Licinius Macer. Antias’ history, written in seventy-six books, is melodramatic and often filled with exaggerations and lies. In his history, anyone named Cornelius is considered a hero and anyone named Claudius is an enemy and the opposition to the populares never went by a consistent name but were instead called “boni,” “optime” or “optimates,” implying that they were the good guys.

Roman historiography is also very well known for subversive writing styles. The information in the ancient Roman histories is often communicated by suggestion, innuendo, implication and insinuation because their attitudes would not always be well received. Tacitus opposed the emperors and believed that they were one of the reasons for the decline of Rome. Tacitus even wrote disparagingly of Augustus the most celebrated and beloved of the emperors. Of course these opinions had to be veiled since they would not have gone over very well.
In Roman historiography commentarii is simply a raw account of events often not intended for publication. It was not considered traditional “history” because it lacked the necessary speeches and literary flourishes. Commentarii was usually turned into “history” later on. Many think Caesar’s account of the Gallic Wars, *Commentarii Rerum Gestarum* (Commentaries on Things Done), was called commentarii for propagandistic purposes. They believe that it is actually “history” since it is so well written, pro-Roman and fits the traditional patterns of historiography.

Ancient Roman historians did not write for the sake of writing, they wrote in an effort to convince their audiences. Propaganda is ever present and is the function of Roman historiography. Ancient Roman historians traditionally had personal and political baggage and were not disinterested observers. Their accounts were written with the specific moral and political agendas. For example Q. Fabius Pictor started the tradition of historiography that was concerned with both morality and history and affirmed the prestige of Roman state and its people.

Ancient Roman historians wrote pragmatic histories in order to benefit future statesmen. The philosophy of pragmatic history treats historical happenings with special reference to causes, conditions and results. In Roman Historiography the facts and an impression of what the facts mean are presented. Interpretation is always a part of historiography; Romans never made any pretence about it. Conflict between the facts and the interpretation of those facts indicate a good historian. Polybius, who wrote in Greek, was the first pragmatic historian. His histories have an aristocratic ethos and reveal his opinions on honour, wealth and war. Tacitus was also a pragmatic. His histories have literary merit and interpretations of facts and events. He was not purely objective, rather his judgments served a moral function.

**Major historians:**

**Caesar**

Julius Caesar was born on July 12, 100 BC into a patrician family. As a young man, he was given the position of the Flamen Dialis by his father-in-law, Cornelius Cinna. When that position was taken away by Sulla, Caesar spent a decade in Asia, earning a great reputation in the military. Upon his return to Rome, he was both elected tribunus militium and given the title of pontifex. During his time in these positions, Caesar befriended Pompey and Crassus, the two men with whom he would later form the First Triumvirate. As the years went on, recognition for Caesar’s political, military, and oratory skills grew and he easily earned the positions of praetor and consul. After his consulship, Caesar gained control of the provinces of Illyricum and Cisalpine and Transalpine. In 58 BC, trouble arose in the Gallic provinces, sparking one of the most important wars of Caesar’s career.
The De Bello Gallico is Caesar’s account of the Gallic Wars. As the Wars were raging on, Caesar fell victim to a great deal of criticisms from Rome. De Bello Gallico is a response to these criticisms, and a way for Caesar to justify these Wars. His argument is that the Wars were both just and pious, and that he and his army attacked Gaul in self-defense. The Helvetians were forming a massive migration straight through the provinces. When a group of neighboring allies came to Caesar himself asking for help against these invading Helvetians that was all the justification Caesar needed to gather his army. By creating an account that portrays himself as a superb military hero, Caesar was able to clear all doubts in Rome about his abilities as a leader.

While it is obvious that Caesar used this account for his own gain, it is not to say that the De Bello Gallico is at all unreliable. Many of the victories that Caesar has written about did, in fact, occur. Smaller details, however, may have been altered, and the word choice makes the reader more sympathetic to Caesar’s cause. De Bello Gallico is an excellent example of the ways in which retellings of actual events can be spun to a person’s advantage. For this reason, De Bello Gallico is often looked at as a commentary, rather than a piece of actual historiography.

**Livy**

Titus Livius, commonly known as Livy, was a Roman historian best known for his work entitled Ab Urbe Condita, which is a history of Rome “from the founding of the city.” He was born in Patavium, which is modern day Padua, in 59 BC and he died there in 17 AD. Others referred to his writing as having “patavinitas.” Little is known about his life, but based on an epitaph found in Padua; he had a wife and two sons. We also know that he was on good terms with Augustus and he also encouraged Claudius to write history.

Ab Urbe Condita covered Roman history from its founding, commonly accepted as 753 BC, to 9 BC. It consisted of 142 books, though only the first ten and books 21-45 survive, as well as a few other fragments. The books were referred to as “decades” because ten books could fit into a parchment codex. The decades were further split in pentads:

- Books 1-5 cover from the founding to 390 BC.
- Books 6-10 cover 390-293 BC.
- Though we do not have books 11-20, evidence suggests that books 11-15 discussed Pyrrhus and books 16-20 dealt with the First Punic War.
- Books 21-30 cover the Second Punic War:
  - 21-25 deal with Hannibal.
  - 26-30 deal with Scipio Africanus.
- The wars against Philip V in Greece are discussed in books 31-35.
- The wars against Antiochus III in the east in books 36-40.
• The Third Macedonian War is dealt with in books 40-45.
• Books 45-121 are missing.
• Books 121-142 deal with the events from 42 through 9 BC.

The purpose of writing *Ab Urbe Condita* was twofold: the first was to memorialize history and the second was to challenge his generation to rise to that same level. He was preoccupied with morality, using history as a moral essay. He connects a nation’s success with its high level of morality, and conversely a nation’s failure with its moral decline. Livy believed that there had been a moral decline in Rome, and he lacked the confidence that Augustus could reverse it. Though he shared Augustus’ ideals, he was not a “spokesman for the regime”. He believed that Augustus was necessary, but only as a short term measure.

According to Quintillian, Livy wrote with “lactea ubertas,” or “milky richness.” He used language to embellish his material, including the use of both poetical and archaic words. He included many anachronisms in his work, such as tribunes having power that they did not have until much later. Livy also used rhetorical elaborations, such as attributing speeches to characters whose speeches could not possibly be known. Though he was not thought of as a first-rate historian, his work was so extensive that other histories were abandoned for Livy. It is unfortunate that these other histories were abandoned, especially since much of Livy’s work is now gone, leaving holes in our knowledge of Roman history.

**Sallust**

C. Sallustius Crispus, more commonly known as Sallust, was a Roman historian of the 1st century BC, born c. 86 BC in the Sabine community of Amiternum. There is some evidence that Sallust’s family belonged to a local aristocracy, but we do know that he did not belong to Rome’s ruling class. Thus he embarked on a political career as a “novus homo,” serving as a military tribune in the 60s BC, quaestor from 55 to 54 BC, and tribune of the plebs in 52 BC. Sallust was expelled from the senate in 50 BC on moral grounds, but quickly revived his career by attaching himself to Julius Caesar. He served as quaestor again in 48 BC, as praetor in 46 BC, and governed the new province in the former Numidian territory until 44 BC. Sallust’s political career ended upon his return to Rome and Caesar’s assassination in 44 BC.

We possess in full two of the historical works that have been convincingly ascribed to Sallust, the monographs, *Bellum Catilinae* and *Bellum Jugurthinum*. We have only fragments of the third work, the *Historiae*. There is less agreement about the authorship of some other works that have, at times, been attributed to him. In *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust outlines the conspiracy of Catiline, a brash and ambitious patrician who tried to seize power in Rome in 63 BC. In his other monograph, Sallust used the Jugurthine War as a backdrop for his examination of the development of party struggles in Rome in the 1st century BC. The *Historiae* describe in general the history of the years 78-67 BC.
Although Sallust’s purposes in writing have been debated over the years, it seems logical to classify him as a senatorial historian who adopted the attitude of a censor. The historical details outlined in his monographs serve as paradigms for Sallust. In *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust uses the figure of Catiline as a symbol of the corrupt Roman nobility. Indeed, much of what Sallust writes in this work does not even concern Catiline. The content of *Bellum Jugurthinum* also suggests that Sallust was more interested in character studies (e.g. Marius) than the details of the war itself. With respect to writing style, the main influences on Sallust’s work were Thucydides and Cato the Elder. Evidence of the former’s influence includes emphasis on politics, use of archaisms, character analysis, and selective omission of details. The use of such devices as asyndeton, anaphora, and chiasmus reflect preference for the old-fashioned Latin style of Cato to the Ciceronian periodic structure of his own era.

Whether Sallust is considered a reliable source or not, he is largely responsible for our current image of Rome in the late republic. He doubtless incorporates elements of exaggeration in his works and has at times been described as more of an artist or politician than historian. But our understanding of the moral and ethical realities of Rome in the 1st century BC would be much weaker if Sallust’s works did not survive.

**Tacitus**

Tacitus was born c. 56 AD in, most likely, either Cisalpine or Narbonese Gaul. Upon arriving in Rome, which would have happened by 75, he quickly began to lay down the tracks for his political career. By 88, he was made praetor under Domitian, and he was also a member of the quindecimviri sacris faciundis. From 89 to 93, Tacitus was away from Rome with his newly married wife, the daughter of the general Agricola. 97 saw Tacitus being named the consul suffectus under Nerva. It is likely that Tacitus held a proconsulship in Asia. His death is datable to c.118.

Tacitus’ style is very much like that of Sallust. Short, sharp phrases cut right to the point, and Tacitus makes no bones about conveying his point. His claim that he writes history “without anger and partiality” is not exactly one that is true. Many of his passages ooze with hatred towards the emperors. Despite this seemingly obvious partisan style of writing, much of what is said can go under the radar, which is as Tacitus wanted things to be. His skill as an orator, which was praised by his good friend Pliny, no doubt contributes to his supreme mastery of the Latin language. Not one to mince words; Tacitus does not waste time with a history of Rome *ab urbe condita*. Rather, he gives a brief synopsis of the key points before he begins a lengthier summary of the reign of Augustus. From there, he launches into his scathing account of history from where Livy would have left off.
Suetonius

Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus (Suetonius) is most famous for his biographies of the Julio-Claudian and Flavian emperors and other notable historical figures. He was born around 69 to an equestrian family. Living during the times of the Emperor Trajan and having a connection to Pliny the Younger, Suetonius was able to begin a rise in rank in the imperial administration. In c. 102, he was appointed to a military tribune position in Britain, which he did not actually accept. He was, though, among the staff for Pliny’s command in Bithynia. During the late period of Trajan’s rule and under Hadrian, he held various positions, until he was discharged. He had a close proximity to the government as well as access to the imperial archives, which can be seen in his historical biographies.

Suetonius wrote a large number of biographies on important literary figures of the past. Included in the collection were notable poets, grammarians, orators, historians, and philosophers. This collection, like his other works, was not organized chronologically. Not all of it has survived to the present day, but there are a number of references in other sources to attribute fragments to this collection.

His most famous work, though, is the De Vita Caesarum. This collection of twelve biographies tells the lives of the Julio-Claudian and Flavian Emperors, spanning from Julius Caesar to Domitian. Other than an introduction genealogy and a short summary of the subject’s youth and death, the biographies do not follow a chronological pattern. Rather than chronicling events as they happened in time, Suetonius presents them thematically. This style allowed him to compare the achievements and downfalls of each emperor using various examples of imperial responsibilities, such as building projects and public entertainment. However, it makes dating aspects of each emperor’s life and the events of the early Roman Empire difficult. It also completely removes the ability to extrapolate a causal sequence from the works. Suetonius’s purpose was not a historical recount of events, though, but rather an evaluation of the emperors themselves.

Suetonius’s style is simple; he often quotes directly from sources that were used, and artistic organization and language does not seem to exist. He addresses points directly, without flowery or misleading language, and quotes from his sources often. However, he is often criticized that he was more interested in the interesting stories about the emperors and not about the actual occurrences of their reigns. The style, with which he writes, primarily stems from his overarching purpose, to catalogue the lives of his subjects. He was not writing an annalistic history, nor was he even trying to create a narrative. His goal was the evaluation of the emperors, portraying the events and actions of the person while they were in office. He focuses on the fulfilment of duties, criticizing those that did not live up to expectations, and praising bad emperors for times when they did fulfil their duties.

There are a variety of other lost or incomplete works by Suetonius, many of which describe areas of culture and society, like the Roman Year or the names of seas. However, what we know about these is only through references outside the works themselves.
West Asia

No historical work is seemed to have been produced in west Asia prior to the emergence of Islam and the establishment of the Arab Empire. Like any other society, pre-Islamic West Asian society had produced ballads, myths and legends with historical elements embedded in them. In fact after the rise of Islam the Arabs were making history, like the Romans and not recording it as they were making history, like the Romans and not recording it, as they were involved in hectic political expansion. The Arabs started history writing with a view to handing over authoritative traditions of Islam as well as to establish their genealogical relationship with the prophet.

During the initial stages the historical narrations in West Asia mainly centred on political and religious affairs. The expansion of the Arab empire paved way for the meeting of various races and cultures of the other parts of the world. As part of their political expansion, the West Asians came to know about the Greek contributions in every field of knowledge, including history. The Arab word ‘tarih’ meaning ‘arrangement of materials according to correct chronology’ was used for history in West Asia. Their historians had adopted a rational approach to verify the veracity and authenticity of sources of historical events, for which they developed a special technique called ‘Isnad’. The Arab word isnad means the chain of authorities by which a narration could be checked back to the original eye witness or the participants. It is a method of investigation into the character, circumstances’ and back-ground of the source.

Ibn Ishaq(704–767)

Ibn Ishaq was an Arab Muslim historian and hagiographer. Ibn Ishaq collected oral traditions that formed the basis of an important biography of the Islamic prophet Muhammad.

During the 8th century, about one hundred years after the death of Muhammad, the founder of the nation of Islam, a record of the great religious and political leader’s life was compiled by a man named Muhammad Ibn Ishaq. Ibn Ishaq, grandson of a freed slave, was not the first person to gather together the oral legends, accounts, and poems about the prophet’s life, but his resulting book, The Biography of the Prophet (Sirat an–Nabi), was viewed as the most comprehensive and multifaceted biography of Muhammad.

Many historians and scholars had already begun to write biographies in praise of the prophet, in order to reaffirm the faith through the presentation of an exemplary life. Other writers spread unflattering stories about Muhammad. Attar’s achievement is unique because he presents a wide range of stories, including both friendly and hostile accounts. In its thoroughness, generic range, and careful attribution of sources, Ibn Ishaq’s Biography provided the most detailed treatment at that time of Muhammad’s life, political and religious mission, and death. Attar’s work serves the faith as a secular complement to the Qur’an (Koran); we know it in the version edited in the 9th century by Ibn Hisham, and it is a model in English translator Alfred Gilliam’s assessment, of biographical “comprehensiveness, arrangement, and systematic treatment.”
Al-Tabari

Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir al-Tabari (224 – 310 AH; 839 A.D–923 A.D) was a prominent and influential Persian scholar, historian and exegete of the Qur’an from Tabaristan, modern Mazandaran in Iran. His most influential and best known works are his Qur’anic commentary known as Tafsir al-Tabari and his historical chronicle Tarikh al-Rusul wa al-Muluk (History of the Prophets and Kings), often referred to Tarikh al-Tabari. Al-Tabari founded his own madhhab which is usually designated by the name Jariri.

Al-Masudi

Al-Masūdī, in full Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Masūdī (born before 893, Baghdad, Iraq—died September 956, Al-Fustāṭ, Egypt [now part of Cairo]), historian and traveler, known as the “Herodotus of the Arabs.” He was the first Arab to combine history and scientific geography in a large-scale work, Murūj al-dhahab wa maʿādin al-jawāhir (“The Meadows of Gold and Mines of Gems”), a world history.

As a child, al-Masūdī showed an extraordinary love of learning, an excellent memory, a capacity to write quickly, and a boundless curiosity that led him to study a wide variety of subjects, ranging from history and geography—his main interests—to comparative religion and science. He was not content to learn merely from books and teachers but traveled widely to gain firsthand knowledge of the countries about which he wrote. His travels extended to Syria, Iran, Armenia, the shores of the Caspian Sea, the Indus valley, Sri Lanka, Oman, and the east coast of Africa as far south as Zanzibar, at least, and, possibly, to Madagascar.

The titles of more than 20 books attributed to him are known, including several about Islamic beliefs and sects and even one about poisons, but most of his writings have been lost. His major work was Akhbār al-zamān (“The History of Time”) in 30 volumes. This seems to have been an encyclopaedic world history, taking in not only political history but also many facets of human knowledge and activity. A manuscript of one volume of this work is said to be preserved in Vienna; if this manuscript is genuine, it is all that remains of the work. Al-Masūdī followed it with Kitāb al-awsaṭ (“Book of the Middle”), variously described as a supplement to or an abridgment of the Akhbār al-zamān. The Kitāb is undoubtedly a chronological history. A manuscript in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, may possibly be one volume of it.

Neither of these works had much effect on scholars—in the case of Akhbār al-zamān, possibly because of its daunting length. So al-Masūdī rewrote the two combined works in less detail in a single book, to which he gave the fanciful title of Murūj al-dhahab wa maʿādin al-jawāhir. This book quickly became famous and established the author’s reputation as a leading historian. Ibn Khaldūn, the great 14th-century Arab philosopher of history, describes al-Masūdī as an imam (“leader,” or “example”) for historians. Though an abridgment, Murūj al-dhahab is still a substantial work. In his introduction, al-Masūdī lists more than 80 historical works known to him, but he also stresses the importance of his travels to “learn the peculiarities of various nations and parts of the world.” He claims that, in the book, he has dealt with every subject that may be useful or interesting.
The work is in 132 chapters. The second half is a straightforward history of Islam, beginning with the Prophet Muhammad and then dealing with the caliphs down to al-Masūdī’s own time, one by one. While it often makes interesting reading because of its vivid descriptions and entertaining anecdotes, this part of the book is superficial. It is seldom read now, as much better accounts can be found elsewhere, particularly in the writings of al-ʿTabarī.

The first half, in contrast, is of great value, though somewhat sprawling and confused in its design. It starts with the creation of the world and Jewish history. Then it intersperses chapters describing the history, geography, social life, and religious customs of non-Islamic lands, such as India, Greece, and Rome, with accounts of the oceans, the calendars of various nations, climate, the solar system, and great temples. Among particularly interesting sections are those on pearl diving in the Persian Gulf, amber found in East Africa, Hindu burial customs, the land route to China, and navigation, with its various hazards, such as storms and waterspouts. The relative positions and characteristics of the seas are also explained.

Al-Masūdī’s approach to his task was original: he gave as much weight to social, economic, religious, and cultural matters as to politics. Moreover, he utilized information obtained from sources not previously regarded as reliable. He retailed what he learned from merchants, local writers (including non-Muslims), and others he met on his travels. He displayed interest in all religions, including Hinduism and Zoroastrianism as well as Judaism and Christianity. But he tended to reproduce uncritically what he had heard; thus, his explanations of natural phenomena are often incorrect. Yet he was no worse, in this respect, than medieval European travelers such as Marco Polo and Sir John Mandeville.

Al-Masūdī had no settled abode for most of his adult life. In 945 he settled in Damascus. Two years later he left there for Al-Fustat ("Old Cairo"), where he remained until his death in 956. It was there, in the last year of his life, that he wrote Kitāb al-tanbih wa al-ishrāf ("The Book of Notification and Verification"), in which he summarized, corrected, and brought up to date the contents of his former writings, especially the three historical works.

Ibn Khaldun (1332–1395, A.D.)

Ibn Khaldun is universally recognized as the founder and father of Sociology and Sciences of History. He is best known for his famous 'Muqaddimah,' (Prolegomena). Abd al-Rahman Ibn Mohammad, generally known as Ibn Khaldun after a remote ancestor, was born in Tunis in 732 A.H. (1332 C.E.) to an upper class family that had migrated from Seville in Muslim Spain. His ancestors were Yemenite Arabs who settled in Spain in the very beginning of Muslim rule in the eighth century.

During his formative years, Ibn Khaldun experienced his family’s active participation in the intellectual life of the city, and to a lesser degree, its political life. He was used to frequent visits to his family by the political and intellectual leaders of western Islamic states (i.e., North Africa and Spain), many of whom took refuge there.
Ibn Khaldun was educated at Tunis and Fez, and studied the Qur’an, Prophet Muhammad’s Traditions and other branches of Islamic studies such as Dialectical theology, shari’a (Islamic Law of Jurisprudence, according to the Maliki School). He also studied Arabic literature, philosophy, mathematics and astronomy. While still in his teens, he entered the service of the Egyptian ruler Sultan Barquq.

Ibn Khaldun led a very active political life before he finally settled down to write his well-known masterpiece on history. He worked for rulers in Tunis and Fez (in Morocco), Granada (in Muslim Spain) and Biaja (in North Africa). In 1375, Ibn Khaldun crossed over to Muslim Spain (Granada) as a tired and embittered man solely for the reasons of escaping the turmoil in North Africa. Unfortunately, because of his political past, the ruler of Granada expelled him. He then went back to Algeria to spend four years in seclusion in Qalat Ibn Salama, a small village. It was in Qalat he wrote *Muqaddimah*, the first volume of his world history that won him an immortal place among historians, sociologists and philosophers. The uncertainty of his career continued because of unrest in North Africa. Finally, he settled in Egypt where he spent his last twenty-four years. Here, he lived a life of fame and respect, marked by his appointment as the Chief Malakite Judge. He also lectured at the Al-Azhar University.

Ibn Khaldun had to move from one court to another, sometimes at his own will, but often forced to do so by plotting rivals or despotic rulers. He learnt much from his encounters with rulers, ambassadors, politicians and scholars from North Africa, Muslim Spain, Egypt and other parts of the Muslim world.

Ibn Khaldun is most famous for his book *Muqaddimah* (Introduction). It is a masterpiece in literature on philosophy of history and sociology. The main theme of this monumental work was to identify psychological, economic, environmental and social facts that contribute to the advancement of human civilization and the currents of history. He analyzed the dynamics of group relationships and showed how group feelings, al-‘Asabiyya, produce the ascent of a new civilization and political power. He identified an almost rhythmic repetition of the rise and fall in human civilization, and analyzed factors contributing to it.

Ibn Khaldun’s revolutionary views have attracted the attention of Muslim scholars as well as many Western thinkers. In his study of history, Ibn Khaldun was a pioneer in subjecting historical reports to the two basic criteria of reason and social and physical laws. He pointed out the following four essential points in the study and analysis of historical reports: (1) relating events to each other through cause and effect, (2) drawing analogy between past and present, (3) taking into consideration the effect of the environment, and (4) taking into consideration the effect of inherited and economic conditions.

Ibn Khaldun’s pioneered the critical study of history. He provided an analytical study of human civilization, its beginning, factors contributing to its development and the causes of decline. Thus, he founded a new science: the science of social development or sociology, as we call it today. Ibn Khaldun writes, "I have written on history a book in
which I discussed the causes and effects of the development of states and civilizations, and I followed in arranging the material of the book an unfamiliar method, and I followed in writing it a strange and innovative way." By selecting his particular method of analysis, he created two new sciences: Historiology and Sociology simultaneously.

Ibn Khaldun argued that history is subject to universal laws and states the criterion for historical truth: "The rule for distinguishing what is true from what is false in history is based on its possibility or impossibility: That is to say, we must examine human society and discriminate between the characteristics which are essential and inherent in its nature and those which are accidental and need not be taken into account, recognizing further those which cannot possibly belong to it. If we do this, we have a rule for separating historical truth from error by means of demonstrative methods that admits of no doubt. It is a genuine touchstone by which historians may verify whatever they relate."

Because of his emphasis on reason and its necessity in judging history and social events, some scholars have claimed that Ibn Khaldun tried to refute conventional religious knowledge and substitute for it reason and rational philosophy. This claim is unfounded. It is known that some schools teach things which are irrational in nature. But this is not true of Islam which has always encouraged observation and thinking, and reminded the nonbelievers for not using their reason and thinking.

Ibn Khaldun remarked that the role of religion is in unifying the Arabs and bringing progress and development to their society. He pointed out that injustice, despotism, and tyranny are clear signs of the downfall of the state. Ibn Khaldun points out that metaphysical philosophy has one advantage only, which is to sharpen one's wits. He states that the knowledge of the metaphysical world particularly in matters of belief can only be derived from revelation.

He was a pioneer in education. He remarked that suppression and use of force are enemies to learning, and that they lead to laziness, lying and hypocrisy. He also pointed out to the necessity of good models and practice for the command of good linguistic habits. Ibn Khaldun lived in the beginning period of the decline of Muslim civilization. This experience prompted him to spend most of his efforts on collecting, summarizing and memorization of the body of knowledge left by the ancestors. He vehemently attacked those unhealthy practices that created stagnation and stifling of creativity by Muslim scholars.

Ibn Khaldun emphasized the necessity of subjecting both social and historical phenomena to scientific and objective analysis. He noted that those phenomena were not the outcome of chance, but were controlled by laws of their own, laws that had to be discovered and applied in the study of society, civilization and history. He remarked that historians have committed errors in their study of historical events, due to three major factors: (l) their ignorance of the natures of civilization and people, (2) their bias and prejudice, and (3) their blind acceptance of reports given by others.
Ibn Khaldun pointed out that true progress and development comes through correct understanding of history, and correct understanding can only be achieved by observing the following three main points. First, a historian should not be in any way prejudiced for or against any one or any idea. Second, he needs to conform and scrutinize the reported information. One should learn all one could about the historians whose reports one hears or reads, and one should check their morals and trustworthiness before accepting their reports. Finally, one should not limit history to the study of political and military news or to news about rulers and states. For history should include the study of all social, religious, and economic conditions.

The Muqaddimah was already recognized as an important work during the lifetime of Ibn Khaldun. His other volumes on world history Kitab al-I’bar deal with the history of Arabs, contemporary Muslim rulers, contemporary European rulers, ancient history of Arabs, Jews, Greeks, Romans, Persians, Islamic History, Egyptian history and North-African history, especially that of Berbers and tribes living in the adjoining areas. The last volume deals largely with the events of his own life and is known as Al-Tasrif. As with his other books, it was also written from an analytical perspective and initiated a new tradition in the art of writing autobiography. He also wrote a book on mathematics which is not extant.

Ibn Khaldun’s influence on the subject of history, philosophy of history, sociology, political science and education has remained paramount down to our times. He is also recognized as the leader in the art of autobiography, a renovator in the fields of education and educational psychology and in Arabic writing stylistics. His books have been translated into many languages, both in the East and the West, and have inspired subsequent development of these sciences. Prof. Gum Ploughs and Kolosio consider Muqaddimah as superior in scholarship to Machiavelli’s The Prince written a century later, as the former bases the diagnosis more on cultural, sociological, economic and psychological factors.

China

A rich and persistent annalistic tradition and a growing emphasis on history as a repertoire of moral examples characterized the earliest Chinese historiography. The first Chinese historians were apparently temple archivists; as the bureaucratic structure of the Chinese state developed, historians occupied high offices. History gained prestige through the thought of the philosopher Confucius (551–479 BC), who was traditionally—though probably wrongly—credited with writing the Chunqiu (“Spring and Autumn [Annals]”) and the Shujing (“Classic of History”). As articulated in these works, Chinese historical thought was intensely moralistic: virtue was conceived as following the example of one’s ancestors. There was consistent interest in the form of governing institutions and frequent emphasis on the doctrine of the Mandate of Heaven—the idea that a monarch ruled by heaven’s decree, which would be withdrawn if he committed evil.
The foundational text of Chinese historiography is the Shiji (“Historical Records”), which was compiled by Sima Qian (145–86 BC). It is an account of the entire history of China from mythical times through the establishment of the Han dynasty in 206 BC. The story becomes more detailed as Sima Qian approaches his own time and is able to question eyewitnesses of events and make use of abundant official documents. Sima Qian introduced order into the welter of surviving records by organizing them into categories.

The classical Chinese historians made an ideal of objectivity. Although they eschewed interpretation of the historical record, they were often faced with conflicting sources. In such cases they typically chose only one, though they never referred to their sources or explained the choices they made. Historical criticism in China was constrained by propriety because of the high cultural value of ancestors; anything like the contentiousness of the Greeks would have been regarded as most unseemly.

By about 710 AD, however, Liu Zhiji (661–721) had produced the Shitong (“Historical Perspectives”), the first comprehensive work on historical criticism in any language. For him, the writing of history had an exalted—and very Confucian—mission:

*Man lives in his bodily shape between heaven and earth and his life is like the span of the summer fly, like the passing of a white colt glimpsed through a crack in the wall. Yet he is shamed to think that within those years his merit will not be known...there is truly none who is not tireless in pursuing merit and fame...Why is this? Because all have their heart set on immortality. And what, then, is immortality? No more than to have one’s name written in a book.*

Liu Zhiji’s view had a lasting influence. Indeed, some of his maxims are still recommended to beginning historians: skepticism about the sources, freedom from deference to established scholars, and the necessity of extensive knowledge of the sources before selection can be made, and insistence on arguments supported by extensive evidence.

**INDIA**

It has long been maintained that ancient Indians lacked historical consciousness and therefore did not produce any historical works. This statement was put forward either from the perspective of modern historical understanding or comparisons with the historical consciousness of ancient Greek or Chinese. That was based upon the belief that chronology dealing with short period of time is ‘the eye of history’ and the ancient Indians were not used to chronology of short period of time. It is a fact that ancient Indians did not consider history as an enquiry into the past with the logical purpose of explaining its causes and consequences. However, if history is defined as philosophy in motion, ancient Indians had their own historical consciousness. The concept of time for them was ‘cycle’ and not ‘linear’. Recent researches have shown that ancient Indians had their own historical consciousness which is exemplified in their genealogies, biographies and chronicles, where time resoring was recorded in generations, renal years and eras.
The best example of the ancient Indian historical writing is the Itihasa-Purana tradition. The term used for history in early India was ‘Itihasa’, a Sanskrit word which means ‘thus it was’ or ‘so it has been’. Though now treated as a term equal to history, it was then used in a more comprehensive sense, which included a variety of subjects along with history. The literary meaning of ‘Purana’ is ‘old’ and it was a body or literature on the then religious and social life, which was thought, should be preserved. The three main constituents of the Itihasa – Purana tradition are genealogy, mythology and ‘Vamasanucharita’ or historical narrative. The two epics, Ramayana and Mahabharata have elements of historical tradition in the form of genealogy. The puranas discuss subjects like nature of creation, relationship between men and Gods, maintenance of social institutions, genealogies of rulers and heroes and eventual end of the universe.

Embedded historical facts are to be separated from the general contents of Itihasasas and Puranas. This tradition did not concern political history instead, showed importance to tradition of lineage in the society. This tradition was placed in the then socio-religious context. They discuss the geographical areas where events had taken place. The epics mention the transformation of kingdom into monarchies, a change which acquires considerable historical importance. The concept of ‘dharma’ or mortality and ‘karma’ or action is interwoven in the Itihasa-Purana tradition as the responsibility of individual in history. Dharma was seen in the historical context as the socio-religious ordering of society. Karma was concerned with the actions in the life of an individual which conditions his next birth. Therefore it can be argued that the continuity between the past and present was maintained in this tradition. The concept of karma was explicated in the political realm, where the karma of the ruler was said to have related with his people. The historicity of the Itihasa-Purana tradition is not to be verified on the material they have, but on the method how these materials are inferred and used by historians.

From 7th century onwards, a separate branch of ‘historical writing known as ‘historical biographies’ came up in ancient India. They were prepared as a consequence to the formation of regional kingdoms, and written mainly by court poets at royal patronage. The important historical biographies of early India were ‘Harshacharita’ of Bana ‘Vikramanadevacharita’ of Bilhana and ‘Prithvirajavijaya’ of Jayanaka. Harshacharita of 7th century contains mostly rhetorical descriptions and covers the smaller period of the rule of the king Harsha. It is a combination of historical and fictitious stories and shows how Harsha had attained his fortunes. Bilhana’s work is about the heroism of his patron, the Chalukya king Vikramaditya of 11th century. Jayanaka of 12th century wrote the historical biography of the Rajput king Prithviraj.Atula, author of ‘Mushakavamsa Kavya’ depicts the historical biography of his patron king, Srikanta, the ruler of Kolathunad a regional kingdom in the northern part of Kerala.
The dynastic chronicle or dynastic history, ‘Rajatarangini’ written by Kalhana in 12th century is generally accepted as the first proper historical work produced in India. It is the detailed chronicle of the King of Kashmir from the legendary times to the author’s life time. No other Indian historians so far had understood the significance of various sources for history like Kalhana. His consideration of inscriptions as legitimate sources of history proves the quality of Kalhana as a historian. He had some concept about historical truths and beyond that historical truth, he wanted to entertain readers and teach them moral lessons. Unlike the early historians, Kalhana treated historical events in correct chronological order. Apart from the details of the royal families Kalhana gives information about caste system, diet and belief systems, temples and monasteries, famines and floods, wars and conquests etc of Kashmir.

The historical writing in India attained a new perspective during the period of the Sultanate of Delhi and the Mughals. The West and Central Asian Scholars arrived in India after the establishment of the Sultanate introduced their method of historical writing in India. They adopted the method of arranging historical events in chronological order. It was mainly dynastic history in the sense that the entire history centered on rulers and their subordinates. They never wrote the history of the society in general. The Delhi Sultanate historian treated history as an academic subject. The abundance of historical literature produced during these periods shows the interest and significance given to history. Ziaudeen Barani, the greatest historian of the Sultanate period characterized history as the queen of science. In fact, they did not write scientific history but narrated the events of the past.

Delhi Sultanate historical writing goes didactic as the historians of the period believed that history has a purpose and that purpose is to teach morals to the people. Barani stated that history introduces life and achievements of great men which would enable the posterity to take correct decisions in life. Sultanate historiography is theocratic and providential. The entire historical works of the period centered on religion and divine will.

The Mughal historiography was a continuation of the Sultanate. Though the changes in the ideas and cultural institutions had reflected in the historical works of the Mughal period, no indepth changes took place in the methods and techniques of historical writings. Apart from historical chronicles the Mughals had produced autobiographies, biographies etc. of the rulers and their close associates. Baber, the founder of the Mughal dynasties wrote his memoirs called ‘Babernama’ which is considered as the true work of historical significance. Abul Fasal, the greatest historian of the Mughal period was an exception to the general trend because he used the method of checking the authenticity of the sources before accepting them as raw materials for writing history.

The Mughal historians in general wrote history to please their masters and so they could not enjoy individual freedom in writing history. The subject matter of their historical works was rulers, their conquest and wars, administration and personal
achievements. However, AbulFasal tried to expand the canvas of history from Northern India to the distant provinces of the Empire and thereby attempted to write national history in its limited sense. He tries to shackle the theological aspects in historical writing and made it more secular. However, this secular approach of Fasal also must be seen in the background of the progressive religious attitude of his master, Akbar.

The Medieval Indian historians did not treat history as a totality. They treated each event as separate unit and did not try to correlate one event with the other. Thus for them history became the narration of unrelated events. The ruler was the deciding factor of historical events and therefore they thought that history was the record of events connected with the ruler only. They had a passion for moralization. Though the medieval period produced number of historical literature, they all went after a set pattern and that pattern was not decided by the historians but by the contemporary rulers.

Kalhana

Kalhana (c. 12th century), a Kashmiri, was the author of Rajatarangini (Chronicle of Kings), an account of the history of Kashmir. He wrote the work in Sanskrit between 1148 and 1149. All information regarding his life has to be deduced from his own writing, a major scholar of which is Mark Aurel Stein. Robin Donkin has argued that with the exception of Kalhana, "there are no [native Indian] literary works with a developed sense of chronology, or indeed much sense of place, before the thirteenth century".

Kalhana was born to a Kashmiri minister, Canpaka, who probably served king Harsa of the Lohara dynasty. It is possible that his birthplace was Parihasapura and his birth would have been very early in the 12th century. It is extremely likely that he was of the Hindu Brahmin caste, suggested in particular by his knowledge of Sanskrit. The introductory verses to each of the eight Books in his Rajatarangini are prefaced with prayers to Shiva, a Hindu deity. In common with many Hindus in Kashmir at that time, he was also sympathetic to Buddhism, and Buddhists tended to reciprocate this feeling towards Hindus. Even in relatively modern times, Buddha’s birthday has been a notable event for Kashmiri Brahmins and well before Kalhana’s time Buddha had been accepted by Hindus as an avatar of Vishnu.

Kalhana was familiar with earlier epics such as the Vikramankadevacharita of Bilhana, the Ramayana and the Mahabharata, to all of which he alludes in his own writings. However, his own writings did not employ what Stein has described as “the very redundant praise and flattery which by custom and literary tradition Indian authors feel obliged to bestow on their patrons”. From this comes Stein’s deduction that Kalhana was not a part of the circle surrounding Jayasimha, the ruling monarch at the time when he was writing the Rajatarangini.
Ziauddin Barani

Ziauddin Barani (1285–1357) was a Muslim historian and political thinker who lived in Delhi Sultanate (present day North India) during Muhammad bin Tughlaq and Firuz Shah’s reign. He was best known for composing the Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi, a major historical work on medieval India, which covers the period from the reign of Ghiyas ud din Balban to the first six years of reign of Firuz Shah Tughluq and the Fatwa-i-Jahandari which details the Muslim Caste System in South Asia.

He was born in aristocratic Muslim family in 1285 in which his father, uncle, and grandfather all working in high government posts under the Sultan of Delhi. His family were natives of Meerut and Bulandsahar. His maternal grandfather Husam-ud-Din, was an important officer of Ghiyas ud din Balban and his father Muwayyid-ul-Mulk held the post of naib of Arkali Khan, the son of Jalaluddin Firuz Khalji. His uncle Qazi Ala-ul-Mulk was the Kotwal (police chief) of Delhi during the reign of Ala-ud-Din Khalji. Barani never held a post, but was a nadim (companion) of Muhammad bin Tughlaq for seventeen years. During this period he was very close to Amir Khusro. After Tughlaq was deposed, he fell out of favor. In "Exile” he wrote two pieces dealing with government, religion, and history, which he hoped would endear him to the new sultan, Firuz Shah Tughluq. He was not rewarded for his works and died poor in 1357.

Fatwa-i-Jahandari

The Fatwa-i-Jahandari is a work containing the political ideals to be pursued by a Muslim ruler in order to earn religious merit and the gratitude of his subjects.

His fatwa would condone segregation of the Muslim ashraf upper castes and ajlaf low castes, in addition to the azral undercastes or the converted Muslims who are regarded as "ritually polluted" by the ashraf.

The work delves into aspects of religion and government and the meeting of those two, as well as political philosophy.

Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi

The Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi (Firuz Shah’s History) (1357) was an interpretation of the history of the Delhi Sultanate up to the then-present Firuz Shah Tughlaq. Then interpretation noted that the sultans who followed the rules of Barani had succeeded in their endeavors while those that did not, or those who had sinned, met the Nemesis.

In the Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi, Barani claims that whatever he has written is true and his account is considered as trustworthy by the modern scholars. But, though Barani refers many times to the sources of information, he did not consult his contemporary works. This resulted in the sketchy description of Ala-ud-Din Khalji’s wars in Chittor, Ranthambhor and Malwa and the Deccan campaigns of Malik Kafur. The later medieval historians, Nizam-ud-Din Ahmad, Badaoni, Ferishta and Haji-ud-Dabir depended upon the Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi for their account of history of the period covered in this work. Abdul Haq Dehlvi in his Akhbar-ul-Akhyar depended upon the work for the biographical sketches of Nizam-ud-Din Auliya and the other Sufi saints.
Abu'l-Fazl

Shaikh Abu al-Fazal ibn Mubarak also known as Abu'l-Fazl, Abu'l Fadl and Abu'l-Fadl 'Allami (January 14, 1551 – August 12, 1602) was the vizier of the great Mughal emperor Akbar, and author of the Akbarnama, the official history of Akbar's reign in three volumes, (the third volume is known as the Ain-i-Akbari) and a Persian translation of the Bible. He was also one of the Nine Jewels of Akbar's royal courts and the brother of Faizi, the poet laureate of Emperor Akbar.

The Akbarnama is a document of history of Akbar's reign and his ancestors spread over three volumes. It contains the history of Akbar's ancestors from Timur to Humayun, Akbar’s reign up to the 46th regnal year (1602), and an administrative report of Akbar's empire, the Ain-i-Akbari, which itself is in three volumes. The third volume of Ain-i-Akbari gives an account of the ancestry and life of the author. The Ain-i-Akbari was completed in the 42nd regnal year, but a slight addition was made to it in the 43rd regnal year on the account of the conquest of Berar.

Regional Histories

Regional histories are histories of specific geographical areas and their people. Global history or international history or world history is a modern form of historical writing. The ancient and medieval historians in general wrote regional histories, though some of them claimed to have maintained a universal conception of historiography. The limitation of historical writings to region wise during the pre-modern period was mainly due to the non-availability of sources and lack of knowledge about other people. The Greco-Roman historians could only write history of their own region. Even when Alexander had made his victorious ‘world conquest’ which paved way for the meeting of different cultures of the East and West, no historical works crossing the barriers of regional histories was produced.

Considering the limitations of his times, the Hellenistic historian Polybius of the 2nd century BC had conceived the idea of writing a grand book on the contemporary history of the entire Mediterranean region. In fact that was the only attempt made by the classical Greco-Roman historians to go outside their respective geographical regions. Likewise all other historians of the ancient world, whether the Chinese or the Indians had to limit their historical writings to regional histories, either they were not aware of the outside world or they could not get necessary information about their outside world. It was only in the 19th century historians began to write history on a wider geographical area.

The practice of writing regional histories was revised to a certain extent during the medieval period, especially by the Christian historiography written on Christian principles, upholding universal history. This concept of universal history tried to go back to the origin of man, formation of various races of men and the rise and fall of various civilizations but all within the paradigm of Christian doctrines. The entire church historiography was limited to Europe only. The Islamic historiography of the medieval period had widened the geographical areas and their histories. Consequently to the geographical expansion of the Arab empire; they began to include the history of the newly conquered regions also. Arab traders and scholars went to different parts of the world and collected source materials for writing history of vast geographical areas.
Their historical works included information about different other regions like India, China, parts of Europe and parts of Africa. Still all these histories were regional histories.

The European historians of the modern period, especially of the Enlightenment period began to view history on a world wide scale and they wrote world History. However, recently regional histories once again came into the fore-front of historical writing. Now it has become an accepted fact that only regional histories could present history in its proper sense.

**Historical Consciousness in Myths and Legends**

In common parlance, a myth is a fiction-something which is untrue. Scholars of mythology define myth differently: a myth is a special kind of story which tries to interpret some aspect of the world around us. Robert W. Brockway, in his book ‘Myth from the Ice Age to Mickey Mouse’ concisely summarizes a number of different scholarly ideas about the meaning of myth.

Myths are stories, usually, about gods and other supernatural beings. They are often stories of origins. They are usually strongly structured and their meaning is only discerned by linguistic analysis. Sometimes they are public dreams which, like private dreams, emerge from the unconscious mind. Indeed, they often reveal the archetypes of the collective unconscious. They are symbolic and metaphorical. They orient people to the metaphysical dimension, explain the origins and nature of the cosmos validate social issues, and, on the psychological plane, address themselves to the innermost depths of the psyche. Some of them are explanatory, being pre scientific attempts to interpret the natural world. As such, they are usually functional and are the science of primitive peoples. Often, they are enacted in rituals. Religious myths are sacred histories, and distinguished from the profane. But, being semiotic expressions, they are a "disease of language". They are both individual and social in scope, but they are first and foremost stories.

The terms legend and folktale are sometimes used interchangeably with myth. Technically, however, these are not the same. How should we distinguish them? Donna Rosenberg, in her book ‘Folklore, Myth, and Legends: A World Perspective’, offers some useful guidelines:

A myth is a sacred story from the past. It may explain the origin of the universe and of life, or it may express its culture’s moral values in human terms. Myths concern the powers who control the human world and the relationship between those powers and human beings. Although myths are religious in their origin and function, they may also be the earliest form of history, science, or philosophy...

A folktale is a story that, in its plot, is pure fiction and that has no particular location in either time or space. However, despite its elements of fantasy, a folktale is actually a symbolic way of presenting the different means by which human beings cope with the world in which they live. Folktales concern people - either royalty or common folk -- or animals who speak and act like people...

A legend is a story from the past about a subject that was, or is believed to have been, historical. Legends concern people, places, and events. Usually, the subject is a saint, a king, a hero, a famous person, or a war. A legend is always associated with a particular place and a particular time in history.
The earliest man has little historical consciousness. Myth and legends satisfied their needs to know about their origin, as they lived in their present and were in the urgencies of survival. Myths are generally considered as prototype of history. It provided narration of some of the selected aspects of the past for the purpose of preservation. In fact, myth and legends are the record of what people like to think about their past. They are generally related with the religious belief of the people all over the world. In Greek mythology Gods competed with one another for love and power, waged war on one another and sometimes failed. Infallibility was not necessarily an attribute of supernatural beings in the ancient world. When disasters and cataclysms took place ancient people normally attributed them to the will of the divine powers. By affirming a connection with divinities through lineage or proximity ancient rulers could establish the legitimacy of their right to given.

Homeric poetry such as Iliad and Odyssey recounted tales of earlier times, consisted of legends and myths, in which Gods and Goddesses and heroes acted together and supernatural forces accounted for the progression of events. Divine wills figured prominently in human affairs. Before history could exist, a text of reason had to take place. The Chinese mytho-historical mind did not polarize myth and history; instead it elevated folklore and oral traditions to the same level as written histories allowing for complementary relationship between the two. Sometimes myth and legends provide social sanction to precedence and at other times it safeguards morality.

The relation of flood with the origin of the universe and human beings is a universally accepted myth. The historical consciousness of the people of the earlier period was woven around this particular myth of course before the interpretation provided by organised religion. The Itihasa- Purana tradition of ancient Indian subscribes to this myth. There are instances of providing social sanction to certain myths, in the later period. The ‘Purushashukta’ of the Rig-Veda of ancient India describing the origin of the four ‘varnas’, said to have sprung from the body of the God, Prajapati- Brahmanas from the mouth, Kshatriyas from the arms. Vaisyas from the thighs and the Sudras from the feet – is an ancient myth transformed as the historical consciousness of the people, through which they had accepted the Varna based social division of the ancient Indian society.

Myths and legends are different types of traditional story. Like myths, legends are stories that are traditionally considered true, but are set in a more recent time. Legends generally feature human beings as their main characters, whereas myths generally focus on super human character. However, it is hard to draw a line between the two. In fact both acted as the earlier forms which provided access to history. There are different theories regarding the origin of myths. One theory claims that myths are distorted accounts of real historical events. This theory is named as ‘Euthemerism’ after the mythologist Euthemerus, who suggested that Greek Gods developed from legends about humans. Another theory considers it as ‘Allegories’ began as poetic description of natural forces into super humans. Some others believe that myths resulted from the ‘personification’ of inanimate objects and forces like fire; air etc, later accepted gods, thus giving rise to myths.
UNIT-II
DIFFUSION OF KNOWLEDGE-HUMANISTIC APPROACH

Renaissance literally “rebirth,” the period in European civilization immediately following the ‘Middle Ages’ and conventionally held to have been characterized by a surge of interest in Classical learning and values. The Renaissance also witnessed the discovery and exploration of new continents, the substitution of the Copernican for the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, the decline of the feudal system and the growth of commerce, and the invention or application of such potentially powerful innovations as paper, printing, the mariner’s compass, and gunpowder. To the scholars and thinkers of the day, however, it was primarily a time of the revival of Classical learning and wisdom after a long period of cultural decline and stagnation.

Origins and rise of humanism

The term ‘Middle Ages’ was coined by scholars in the 15th century to designate the interval between the downfall of the Classical world of Greece and Rome and its rediscovery at the beginning of their own century, a revival in which they felt they were participating. Indeed, the notion of a long period of cultural darkness had been expressed by Petrarch even earlier. Events at the end of the Middle Ages, particularly beginning in the 12th century, set in motion a series of social, political, and intellectual transformations that culminated in the Renaissance. These included the increasing failure of the Roman Catholic Church and the Holy Roman Empire to provide a stable and unifying framework for the organization of spiritual and material life, the rise in importance of city-states and national monarchies, the development of national languages, and the breakup of the old feudal structures.

While the spirit of the Renaissance ultimately took many forms, it was expressed earliest by the intellectual movement called humanism. Humanism was initiated by secular men of letters rather than by the scholar-clerics who had dominated medieval intellectual life and had developed the Scholastic philosophy. Humanism began and achieved fruition first in Italy. Its predecessors were men like Dante and Petrarch, and its chief protagonists included Gianozzo Manetti, Leonardo Bruni, Marsilio Ficino, Pico della Mirandola, Lorenzo Valla, and Coluccio Salutati. The fall of Constantinople in 1453 AD provided humanism with a major boost, for many eastern scholars fled to Italy, bringing with them important books and manuscripts and a tradition of Greek scholarship.

Humanism had several significant features. First, it took human nature in all of its various manifestations and achievements as its subject. Second, it stressed the unity and compatibility of the truth found in all philosophical and theological schools and systems, a doctrine known as syncretism. Third, it emphasized the dignity of man. In place of the medieval ideal of a life of penance as the highest and noblest form of human activity, the humanists looked to the struggle of creation and the attempt to exert
mastery over nature. Finally, humanism looked forward to a rebirth of a lost human spirit and wisdom. In the course of striving to recover it, however, the humanists assisted in the consolidation of a new spiritual and intellectual outlook and in the development of a new body of knowledge. The effect of humanism was to help men break free from the mental strictures imposed by religious orthodoxy, to inspire free inquiry and criticism, and to inspire a new confidence in the possibilities of human thought and creations.

From Italy the new humanist spirit and the Renaissance it engendered spread north to all parts of Europe, aided by the invention of printing, which allowed literacy and the availability of Classical texts to grow explosively. Foremost among northern humanists was Desiderius Erasmus, whose ‘Praise of Folly’ (1509) epitomized the moral essence of humanism in its insistence on heartfelt goodness as opposed to formalistic piety. The intellectual stimulation provided by humanists helped spark the Reformation, from which, however, many humanists, including Erasmus, recoiled. By the end of the 16th century the battle of Reformation and Counter-Reformation had commanded much of Europe’s energy and attention, while the intellectual life was poised on the brink of the Enlightenment.

Francis Bacon (1561-1626)

Sir Francis Bacon was an English philosopher, statesman, scientist, jurist, and orator. Francis Bacon has been called the major prophet of the Scientific Revolution. At the age of twelve Bacon went to study at Trinity College, Cambridge, later acquired an education in law, and was eventually admitted to the bar. He next embarked on a political career in the hope that it would allow him to advance his emerging ideas for the advancement of science. In due time he acquired a seat in the House of Commons, was knighted, held the position of Lord Chancellor and Baron Verulam, and Viscount St. Albans. He gained fame as a speaker in Parliament and as a lawyer in some famous trials in which he was considered an expert on English constitutional law. An outstanding thinker, Bacon was motivated to write in areas as far-reaching as science and civil government in a battle against the old order of scholasticism with its slavish dependence on accepted authorities. He advocated the view that whatever the “mind seizes and dwells upon with particular satisfaction is to be held in suspicion”. His passion for the advancement of natural philosophy was rooted in his belief that science was dependent on and the key to technological progress. Much of his greatest philosophical effort was applied to the Novum Organum in which he described the inductive method of reasoning for the interpretation of nature.

Bacon was very critical of those in the scholastic tradition who jumped from a few particular observations to remote axioms, and then deduced intermediate axioms through syllogistic demonstration. He also took a dim view of those empiricists who had been side-tracked with experiments done in depth without reference to related phenomena, since they were unjustified in the breadth of their generalizations.
According to Bacon there were four categories of false knowledge, or "idols," that had captured the minds of the men of his day. They are paraphrased as follows:

- **Idols of the tribe**: False notions due to the human nature and common to all men. An example would be geocentricity which was due to the limits of human insight.

- **Idols of the cave**: Personal interpretations due to individual makeup or disposition. An example would be Gilbert's "magnetic world view."

- **Idols of the market-place**: The problem of language and the confusion of words and terms. An example of this relates to the problem with definitions of words which likewise depend upon words.

- **Idols of the theatre**: The dogmas of philosophies that are received from wrong "laws of demonstration." This involves the results of the Aristotelian method of syllogistic argumentation.

In contrast to these, Bacon said that a true science progressed "in a just scale of ascent, and by successive steps not interrupted or broken, we rise from particulars to lesser axioms; and then to middle axioms, one above the other; and last of all to the most general". In short, his method required (1) accumulating a store of particular empirical observations, (2) from these inductively inferring lesser axioms, (3) from these inductively inferring middle axioms, (3) and then proposing the most general of notions, each in progressive steps. If we read modern meaning into the language used by Bacon, we might see a foreshadowing of the idea of a hypothesis in a "lesser axiom" and a theory in the "middle axiom." This would make his method agree with the mature conception of science in use today; however, the context indicates that his ideas were not yet so fully developed. Bacon also argued that this inductive method "must be used not only to discover axioms, but also notions," which may be taken to correspond to the concept of a paradigm, but again this may be reading into the text. In any case, it is clear that Bacon's view of the scientific method is progressive and cumulative.

The radical commitment to empiricism advocated by Bacon may imply for some that he did not accept any knowledge that was not received by personal observation. This is a mistakenly narrow interpretation of Bacon's view of natural philosophy which he believed was given as the "most faithful handmaid" of religion. Bacon actually saw his new way of acquiring knowledge as a fulfilment of Biblical prophecy concerning the last days: "Many shall go to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased". Further, he saw the technological advancement of science as a restoration of the "dominion mandate", and thus he wrote, "Man by the fall fell at the same time from his state of innocence and from his dominion over creation. Both of these losses however can even in this life be in some parts repaired; the former by religion and faith, the latter by the arts and sciences". There was, however, reason to believe that Bacon's views would play into the hands of humanistic concerns, since he also believed that his inductive method would "extend more widely the limits, of the power and greatness of man," and one day "embrace everything". For those who later advocated a "scientific world view," this prediction was claimed to be fulfilled.
**Novum Organum**

The *Novum Organum*, full original title *Novum Organum Scientiarum*, is a philosophical work by Francis Bacon, written in Latin and published in 1620. The title translates as new instrument, i.e. new instrument of science. This is a reference to Aristotle's work *Organon*, which was his treatise on logic and syllogism. In *Novum Organum*, Bacon details a new system of logic he believes to be superior to the old ways of syllogism. This is now known as the Baconian method.

For Bacon, finding the essence of a thing was a simple process of reduction, and the use of inductive reasoning. In finding the cause of a *phenomenal nature* such as heat, one must list all of the situations where heat is found. Then another list should be drawn up, listing situations that are similar to those of the first list except for the lack of heat. A third table lists situations where heat can vary. The *form nature*, or cause, of heat must be that which is common to all instances in the first table, is lacking from all instances of the second table and varies by degree in instances of the third table.

The title page of *Novum Organum* depicts a galleon passing between the mythical Pillars of Hercules that stand either side of the Strait of Gibraltar, marking the exit from the well-charted waters of the Mediterranean into the Atlantic Ocean. The Pillars, as the boundary of the Mediterranean, have been smashed through opening a new world to exploration. Bacon hopes that empirical investigation will, similarly, smashes the old scientific ideas and lead to greater understanding of the world and heavens.

**Rene Descartes (1596-1650)**

René Descartes (31 March 1596 – 11 February 1650) was a French philosopher, mathematician, and writer who spent most of his adult life in the Dutch Republic. He has been dubbed the 'Father of Modern Philosophy'.

It has been said that both modern philosophy and modern mathematics began with the work of Rene Descartes. His analytic method of thinking focused attention on the problem of how we know (epistemology), which has occupied philosophers ever since. Descartes was educated at the renowned Jesuit school of La Fleche where he was taught philosophy, science, and mathematics. He earned a law degree and then volunteered for the military in order to broaden his experience. When his duties allowed he continued his studies in mathematics and science. Eventually he became dissatisfied with the unsystematic methods utilized by the previous authorities in science, since he concluded they had not "produced anything which was not in dispute and consequently doubtful". The only exception to this was in the field of mathematics which he believed was built on a "solid foundation". Medieval science, on the other hand, was largely based on authorities from the past rather than observations in the present, therefore Descartes decided to conduct a personal plan of investigation. But, for Descartes, even his personal observation of the "book of nature" was not sufficiently beyond doubt because of his concern about the "deception of the senses." After consideration of all the previous methods of inquiry Descartes decided that there must be a better way; and in his *Discourse on Method* he wrote, "I eventually reached the decision to study my own self, and choose the right path".
Descartes aspired to rebuild a new system of truth based upon an unquestionable first principle which, like the fulcrum of Archimedes, would allow him to "move the earth from its orbit and place it in a new orbit". The first principle that he finally felt was self evident was summarized in the statement, "I think, therefore I am" (1). Descartes believed that he could then use his new method of reasoning to build on such a first principle, ultimately leading to the unification of all knowledge. The method developed by Descartes was based on the following rules:

- The first rule was never to accept anything as true unless I recognized it to be evidently such: that is, carefully to avoid precipitation and prejudgment, and to include nothing in my conclusions unless it presented itself so clearly and distinctly to my mind that there was no occasion to doubt it.

- The second was to divide each of the difficulties which I encountered into as many parts as possible, and as might be required for an easier solution.

- The third was to think in an orderly fashion, beginning with the things which were simplest and easiest to understand, and gradually and by degrees reaching toward more complex knowledge, even treating as though ordered materials which were not necessarily so.

- The last was always to make enumerations so complete, and reviews so general, that I would be certain that nothing was omitted.

In short, his method required (1) accepting as "truth" only clear, distinct ideas that could not be doubted, (2) breaking a problem down into parts, (3) deducing one conclusion from another, and (4) conducting a systematic synthesis of all things. Descartes based his entire philosophical approach to science on this deductive method of reasoning.

Descartes was highly optimistic about his plan to reconstruct a new and fully reliable body of knowledge. He even wondered if among "all things knowable to men" there might not be a proper application of his method so that "there cannot be any propositions so abstruse that we cannot prove them, or so recondite that we cannot discover them". The apparently global scope of Descartes' speculations might lead some to conclude that his epistemology demanded the rejection of all authority, including the Bible. In point of fact, he considered himself a good Catholic and with respect to the "truths of revelation" he clearly stated, "I would not have dared to ... submit them to the weakness of my reasonings". Ultimately it was his religion that kept him from living in a cocoon of personal introspection. However, Descartes did plant the seeds for later dissent from the theistic view of the world allowing for the humanistic dependence on human reason alone. It was left to the humanists who followed to assert an all encompassing rationalism that would take human reason as the sole measure of what constitutes "truth."
**Cartesianism**

Cartesianism is the name given to the philosophical doctrine (or school) of René Descartes. Descartes is often regarded as the first thinker to emphasize the use of reason to develop the natural sciences. For him the philosophy was a thinking system that embodied all knowledge, and expressed it in this way:

Cartesians view the mind as being wholly separate from the corporeal body. Sensation and the perception of reality are thought to be the source of untruth and illusions, with the only reliable truths to be had in the existence of a metaphysical mind. Such a mind can perhaps interact with a physical body, but it does not exist in the body, nor even in the same physical plane as the body. In general, Cartesian thought divides the world into three areas of existence:

- that inhabited by the physical body (matter),
- that inhabited by the mind, and
- that inhabited by God.

**Geographical dispersal**

In Holland, where Descartes had lived for a long time, Cartesianism was a doctrine popular mainly among university professors and lecturers. In Germany the influence of this doctrine was not relevant and followers of Cartesianism in the German-speaking border regions between these countries (e.g., theiatromathematician Yvo Gaukes from East Frisia) frequently chose to publish their works in Holland. In France, it was very popular, and gained influence also among Jansenists such as Antoine Arnauld, though there also, as in Italy, it became opposed by the church. In Italy, the doctrine failed to make inroads, probably since Descartes' works were placed on the Index in 1663.

In England, due to religious and other reasons Cartesianism was not widely accepted. Though Henry More was initially attracted to the doctrine, his own changing attitudes toward Descartes mirrored those of the country: "quick acceptance, serious examination with accumulating ambivalence, final rejection."

**Comparison and Contrast of the Methods of Descartes and Bacon**

The differences between the methods of Descartes and Bacon are many and deep, but there are also many things they have in common. Each of these pioneers advocated the complete overthrow of all the methods and most of the results of the authorities that came before them. Both of these men demanded a new standard of precision, since there were so many examples of sloppy reasoning and observation that littered the path of the science of the past. There was also a common commitment to doubt in general and a concern about the "deceptions of the senses". In addition, they believed in the reduction of problems to their smallest constituent parts as a general principle. Descartes and Bacon each saw himself primarily in the role of an advocate for science and therefore they contributed very little to any particular field of empirical science. Finally, both of these men were uniquely gifted to promote the particular aspects of science that were eventually crucial to its advance.
The most obvious difference in methodology between Descartes and Bacon was related to their procedures for reasoning. Descartes began with intuitively derived principles that were taken as the premises in the standard deductive method of reasoning, but Bacon began with empirical observations that were used to inductively educe higher axioms. Descartes' method was a "top down" approach, whereas Bacon's was "bottom up." So strong is this particular contrast that it seems at times that Bacon was writing specifically about Descartes' method as an example of what was wrong in science. A crucial difference in the background of the two men is seen in the mathematical mastery of Descartes as compared to the mathematical neglect of Bacon. Descartes is noted for his great accomplishments in the areas of algebra and geometry, whereas Bacon's spoke little of mathematics since his area of expertise was law. Background may explain the similarities in the method of Descartes which parallels that of mathematical proofs. For Bacon the empirical observations he emphasized for science may parallel the kind of "eye witness" evidence he required when building a case in a court of law. In view of Descartes background it appears obvious that his exemplar would be found among the mathematicians who he said "alone have been able to find some demonstrations, some certain and evident reasons." Therefore, he decided to "begin where they did". In spite of Bacon's distinguished background he was actually very pragmatic in his pursuit of an exemplar which he found among the "mechanics." It was the "mechanical arts which were founded on nature and the light of experience". Because of this observation he was greatly impressed with the discovery of printing, gunpowder, and the magnet. In his view "no empire, no sect, no star seems to have exerted greater power and influence in human affairs than these mechanical discoveries". It is important to note that as different as the methods of Descartes and Bacon were, when their exemplars are synthesized into one, we have an anticipation of the modern mathematical-experimentalist. We can now see that when taken together, Rene Descartes and Francis Bacon were germinal for the modern scientific method.

**Giambattista Vico and Anti-Cartesianism**

Giovan Battista (Giambattista) Vico (23 June 1668 – 23 January 1744) was an Italian political philosopher, rhetorician, historian, and jurist. He criticised the expansion and development of rationalism and was an apologist of classical antiquity. Vico is best known for his magnum opus, the *Scienza Nuova* of 1725, often published in English as *New Science*.

Vico is a precursor of systemic and complexity thinking, as opposed to Cartesian analysis and other kinds of reductionism. He is also well known for noting that verum esse ipsum factum ("true itself is fact" or "the true itself is made"), a proposition that has been read as an early instance of constructivist. Vico is often claimed to have inaugurated modern philosophy of history, although the term is not found in his text (Vico speaks of a "history of philosophy narrated philosophically"). While Vico was not, strictly speaking, a historicist, interest in him has often been driven by historicists (such as Isaiah Berlin and Hayden White).
Born to a bookseller and the daughter of a carriage maker in Naples, Italy, Vico attended a series of grammar schools, but ill-health and dissatisfaction with Jesuit scholasticism led to home schooling. After a bout of typhus in 1686, Vico accepted a tutoring position in Vatolla (a Frazione of the comune of Perdifumo), south of Salerno that would last for nine years. In 1699, he married a childhood friend, Teresa Destito, and took a chair in rhetoric at the University of Naples. Throughout his career, Vico would aspire to, but never attain, the more respectable chair of jurisprudence. In 1734, however, he was appointed royal historiographer by Charles III, king of Naples, and was offered a salary far surpassing that of his professorship. Vico retained the chair of rhetoric until ill-health forced him to retire in 1741.

The Scienza Nuova

The New Science (1725, original title Scienza Nuova) is his major work and has been highly influential in the philosophy of history, and for historicists like Isaiah Berlin and Hayden White.

The verum factum principle

Vico is best known for his verum factum principle, first formulated in 1710 as part of his De antiquissima Italorum sapientia, ex linguae latinae originibus eruenda (1710) ("On the most ancient wisdom of the Italians, unearthed from the origins of the Latin language"). The principle states that truth is verified through creation or invention and not, as per Descartes, through observation: “The criterion and rule of the true is to have made it. Accordingly, our clear and distinct idea of the mind cannot be a criterion of the mind itself, still less of other truths. For while the mind perceives itself, it does not make itself.” This criterion for truth would later shape the history of civilization in Vico’s opus, the Scienza Nuova (The New Science, 1725), because he would argue that civil life – like mathematics – is wholly constructed.

Vichian rhetoric and humanism

Vico’s version of rhetoric is often seen as the result of both his humanist and pedagogic concerns. In De Nostri Temporis Studiorum Ratione ("On the Order of the Scholarly Disciplines of Our Times"), presented at the commencement ceremonies of 1708, Vico argued that whoever “intends a career in public life, whether in the courts, the senate, or the pulpit” should be taught to “master the art of topics and defend both sides of a controversy, be it on nature, man, or politics, in a freer and brighter style of expression, so he can learn to draw on those arguments which are most probable and have the greatest degree of verisimilitude” (however, in his "Scienza Nuova”, Vico denounces as "false eloquence" one defending both sides in controversies). As Royal Professor of Latin Eloquence, it was Vico’s task to prepare students for higher studies in law and jurisprudence. His lessons thus dealt with the formal aspects of the rhetorical canon, including arrangement and delivery. Yet as the above oration also makes clear, Vico chose to emphasize the Aristotelian connection of rhetoric with dialectic or logic, thereby reconnecting rhetoric to ends (or topics) as their center. Vico’s objection to modern rhetoric is that it cuts itself off from common sense (sensus communis), as the
sense common to all men. In his lectures and throughout the body of his work, Vico’s rhetoric begins from a central argument or "middle term" (medius terminus) which it then sets out to clarify by following the order of things as they arise in our experience. Probability and circumstance retain their proportionate importance, and discovery – reliant upon topics or loci – supersedes axioms derived through reflective abstraction. In the tradition of classical Roman rhetoric, Vico sets out to educate the orator as the deliverer of the "oratio", a speech having "ratio" or reason/order at its heart. What is essential to the oratory art (as the Greek rhetorike) is the orderly link between common sense and an end commensurate to it—an end that is not imposed upon the imagination from above (in the manner of the moderns and a certain dogmatic form of Christianity), but that is drawn out of common sense itself. In the tradition of Socrates and Cicero, Vico’s real orator or rhetorician will serve as midwife in the birth of “the true” (as a form or idea) out of “the certain” (as the confusion or ignorance of the student’s particularized mind).

Vico’s rediscovery of "the most ancient wisdom" of the senses (a wisdom that is "human foolishness" or humana stultitia), his emphasis on the importance of civic life, and his professional obligations remind us of the humanist tradition. He would call for a maieutic or jurisprudential oratory art against the grain of the modern privileging of a dogmatic form of reason in what he called the “geometrical method” of Descartes and the Port-Royal logicians.

Response to the Cartesian method

As he relates in his autobiography, Vico returned to Naples from Vatolla to find "the physics of Descartes at the height of its renown among the established men of letters." Developments in both metaphysics and the natural sciences abounded as the result of Cartesianism. Widely disseminated by the Port Royal Logic of Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole, Descartes' method was rooted in verification: the only path to truth, and thus knowledge, was through axioms derived from observation. Descartes' insistence that the "sure and indubitable" (or, "clear and distinct") should form the basis of reasoning had an obvious impact on the prevailing views of logic and discourse. Studies in rhetoric – indeed all studies concerned with civic discourse and the realm of probable truths – met with increasing disdain.

Vico’s humanism and professional concerns prompted an obvious response that he would develop throughout the course of his writings: the realms of verifiable truth and human concern share only a slight overlap, yet reasoning is required in equal measure in both spheres. One of the clearest and earliest forms of this argument is available in the De Italorum Sapientia, where Vico argues that to introduce geometrical method into practical life is "like trying to go mad with the rules of reason," attempting to proceed by a straight line among the tortuosities of life, as though human affairs were not ruled by capriciousness, temerity, opportunity, and chance. Similarly, to arrange a political speech according to the precepts of geometrical method is equivalent to stripping it of any acute remarks and to uttering nothing but pedestrian lines of argument.
Vico’s position here and in later works is not that the Cartesian method is irrelevant, but that its application cannot be extended to the civic sphere. Instead of confining reason to a string of verifiable axioms, Vico suggests (along with the ancients) that appeals to phronēsis or practical wisdom must also be made, as do appeals to the various components of persuasion that comprise rhetoric. Vico would reproduce this argument consistently throughout his works, and would use it as a central tenet of the Scienza Nuova.

**Enlightenment historiography**

The Age of Enlightenment is a term used to describe a phase in Western philosophy and cultural life centred upon the 18th century. The term came into use in English during the mid-19th century, with particular reference to French philosophy, as the equivalent of a term then in use by German writers, *Zeitalter der Aufklärung*, signifying generally the philosophical outlook of the eighteenth century. It does not represent a single movement or school of thought, for these philosophies was often mutually contradictory or divergent.

"Age of Enlightenment" and "The Enlightenment" refer particularly to the intellectual and philosophical developments of that age (and their impact in moral and social reform), in which Reason was advocated as the primary source and basis of authority. Developing in Germany, France and Britain, the movement spread through much of Europe, including Russia and Scandinavia. The signatories of the American Declaration of Independence, the United States Bill of Rights and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen were motivated by "Enlightenment" principles (although the English Bill of Rights predates the era). The era is marked by political aspiration towards governmental consolidation, nation-creation and greater rights for common people, attempting to supplant the arbitrary authority of aristocracy and established churches.

The 18th century was an age of optimism, tempered by the realistic recognition of the sad state of the human condition and the need for major reforms. The Enlightenment was less a set of ideas than it was a set of attitudes. At its core was a critical questioning of traditional institutions, customs, and morals. Some classifications of this period also include the late 17th century, which is typically known as the Age of Reason or Age of Rationalism.

There is no consensus on when to date the start of the age of Enlightenment, and some scholars simply use the beginning of the eighteenth century or the middle of the seventeenth century as a default date. Other scholars use the beginning of the Napoleonic (1804–15) as a convenient point in time with which to date the end of the Enlightenment. Still others describe the Enlightenment beginning in Britain’s Glorious Revolution of 1688 and ending in the French Revolution of 1789. However others also claim the Enlightenment ended with the death of Voltaire in 1778.
SCIENCE AND SKEPTICISM

Two new challenges confronted the study of history in the 17th century. One was generated by the successes of natural science, claimed by its proponents to be the best—or even the only—producer of truth. Science created a new picture of the world, discrediting all past conceptions. As the English poet Alexander wrote: “Nature and nature’s laws lay hid in night/ Then God said: ‘Let Newton be!’ and all was light.” These successes inspired the hope that similar laws would be found for social and historical phenomena and that the same scientific methods could be applied to every subject, including politics, economics, and even literature.

The other challenge lay in the relativism and skepticism generated within historical discourse itself. In his Histoire des histoires et l'idée de l'histoire accompli (1599; “History of Histories and the Idea of History Accomplished”), Lancelot Voisin La Popelinière (1540–1608) asked: if history shows the ceaseless mutations of human culture, what keeps history itself from being more than a mode of perception of any particular culture, of no more permanent value than any other changeable cultural artifact? Thus, the unmasking of forgeries could lead to suspicions about every relic of the past. In a similar vein, the French Jesuit Jean Hardouin claimed that almost all the Latin and Greek classics and most of the works of the Church Fathers, including St. Augustine and St. Jerome, were written by a group of medieval Italian scholars, who then forged all the manuscripts purporting to be earlier. Hardouin, it must be said, pushed historical criticism past the boundaries of sanity.

The most influential philosopher of the 17th century, René Descartes, included history in his catalogue of dubious sciences. In his Discourse on Method (1637), Descartes asserted that, although histories exalt the mind, even the most accurate of histories, if they do not exactly misrepresent or exaggerate the value of things in order to render them more worthy of being read, at least omit in them all the circumstances which are basest and least notable; and from this it follows that what is retained is not portrayed as it really is, and that those who regulate their conduct by examples which they derive from such a source are liable to fall into the extravagances of the knights-errant of romances.

According to Descartes, history is doubtful because it is selective. Unlike the sciences, which are based on mathematics, history cannot yield knowledge.

One attempt to rescue the truth-claims of history, which ironically lent support to skepticism, was the Dictionnaire historique et critique (1697; “Historical and Critical Dictionary”), by the French philosopher Pierre Bayle (1647–1706), one of the most widely read works of the 18th century. The articles in Bayle’s dictionary, enlivened by learned and often witty marginalia established what was known about the subject but often undermined religious and political orthodoxies. These sallies were far more memorable than the often trivial facts provided in the work.
MONTESQUIEU AND VOLTAIRE

The leading historians of the French Enlightenment, Montesquieu (1689–1755) and Voltaire (1694–1778), responded in different ways to the scientific impulse. In De l'esprit des loix (1748; The Spirit of Laws), Montesquieu explored the natural order that he believed underlay polities as well as economies. Despite lacking information about many cultures, he systematically applied a comparative method of analysis. Climate and soil, he believed, are the deepest level of causality. The size of the territory to be governed also determines what kind of government it can have (republics have to be small; large countries like Russia require despotism). Montesquieu’s preferred form of government was constitutional monarchy, which existed in France before Louis XIV (reigned 1643–1715) and in England during Montesquieu’s day. Among his many readers were the Founding Fathers of the United States, who embraced Montesquieu’s idea of balanced government and indeed created one exquisitely contrived to allow each branch to check the others.

Voltaire’s temperament was more skeptical. “History,” he declared, “is a pack of tricks we play on the dead.” He nevertheless spent much of his life playing those tricks, producing L'Histoire de Charles XII (1731; “History of Charles XII”), on the Swedish monarch, Le Siècle de Louis XIV (1751; “The Century of Louis XIV”), and Essai sur les moeurs (1756; “Essay on Morals”). In an article on history for the Encyclopédie, edited by the philosopher Denis Diderot, Voltaire noted that the modern historian requires not only precise facts and dates but also attention to customs, commerce, finance, agriculture, and population. This was the program that the Essai tried to fulfill. It starts not with Adam or the Greek poet Homer but with the ancient Chinese, and it also treats Indian, Persian, and Arab civilizations. Voltaire’s Essai was the first attempt to make the genre of “universal history” truly universal, not just in covering the globe—or at least the high cultures—but also in studying every aspect of human life. In this respect Voltaire is the father of the “total histories” and the “histories of everyday life” that blossomed in the second half of the 20th century.

Voltaire was curious about everything—but not tolerant of everything. Like most philosophes (the leading thinkers of the French Enlightenment), he considered the Middle Ages an epoch of unbroken superstition and barbarism. Even the age of Louis XIV exhibited “a history of human stupidity.” Like Machiavelli, he believed that one could learn from history—but only what not to do. Thus, a statesman reading a history of the reign of Charles XII should be “cured of the folly of war.”

Although Voltaire was interested in other cultures, he believed that reason had made headway only in the Europe of his own day. It was left to thinkers of the next generation, including the baron l’Aulne Turgot (1727–81) and the marquis de Condorcet (1743–94), to construe history as gradually but inevitably moving toward the elimination of bigotry, superstition, and ignorance. Condorcet rhapsodized: “How welcome to the philosopher is this picture of the human race, freed from all its chains, released from the domination of chance and from that of the enemies of progress, advancing with a firm and sure step on the path of truth, virtue, and happiness.”
Positivism

Isidore Auguste Marie François Xavier Comte (19 January 1798 – 5 September 1857), better known as Auguste Comte, was a French philosopher. He was a founder of the discipline of sociology and of the doctrine of positivism. He is sometimes regarded as the first philosopher in the modern sense of the term. Influenced by the utopian socialist Henri Saint-Simon, Comte developed the positive philosophy in an attempt to remedy the social malaise of the French Revolution, calling for a new social doctrine based on the sciences.

Positivism is a philosophy developed by Auguste Comte (widely regarded as the first true sociologist) in the middle of the 19th century that stated that the only authentic knowledge is scientific knowledge, and that such knowledge can only come from positive affirmation of theories through strict scientific method. This view is sometimes referred to as a scientist ideology, and is often shared by technocrats who believe in the necessary progress through scientific progress. As an approach to the philosophy of science deriving from Enlightenment thinkers like Pierre-Simon Laplace (and many others), positivism was first systematically theorized by Comte, who saw the scientific method as replacing metaphysics in the history of thought, and who observed the circular dependence of theory and observation in science. Comte was thus one of the leading thinkers of the social evolutionism thought. Brazil’s national motto, Ordem e Progresso (“Order and Progress”) was taken from Comte’s positivism, also influential in Poland. Positivism is the most evolved stage of society in anthropological Evolutionism, the point where science and rational explanation for scientific phenomena develops. Marxism and predictive dialectics is a highly positivist system of theory. However Marxism rejects positivism and views it as subjective idealism, because it limits itself only to facts and does not examine the underlying causes of things. According to Auguste Comte, society undergoes three different phases in its quest for the truth. These three phases are the Theological, the Metaphysical and the Positive Phases.

The Theological Phase of man is based on whole-hearted belief in all things with reference to God. God, he says, had reigned supreme over human existence pre-Enlightenment. Man’s place in society was governed by his association with the divine presences and with the church that governed all. The Theological Phase deals with mankind accepting the doctrines of the church and not questioning the world. It dealt with the restrictions put in place by the religious organization at the time and the total acceptance of any “fact” placed forth for society to believe.

Comte describes the Metaphysical Phase of man as the time since the Enlightenment, a time steeped in logical rationalism, to the time after right the French Revolution. This second phase states that the universal rights of man are most important. The idea that man is born with certain rights that should and cannot be taken away, that must be respected and central at its heart. With this in mind democracies and dictators rose and fell in attempt to maintain the innate rights of man.
The final stage of the trilogy of Comte’s universal law is the Scientific, or Positive Stage. The central idea of this phase is the idea that individual rights are more important than the rule of any one person. Comte stated the idea that man is able to govern himself is what makes this stage innately different from the rest. There is no higher power governing the masses and the intrigue of any one person than the idea that he can achieve anything based on his individual free will and authority. It is third principle that is is what is most important in the positive stage.

These three phases are what Comte calls the Universal Rule – in relation to society and its development. Neither the second nor the third phase can be reached without the completion and understanding of the preceding stage. All stages must be completed in progress.

The irony of this series of phases is that though Comte attempted to prove that human development has to go through these three stages it seems that the Positivist stage is far from becoming a realization. This is due to two truths. The Positivist Phase requires having complete understanding of the universe and world around us and requires that society should never know if it is in this Positivist Phase. Some may argue that the Positivist phase could not be reached unless one were God thus reverting to the first and initial phase or argue that man is constantly using science to discover and research new things leading one back to the second Metaphysical Phase. Thus, some believe Comte’s Positivism to be circular.

Comte believed that the appreciation of the past and the ability to build on it towards the future was the key in transitioning from the theological and metaphysical phases. The idea of progress was central to Comte’s new science, Sociology. Sociology would "lead to the historical consideration of every science" because "the history of one science, including pure political history, would make no sense unless it was attached to the study of the general progress of all of humanity". As Comte would say, "from science comes prediction; from prediction comes action."

### Ranke and Berlin Revolution

Leopold von Ranke (1795–1886) is one of the great figures of European nineteenth-century scholarship and a founder of modern historical science. The son of a lawyer in a small town of Thuringia, he graduated from Schulpforta, one of the most renowned public schools of Germany, and studied philology and theology at the University of Leipzig. In 1818 he became a teacher of classical languages in the high school (Gymnasium) in Frankfurt on the Oder. In 1824 his first book, the History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations, appeared and immediately brought him wide recognition. Ranke was appointed professor at the University of Berlin and received a travel grant from the Prussian government that permitted him to spend four years abroad, mainly in Italy—decisive years for the development of his historical views. He returned to Berlin in 1831 and, with the exception of extended trips for research in German, French, and English archives, he spent the rest of his life in Berlin. In the historical seminars that he made an essential part of the education of a young historian he trained most of the
better-known German historians of the nineteenth century. Ranke retired from teaching in 1871 but continued to work on a last great enterprise, a world history. When he died in 1886, ennobled by the King of Prussia and laden with honours from all countries of the world, he was generally recognized as the greatest historical scholar of the modern world.

Ranke’s collected works comprise 54 volumes. Most famous among them are his history of the popes (1834–1836), his history of the Reformation in Germany (1839–1847), his works on French history (1852) and on English history (1859–1869), and his 12 volumes on Prussian history (1847–1848). All of them focus on developments from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century; they show that Ranke’s main attainment was to provide a scientific basis for the study of modern history.

Ranke’s most important innovation was the introduction of a critical historical method. In an appendix to his first work, the History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations, which was concerned with the development of a European state system around 1500, Ranke, showed that the historical works by contemporaries, on which previous treatments of this period were based, were vitiated by personal and political prejudices and should be used only with great caution. When Ranke was in Italy he discovered the reports that Venetian ambassadors delivered before the Senate after their return from their diplomatic missions and realized that such materials of an official character, produced in the course of the conduct of affairs, were far superior to narrative sources as tools for discovering the truth about the past. Thus he established that the materials from which the historian should construct his history ought to be, wherever possible, documentary sources. Both the proposition that serious history ought to be based on archival research and the large-scale publications of documentary source materials that were started in the nineteenth century have their origin in Ranke’s adoption of a new critical method.

This methodological innovation sprang from Ranke’s general notions about the task of the historian: “to show what actually happened”. This statement sounds simple and matter-of-course, but it was meant to be a challenge to the philosophies of history of the first half of the nineteenth century, particularly the philosophy of Hegel. According to Ranke, history has no final aim that can be abstractly defined and is not an ascending process in which the later period is always superior to the earlier one. Ranke thought that it is almost sacrilegious for man to believe that he can grasp God’s providential plan, but he did believe that history helps reveal the working of God by demonstrating the richness and variety of life. Thus the statement that the historian ought “to show what actually happened” was complementary to another famous pronouncement by Ranke—that “each period is equally close to God.”

For Ranke each period of history has its own individual features: it is unique. Each period, almost each historical phenomenon, reflects a distinctive “idea.” His own deeply religious feeling, his romantic enthusiasm for the “abyss of individuality,” as well as Platonic influences—all combined to form Ranke’s view of the role of “ideas” in
history. He had a very fine understanding of the manner in which the various activities of a period —political, literary, intellectual—are permeated by the same spirit and express the same “idea.”

Despite his understanding of the interrelation of all these spheres, Ranke was chiefly a political and diplomatic historian. He belonged to the age of rising nationalism, and his interests were focused on the great powers that were the political embodiments of the spirits of the various European nations. He saw these powers as individualities, as expressions of different “ideas.” The clearest formulation of these views can be found in his essay entitled “A Dialogue on Politics,” published in 1836 in the periodical Historisch—Politische Zeitschrift, which Ranke himself edited and which represented one of his few ventures into the field of practical politics. In the essay Ranke defended the existing governments against the revolutionary movements of 1830 and explained that liberalism could not set a generally valid political pattern because each state was a living organism, an individuality, and must have its own particular institutional forms. The events of foreign policy must form the central interest of the historian because the great powers developed their particular individualities during, and by means of, struggles against each other. Ranke never used the expression “primacy of foreign policy,” but the doctrine that is signified by this term—that external pressure forms and determines the internal structure of a state—is implied in his works. Because Ranke was principally concerned with foreign policy, he had little understanding of the importance of the changes that industrialization brought about in his own century. Ranke was fundamentally conservative.

Ranke’s views are incompatible with the aims of the modern social sciences. He rejected the possibility of laws of social development and of patterns generally applicable to social action or behaviour. He was a great writer, and his books are not simply histories but also work of literature. Nevertheless, the turn he gave to the development of historical scholarship did have an influence on the development of the social sciences in that his views were a decisive factor in “professionalizing” history. History became an academic subject that required specialized training and archival research and the editing of source materials became a great part of the activity of a historian. Although originally such efforts focused on sources for the history of foreign affairs, they soon extended to other aspects of the past: the sources for institutional, economic, and social developments. Thus historical scholarship has produced significant material for all kinds of social research. Moreover, by emphasizing the particular and individual character of each period of the past, Ranke implicitly suggested the existence of a relativity of values and helped to remove the barriers that had prevented an understanding of foreign cultures.
Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (August 27, 1770 – November 14, 1831) was a German philosopher, and a major figure in German Idealism. His historicist and idealist account of reality revolutionized European philosophy and was an important precursor to Continental and Marxism.

Hegel developed a comprehensive philosophical framework, or "system", of absolute idealism to account in an integrated and developmental way for the relation of mind and nature, the subject and object of knowledge, psychology, the state, history, art, religion, and philosophy. In particular, he developed the concept that mind or spirit manifested itself in a set of contradictions and oppositions that it ultimately integrated and united, without eliminating either pole or reducing one to the other. Examples of such contradictions include those between nature and freedom, and between immanence and transcendence.

Hegel influenced writers of widely varying positions, including both his admirers and his detractors. Karl Barth compared Hegel to a "Protestant Aquinas". Maurice Merleau-Ponty wrote, "All the great philosophical ideas of the past century—the philosophies of Marx and Nietzsche, phenomenology, German existentialism, and psychoanalysis—had their beginnings in Hegel...". Michel Foucault has contended that contemporary philosophers may be "doomed to find Hegel waiting patiently at the end of whatever road we travel". Hegel's influential conceptions are those of speculative logic or "dialektik", "absolute idealism". They include "Geist" (spirit), negativity, sublation (Aufhebung in German), the "Master/Slave" dialectic, "ethical life" and the importance of history.

Geist

Geist is a German word. Depending on context it can be translated as the English words mind, spirit, or ghost, covering the semantic field of these three English nouns. Some English translators resort to using "spirit/mind" or "spirit (mind)" to help convey the meaning of the term.

Edmund Spenser's usage of the English-language word 'ghost', in his 1590 The Faerie Queene, demonstrates the former, broader meaning of the English-language term. In this context, the term describes the sleeping mind of a living person, rather than a ghost, or spirit of the dead. The word Geist is etymologically identical to the English ghost but has retained its full range of meanings, while some applications of the English word ghost had become obsolete by the 17th century, replaced with the Latinate spirit. For this reason, English-language translators of the term Geist from the German language face some difficulty in rendering the term, and often disagree as to the best translation in a given context.

Geist is a central concept in Hegel's The Phenomenology of Spirit. According to Hegel, the Weltgeist ("World Spirit") is not an actual thing one might come upon or a God-like thing beyond, but a means of philosophizing about history. Weltgeist is effected in history through the mediation of various Volksgeister ("Folk Spirits"), the great men of history, such as Napoleon, are the "concrete universal".
This has led some to claim that Hegel favoured the great man theory, although his philosophy of history, in particular concerning the role of the "universal state" (Universal Stand, which means as well "order" or "statute" than "state"), and of an "End of History" is much more complex.

For Hegel, the great hero is unwittingly utilized by Geist or Absolute Spirit, by a "ruse of Reason" as Hegel puts it, and is irrelevant to history once his historic mission is accomplished; he is thus submitted to the teleological principle of history, a principle which allows Hegel to re-read all the history of philosophy as culminating in his philosophy of history.

Weltgeist, the world spirit concept, designates an idealistic principle of world explanation, which can be found from the beginnings of philosophy up to more recent time. The concept of world spirit was already accepted by the idealistic schools of ancient Indian philosophy, whereby one explained objective reality as its product. In the early philosophy of Greek antiquity, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle all paid homage, amongst other things, to the concept of world spirit. Hegel later based his philosophy of history on it.

Why study Hegel?

In 1847 the London Communist League (Karl Marx and Frederick Engels) used Hegel's theory of the dialectic to back up their economic theory of communism. Now, in the 21st century, Hegelian-Marxist thinking affects our entire social and political structure. The Hegelian dialectic is the framework for guiding our thoughts and actions into conflicts that lead us to a predetermined solution. If we do not understand how the Hegelian dialectic shapes our perceptions of the world, then we do not know how we are helping to implement the vision. When we remain locked into dialectical thinking, we cannot see out of the box.

Hegel's dialectic is the tool which manipulates us into a frenzied circular pattern of thought and action. Every time we fight for or defend against an ideology we are playing a necessary role in Marx and Engels' grand design to advance humanity into a dictatorship of the proletariat. The synthetic Hegelian solution to all these conflicts can't be introduced unless we all take a side that will advance the agenda. The Marxist's global agenda is moving along at breakneck speed. The only way to completely stop the privacy invasions, expanding domestic police powers, land grabs, insane wars against inanimate objects (and transient verbs), covert actions, and outright assaults on individual liberty, is to step outside the dialectic. This releases us from the limitations of controlled and guided thought.

When we understand what motivated Hegel, we can see his influence on all of our destinies. ... Hegelian conflicts steer every political arena on the planet, from the United Nations to the major American political parties, all the way down to local school boards and community councils. Dialogues and consensus-building are primary tools of the dialectic, and terror and intimidation are also acceptable formats for obtaining the goal. The ultimate Third Way agenda is world government. Once we get what’s really going on,
we can cut the strings and move our lives in original directions outside the confines of the dialectical madness. Focusing on Hegel’s and Engel’s ultimate agenda, and avoiding getting caught up in their impenetrable theories of social evolution, gives us the opportunity to think and act our way toward freedom, justice, and genuine liberty for all.

Today the dialectic is active in every political issue that encourages taking sides. We can see it in environmentalists instigating conflicts against private property owners, in democrats against republicans, in greens against libertarians, in communists against socialists, in neo-cons against traditional conservatives, in community activists against individuals, in pro-choice versus pro-life, in Christians against Muslims, in isolationists versus interventionists, in peace activists against war hawks. No matter what the issue, the invisible dialectic aims to control both the conflict and the resolution of differences, and leads everyone involved into a new cycle of conflicts.

"Dialectic ....the Hegelian process of change in which a concept or its realization passes over into and is preserved and fulfilled by its opposite... development through the stages of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis in accordance with the laws of dialectical materialism ....any systematic reasoning, exposition, or argument that juxtaposes opposed or contradictory ideas and usually seeks to resolve their conflict......the dialectical tension or opposition between two interacting forces or elements."

"Dialectical Materialism ... 1: the Marxist theory that maintains the material basis of a reality constantly changing in a dialectical process and the priority of matter over mind."

"Hegel’s dialectic often appears broken up for convenience into three moments called "thesis" (in the French historical example, the revolution), "antithesis" (the terror which followed), and "synthesis" (the constitutional state of free citizens). ... Much Hegel scholarship does not recognize the usefulness of this triadic classification for shedding light on Hegel’s thought. Although Hegel refers to "the two elemental considerations: first, the idea of freedom as the absolute and final aim; secondly, the means for realising it, i.e. the subjective side of knowledge and will, with its life, movement, and activity" (thesis and antithesis) he doesn’t use "synthesis" but instead speaks of the "Whole": "We then recognised the State as the moral Whole and the Reality of Freedom, and consequently as the objective unity of these two elements." ...

"Hegel used this system of dialectics to explain the whole of the history of philosophy, science, art, politics and religion, but many modern critics point out that Hegel often seems to gloss over the realities of history in order to fit it into his dialectical mold....

In the 20th century, Hegel's philosophy underwent a major renaissance. This was due partly to the rediscovery and reevaluation of him as the philosophical progenitor of Marxism by philosophically oriented Marxists, partly through a resurgence of the historical perspective that Hegel brought to everything, and partly through increasing recognition of the importance of his dialectical method. The book that did the most to
reintroduce Hegel into the Marxist canon was perhaps Georg Lukacs’s History and Class Consciousness. This sparked a renewed interest in Hegel reflected in the work of Herbert Marcuse, Theodor Adorno, and Ernst Bloch....

"Beginning in the 1960's, Anglo-American Hegel scholarship has attempted to challenge the traditional interpretation of Hegel as offering a metaphysical system."


For example: If (A) my idea of freedom conflicts with (B) your idea of freedom then (C) neither of us can be free until everyone agrees to be a slave. The Soviet Union was based on the Hegelian dialectic, as is all Marxist writing. The Soviets didn't give up their Hegelian reasoning when they supposedly stopped being a communist country. They merely changed the dialectical language to fit into the modern version of Marxist thinking called communitarianism. American author Steve Montgomery explores Moscow's adept use of the Hegelian dialectic in Glasnost-Perestroika: A Model Potemkin Village.

How is it possible to consider a Hegelian argument?

If the ideas, interpretations of experiences, and the sources are all wrong, can a conclusion based on all these wrong premises be sound? The answer is no. Two false premises do not make a sound conclusion even if the argument follows the formula. Three, four, five, or six false premises do not all combine to make a conclusion sound. You must have at least one sound premise to reach a sound conclusion. Logical mathematical formulas are only the basis for deductive reasoning. Equally important is knowledge of semantics, or considering the meanings of the words used in the argument. Just because an argument fits the formula, it does not necessarily make the conclusion sound. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel knew this when he designed his dialectic.

Hegel is an imperialist con artist who established the principles of dialectical "no-reason." Hegel's dialectic has allowed globalists to lead simple, capable, freeborn men and women back into the superstitious, racist and unreasonable age of imperial global dominance. National governments represent people who are free from imperial controls over private property, trade and production. National governments protect their workers from imperial slavery by protecting the worker's markets. But if you use Hegel's logical Marxism, the only way to protect people from slavery is to become the slave trader, just for a while. Twisted logic is why cons are so successful, and Hegel twisted it in such a way as to be "impenetrable." Like Hegel and Marx, the best street con knows his spiel has to use logic to bend and distort the story, and good cons weave their lies on logical mathematical progression. The fallacy is in the language, not in the math. Detective Phillip Worts' 2001 article Communist Oriented Policing is a nice explanation of Dialectical Materialism's influence on America.
The communitarian purpose for the Hegelian dialectic

Hegel's theory is basically that mankind is merely a series of constant philosophical conflicts. Hegel was an idealist who believed that the highest state of mankind can only be attained through constant ideological conflict and resolution. The rules of the dialectic means mankind can only reach its highest spiritual consciousness through endless self-perpetuating struggle between ideals, and the eventual synthesizing of all opposites. Hegel's dialectic taught all conflict takes man to the next spiritual level. But in the final analysis, this ideology simply justifies conflict and endless war. It is also the reasoning behind using military power to export an illogical version of freedom and false democratic ideals.

The reason we can call it the justification for modern conflicts and war, with impunity, is because no one can prove Hegel's theory is true. No matter how many new words they make up to define it, or how many new theories they come up with to give it validity, we can prove beyond a doubt that it is all false. And, we can show the final equation in Hegels' Dialectic is:

A: The [your nation goes here] System of Political Economy (List 1841)
B: state controlled world communism
C: state controlled global communitarianism.

The Hegelian dialectic is the ridiculous idea that constant conflict and continual merging of opposite ideologies, as established by extreme right or left belief systems, will lead spiritual mankind into final perfection. (Americans understood man’s spiritual quests to be outside the realm of government control). Hegel’s brilliance rests in his ability to confuse and obfuscate the true motives of the planners, and millions of people world-wide have been trying to make sense of why it doesn’t work for over 150 years. But like the AA definition of insanity, the world keeps trying it over and over expecting different results. ...

When Frederick Engels and Karl Marx based their communist theory on Hegel's theory of spiritual advancement via constant resolution of differences, they based the theory of communism on an unproven theory. While Darwin's theory of evolution is still being debated, there's absolutely no proof that societies are continually evolving. When Engels and Marx later based their communist theory on Lewis Henry Morgan’s theory of anthropology in 1877, they again based the theory of communism on an unprovable theory.

And when Amitai Etzioni used Hegelian reasoning to base the Communitarian Network on a "balance" between (A) Rights and (B) Responsibilities, he built the entire theory of (C) communitarianism on nothing but disproven and unprovable unscientific theories....

Already gaining substantial ground against the Americans, British Marxism was bolstered when Charles Darwin published his theory of human evolution in 1859. Engels, according to modern day scholars, seized upon Darwin’s theory to substantiate communism:
"When Marx read The Origin of Species he wrote to Engels that, 'although it is developed in the crude English style, this is the book which contains the basis in natural history for our view.' They turned against what they saw as the social, as opposed to the biological, implications of Darwinism when they realised that it contained no support for their shibboleth of class oppression. Since they were slippery customers rather than scientists, they were not likely to relinquish their views just because something did not fit."

In 1877 Lewis Henry Morgan published Ancient Society, or Researches in Life, Lines of Human Progress from Savagery, through Barbarism, to Civilization. Then the "slippery" Engels seized upon Morgan's work as the constantly "evolving" basis for the totally unsubstantiated theory of natural social evolution into utopian world communism....

Hegel's formula has been so successful that in 2003 all U.S. domestic and foreign policy is dominated by "communitarian thinking," the whole country is living under the new laws, and yet Americans most affected by "impenetrable" Hegelian laws have never once heard the term used.

**Conclusion:**

The Hegelian dialectic presupposes the factual basis for the theory of social evolutionary principles, which coincidentally backed up Marx. Marx's Darwinian theory of the "social evolution of the species," (even though it has been used for a century to create a vast new scientific community, including eugenics and socio-economic), does not adhere to the basis for all good scientific research, and appears to exist mainly to advance itself, and all its sub-socio-scientific arms, as the more moral human science. To the ACL this means the entire basis for the communitarian solution is based on a false premise, because there is no FACTUAL basis that "social evolution of the species" exists, based as it is only on Darwinian and Marxist ideology of man's "natural" evolution towards a British version of utopia.

The London-Marxist platform in 1847 was "to abolish private property." The American Revolution was based in private property rights. Marxist societies confiscate wealth and promise to "re-distribute it equally." America promised everyone they could keep and control what was the product of their own labour. Modern Marxist adherents openly claim they will "rebuild the world," and they train activist "change agents" to openly support overthrowing the legitimate governments of the world. Since their inception, Marxist agent provocateurs can be linked to every anarchist assassination and student uprising that caused chaos to the established European civilization throughout the 18th and 19th centuries. Modern Americans have succumbed to the conspiracy theory label and will only listen to what the propaganda machines tell them. Now our people don't believe anyone other than maybe the Arab world "hates our freedom." Most modern Americans will never know what went wrong with their "great experiment in democracy."
While the Marxist-communitarian argument has not provided a shred of evidence to prove their utopian vision, and their synthesis does not match their own projected conclusions of world justice, we are convinced their argument does in fact substantiate our conclusion, that the entire philosophical dialectical argument is nothing but a brilliant ruse. We used to call it "a cheap parlour trick" until a responder to this page wondered how we could call it "cheap" when it's been so successful. And he was right. The dialectical arguments for human rights, social equity, and world peace and justice are a perfectly designed diversion in the defeated British Empire's Hegelian-Fabian-Metaphysical-Theosophical Monopoly game. It's the most successful con job in the history of the modern world. (For a well presented Christian overview of the con, see American Babylon: Part Five-the Triumph of the Merchants by Peter Good game.)

The communitarian synthesis is the final silent move in a well-designed, quietly implemented plot to re-make the world into colonies. To us it doesn't matter if there is some form of ancient religion that propels the plotters, nor does it really matter if it turns out they're aliens (as some suggest). The bottom line is the Hegelian dialectic sets up the scene for state intervention, confiscation, and redistribution in the U.S. and this is against our ENTIRE constitutional based society. The Hegelian dialectic is not a conspiracy theory because the Conspiracy Theory is a fraud. We've all been duped by global elitists who plan to take totalitarian control of all nation's people, property, and produce. Communitarian Plans exist in every corner of the world, and nobody at the local level will explain why there's no national legal avenue to withdraw from the U.N.'s "community" development plans.

Oswald Spengler (May 29, 1880 - May 8, 1936)

Oswald Spengler was a German philosopher and mathematician. His work The Decline of the West argues that the development of civilizations follows a recognizable series of repetitive rises and falls.

Spengler, a man of wide education with a PhD in philosophy, conceived the idea for "The Decline of the West" during the Agadir Crisis of 1911, when he formed the opinion that a general European war was inevitable. Spengler's work was written largely during the times of the carnage of the First World War, the first volume being published in 1918.

According to Spengler:......The future of the West is not a limitless tending upwards and onwards for all time towards our presents ideals, but a single phenomenon of history, strictly limited and defined as to form and duration, which covers a few centuries and can be viewed and, in essentials, calculated from available precedents. With this enters the age of gigantic conflicts, in which we find ourselves today. It is the transition from Napoleonism to Caesarism, a general phase of evolution, which occupies at least two centuries and can be shown to exist in all Cultures.....
The last century [the 19th] was the winter of the West, the victory of materialism and scepticism, of socialism, parliamentarianism, and money. But in this century blood and instinct will regain their rights against the power of money and intellect. The era of individualism, liberalism and democracy, of humanitarianism and freedom, is nearing its end. The masses will accept with resignation the victory of the Caesars, the strong men, and will obey them.....

Spengler had been influenced by a cultural tendency, over the last quarter of the 19th century by many people, to suggested that the then modern era of the West bore significant similarities to the Hellenistic era and the late Roman Republic, a period running roughly from the death of Alexander the Great (330 B.C.) to the assassination of Julius Caesar (44 B.C.).

Based on such a comparison of historical situation Spengler considered that the West was entering a period of two centuries of wars for world power, like that between the Battles of Cannae (216 B.C.) and Actium (31 B.C.).

Arnold J. Toynbee (1889 –1975)

Arnold Joseph Toynbee was a British historian, philosopher of history, research professor of International History at the London School of Economics and the University of London and author of numerous books. Toynbee in the 1918–19500period was a leading specialist on international affairs.


Toynbee was a nephew of the 19th-century economist Arnold Toynbee. He was educated at Balliol College, Oxford (classics, 1911), and studied briefly at the British School at Athens, an experience that influenced the genesis of his philosophy about the decline of civilizations. In 1912 he became a tutor and fellow in ancient history at Balliol College, and in 1915 he began working for the intelligence department of the British Foreign Office. After serving as a delegate to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 he was appointed professor of Byzantine and Modern Greek studies at the University of London. From 1921 to 1922 he was the Manchester Guardian correspondent during the Greco-Turkish War, an experience that resulted in the publication of The Western Question in Greece and Turkey (1922). In 1925 he became research professor of international history at the London School of Economics and director of studies at the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London.

Toynbee began his Study of History in 1922, inspired by seeing Bulgarian peasants wearing fox-skin caps like those described by Herodotus as the headgear of Xerxes’ troops. This incident reveals the characteristics that give his work its special quality—his sense of the vast continuity of history and his eye for its pattern, his immense erudition, and his acute observation.
In the Study Toynbee examined the rise and fall of 26 civilizations in the course of human history, and he concluded that they rose by responding successfully to challenges under the leadership of creative minorities composed of elite leaders. Civilizations declined when their leaders stopped responding creatively, and the civilizations then sank owing to the sins of nationalism, militarism, and the tyranny of a despotic minority. Unlike Spengler in his The Decline of the West, Toynbee did not regard the death of a civilization as inevitable, for it may or may not continue to respond to successive challenges. Unlike Karl Marx, he saw history as shaped by spiritual, not economic forces.

While the writing of the Study was under way, Toynbee produced numerous smaller works and served as director of foreign research of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (1939–43) and director of the research department of the Foreign Office (1943–46); he also retained his position at the London School of Economics until his retirement in 1956. A prolific writer, he continued to produce volumes on world religions, western civilization, classical history, and world travel throughout the 1950s and 1960s. After World War II Toynbee shifted his emphasis from civilization to the primacy of higher religions as historical protagonists. His other works include Civilization on Trial (1948), East to West: A Journey Round the World (1958), and Hellenism: The History of a Civilization (1959).

Toynbee has been severely criticized by other historians. In general, the critique has been levelled at his use of myths and metaphors as being of comparable value to factual data and at the soundness of his general argument about the rise and fall of civilizations, which relies too much on a view of religion as a regenerative force. Many critics complained that the conclusions he reached were those of a Christian moralist rather than of a historian. His work, however, has been praised as a stimulating answer to the specializing tendency of modern historical research.

**Johann Gottfried Herder (25 August 1744 – 18 December 1803)**

Johann Gottfried von Herder was a German philosopher, theologian, poet, and literary critic. He is associated with the periods of Enlightenment, Sturm und Drang, and Weimar Classicism.

Born in Mohrungen (today: Morag) in the Kingdom of Prussia, Herder grew up in a poor household, educating himself from his father's Bible and songbook. In 1762, an introspective youth of seventeen, he enrolled at the local University of Königsberg, where he became a student of Immanuel Kant. At the same time, Herder became an intellectual protégé of Johann Georg Hamann, a patriotic Francophobe and intensely subjective thinker who disputed the claims of pure secular reason. His choice of Hamann over such luminaries as Immanuel Kant was significant, as this odd figure, a needy hypochondriac, delved back into the German mysticism of Jacob Böhme and others, pronouncing obscure and oracular dicta that brought him fame as the "Magus of the North". Hamann's disjointed effusions generally carried subtitles such as Hierophantic Letters or A Rhapsody in Cabbalistic Prose.
Hamann's influence led Herder to confess to his wife later in life that "I have too little reason and too much idiosyncrasy", yet Herder can justly claim to have founded a new school of German political thought. Although himself an unsociable person, Herder influenced his contemporaries greatly. One friend wrote to him in 1785, hailing his works as "inspired by God." A varied field of theorists were later to find inspiration in Herder's tantalisingly incomplete ideas.

In 1764, now a clergyman, Herder went to Riga to teach. It was during this period that he produced his first major works, which were literary criticism. In 1769 Herder travelled by ship to the French port of Nantes and continued on to Paris. This resulted in both an account of his travels as well as a shift of his own self-conception as an author.

By 1770 Herder went to Strasbourg, where he met the young Goethe. This event proved to be a key juncture in the history of German literature, as Goethe was inspired by Herder's literary criticism to develop his own style. This can be seen as the beginning of the "Sturm und Drang" movement. In 1771 Herder took a position as head pastor and court preacher at Bückeburg under Count Wilhelm von Schaumburg-Lippe.

By the mid-1770s, Goethe was a well-known author, and used his influence at the court of Weimar to secure Herder a position as General Superintendent. Herder moved there in 1776, where his outlook shifted again towards classicism.

Towards the end of his career, Herder endorsed the French Revolution, which earned him the enmity of many of his colleagues. At the same time, he and Goethe experienced a personal split. Herder was ennobled by the Elector-Prince of Bavaria late in life, which added the prefix "von" to his last name. He died in Weimar in 1803.

Works and ideas

In 1772 Herder published Treatise on the Origin of Language and went further in this promotion of language than his earlier injunction to "spew out the ugly slime of the Seine. Speak German, O You German". Herder now had established the foundations of comparative philology within the new currents of political outlook.

Throughout this period, he continued to elaborate his own unique theory of aesthetics in works such as the above, while Goethe produced works like The Sorrows of Young Werther – the Sturm und Drang movement was born.

Herder wrote an important essay on Shakespeare and Auszug aus einem Briefwechsel über Ossian und die Lieder alter Völker (Extract from a correspondence about Ossian and the Songs of Ancient Peoples) published in 1773 in a manifesto along with contributions by Goethe and Justus Möser. Herder wrote that "A poet is the creator of the nation around him; he gives them a world to see and has their souls in his hand to lead them to that world." To him such poetry had its greatest purity and power in nations before they became civilised, as shown in the Old Testament, the Edda, and Homer, and he tried to find such virtues in ancient German folk songs and Norse poetry and mythology.
After becoming General Superintendent in 1776, Herder’s philosophy shifted again towards classicism. Herder was at his best during this period, and produced works such as his unfinished Outline of a Philosophical History of Humanity which largely originated the school of historical thought. Herder’s philosophy was of a deeply subjective turn, stressing influence by physical and historical circumstance upon human development, stressing that "one must go into the age, into the region, into the whole history, and feel one’s way into everything". The historian should be the "regenerated contemporary" of the past, and history a science as "instrument of the most genuine patriotic spirit".

Herder gave Germans new pride in their origins, modifying that dominance of regard allotted to Greek art (Greek revival) extolled among others by Johann and Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. He remarked that he would have wished to be born in the Middle Ages and mused whether "the times of the Swabian emperors" did not "deserve to be set forth in their true light in accordance with the German mode of thought?" Herder equated the German with the Gothic and favoured Dürer and everything Gothic. As with the sphere of art, equally he proclaimed a national message within the sphere of language. He topped the line of German authors emanating from Martin Opitz, who had written his Aristarchus, sive de contemptu linguae Teutonicæ in Latin in 1617, urging Germans to glory in their hitherto despised language. Herder's extensive collections of folk-poetry began a great craze in Germany for that neglected topic.

Along with Wilhelm von Humboldt, Herder was one of the first to argue that language determines thought, a theme that two centuries later would be central to the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis. Herder's focus upon language and cultural traditions as the ties that create a "nation" extended to include folklore, dance, music and art, and inspired Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm in their collection of German folk tales.

Herder attached exceptional importance to the concept of nationality and of patriotism – "he that has lost his patriotic spirit has lost himself and the whole worlds about himself", whilst teaching that "in a certain sense every human perfection is national". Herder carried folk theory to an extreme by maintaining that "there is only one class in the state, the Volk, (not the rabble), and the king belongs to this class as well as the peasant". Explanation that the Volk was not the rabble was a novel conception in this era, and with Herder can be seen the emergence of "the people" as the basis for the emergence of a classless but hierarchical national body.

The nation, however, was individual and separate, distinguished, to Herder, by climate, education, foreign intercourse, tradition and heredity. Providence he praised for having "wonderfully separated nationalities not only by woods and mountains, seas and deserts, rivers and climates, but more particularly by languages, inclinations and characters". Herder praised the tribal outlook writing that "the savage who loves himself, his wife and child with quiet joy and glows with limited activity of his tribe as for his own life is in my opinion a more real being than that cultivated shadow who is
enraptured with the shadow of the whole species", isolated since "each nationality
contains its centre of happiness within itself, as a bullet the centre of gravity". With no
need for comparison since "every nation bears in itself the standard of its perfection,
totally independent of all comparison with that of others" for "do not nationalities differ
in everything, in poetry, in appearance, in tastes, in usages, customs and languages?
Must not religion which partakes of these also differ among the nationalities?"

He also predicted that Slavic nations would one day be the real power in Europe,
as the western Europeans would reject Christianity, and thus rot away, and saying that
the eastern European nations would stick to their religion and their idealism; and would
this way become the power in Europe. One of his related predictions was that the
Hungarian nation would disappear and become assimilated by surrounding Slavic
peoples; this prophecy caused considerable uproar in Hungary and is widely cited to
this day.

**Germany and the Enlightenment**

This question was further developed by Herder’s lament that Martin Luther did
not establish a national church, and his doubt whether Germany did not buy
Christianity at too high a price, that of true nationality. Herder’s patriotism bordered at
times upon national pantheism, demanding of territorial unity as "He is deserving of
glory and gratitude who seeks to promote the unity of the territories of Germany
through writings, manufacture, and institutions".

In his *Ideas upon Philosophy and the History of Mankind* he even wrote, "Compare
England with Germany: the English are Germans, and even in the latest times the
Germans have led the way for the English in the greatest things."

Herder, who hated absolutism and Prussian nationalism, but who was imbued
with the spirit of the whole German Volk, yet as historical theorist turned away from the
light of the eighteenth century. Seeking to reconcile his thought with this earlier age,
Herder sought to harmonize his conception of sentiment with reason, whereby all
knowledge is implicit in the soul; the most elementary stage is sensuous and intuitive
perception which by development can become self-conscious and rational. To Herder,
this development is the harmonizing of primitive and derivative truth, of experience and
intelligence, feeling and reason.

Herder is the first in a long line of Germans preoccupied with this harmony. This
search is itself the key to much in German theory. And Herder was too penetrating a
thinker not to understand and fear the extremes to which his folk-theory could tend,
and so issued specific warnings. Herder’s attitude toward Jews is complex. He argued
that Jews in Germany should enjoy the full rights and obligations of Germans, and that
the non-Jews of the world owed a debt to Jews for centuries of abuse, and that this debt
could be discharged only by actively assisting those Jews who wished to do so to regain
political sovereignty in their ancient homeland of Israel. Herder refused to adhere to a
rigid racial theory, writing that "notwithstanding the varieties of the human form, there
is but one and the same species of man throughout the whole earth".
He also announced that "national glory is a deceiving seducer. When it reaches a certain height, it clasps the head with an iron band. The enclosed sees nothing in the mist but his own picture; he is susceptible to no foreign impressions."

The passage of time was to demonstrate that while many Germans were to find influence in Herder's convictions and influence, fewer were to note his qualifying stipulations.

Herder had emphasised that his conception of the nation encouraged democracy and the free self-expression of a people's identity. He proclaimed support for the French Revolution, a position which did not endear him to royalty. He also differed with Kant's philosophy and turned away from the Sturm und Drang movement to go back to the poems of Shakespeare and Homer.

To promote his concept of the Volk, he published letters and collected folk songs. These latter were published in 1773 as Voices of the Peoples in Their Songs. The poets Achim von Arnim and Clemens von Brentano later used Stimmen der Völker as samples for The Boy's Magic Horn (Des Knaben Wunderhorn).

Herder also fostered the ideal of a person's individuality. Although he had from an early period championed the individuality of cultures - for example, in his This Too a Philosophy of History for the Formation of Humanity (1774), he also championed the individuality of persons within a culture; for example, in his On Thomas Abbt's Writings (1768) and On the Cognition and Sensation of the Human Soul (1778).

In On Thomas Abbt's Writings, Herder stated that "a human soul is an individual in the realm of minds: it senses in accordance with an individual formation, and thinks in accordance with the strength of its mental organs. . . My long allegory has succeeded if it achieves the representation of the mind of a human being as an individual phenomenon, as a rarity which deserves to occupy our eyes."

**Edward Gibbon (8 May 1737– 16 January 1794)**

Edward Gibbon was an English historian and Member of Parliament. His most important work, The, was published in six volumes between 1776 and 1788. The Decline and Fall is known for the quality and irony of its prose, its use of primary sources, and its open criticism of organised religion.

Edward Gibbon was born in 1737, the son of Edward and Judith Gibbon at Lime Grove, in the town of Putney, Surrey. He had six siblings: five brothers and one sister, all of whom died in infancy. His grandfather, also named Edward, had lost all of his assets as a result of the South Sea Bubble stock market collapse in 1720, but eventually regained much of his wealth, so that Gibbon's father was able to inherit a substantial estate.
As a youth, Gibbon’s health was under constant threat. He described himself as "a puny child, neglected by my Mother, starved by my nurse”. At age nine, he was sent to Dr. Woddeson’s school at Kingston upon Thames (now Kingston Grammar School), shortly after which his mother died. He then took up residence in the Westminster School boarding house, owned by his adored "Aunt Kitty”, Catherine Porten. Soon after she died in 1786, he remembered her as rescuing him from his mother's disdain and imparting "the first rudiments of knowledge, the first exercise of reason, and a taste for books which is still the pleasure and glory of my life”. By 1751, Gibbon’s reading was already extensive and certainly pointed toward his future pursuits: Laurence Echard’s Roman History (1713), William Howel[l]’s An Institution of General History (1680–85), and several of the 65 volumes of the acclaimed Universal History from the Earliest Account of Time (1747–1768).

Following a stay at Bath in 1752 to improve his health, at the age of 15 Gibbon was sent by his father to Magdalen College, Oxford, where he was enrolled as a gentleman-commoner. He was ill-suited, however, to the college atmosphere and later rued his 14 months there as the "most idle and unprofitable" of his life. Because he himself says so in his autobiography, it used to be thought that his penchant for "theological controversy" (his aunt’s influence) fully bloomed when he came under the spell of the deist or rationalist theologian Conyers Middleton (1683–1750), the author of Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers (1749). In that tract, Middleton denied the validity of such powers; Gibbon promptly objected, or so the argument used to run. The product of that disagreement, with some assistance from the work of Catholic Bishop Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627–1704), and that of the Elizabethan Jesuit Robert Parsons (1546–1610), yielded the most memorable event of his time at Oxford: his conversion to Roman Catholicism on 8 June 1753. He was further "corrupted" by the ‘free thinking' deism of the playwright/poet couple David and Lucy Mallet; and finally Gibbon's father, already "in despair,” had had enough. David Womersley has shown, however, that Gibbon’s claim to having been converted by a reading of Middleton is very unlikely, and was introduced only into the final draft of the "Memoirs" in 1792–93. Bowersock suggests that Gibbon fabricated the Middleton story retrospectively in his anxiety about the impact of the French Revolution and Edmund Burke’s claim that it was provoked by the French philosophes, so influential on Gibbon.

Within weeks of his conversion, the youngster was removed from Oxford and sent to live under the care and tutelage of Daniel Pavillard, Reformed pastor of Lausanne, Switzerland. It was here that he made one of his life’s two great friendships, that of Jacques Georges Deyverdun (the French language translator of Goethe’s The Sorrows of Young Werther); the other being John Baker Holroyd (later Lord Sheffield). Just a year and a half later, after his father threatened to disinherit him, on Christmas Day, 1754, he reconverted to Protestantism. "The various articles of the Romish creed," he wrote, "disappeared like a dream". He remained in Lausanne for five intellectually productive years, a period that greatly enriched Gibbon’s already immense aptitude for scholarship and erudition: he read Latin literature; travelled throughout Switzerland studying its cantons’ constitutions; and aggressively mined the works of Hugo Grotius, Samuel von Pufendorf, John Locke, Pierre Bayle, and Blaise Pascal.
**Thwarted romance**

He also met the one romance in his life: the daughter of the pastor of Crissy, a young woman named Suzanne Curchod, who would later become the wife of Louis XVI's finance minister Jacques Necker, and the mother of Madame de Staël. The two developed a warm affinity; Gibbon proceeded to propose marriage, but ultimately wedlock was out of the question, blocked both by his father's staunch disapproval and Curchod's equally staunch reluctance to leave Switzerland. Gibbon returned to England in August 1758 to face his father. There could be no refusal of the elder's wishes. Gibbon put it this way: "I sighed as a lover, I obeyed as a son." He proceeded to cut off all contact with Curchod, even as she vowed to wait for him. Their final emotional break apparently came at Ferney, France in the spring of 1764, though they did see each other at least one more time a year later.

**First fame and the grand tour: 1758–1765**

Upon his return to England, Gibbon published his first book, *Essai sur l'Étude de la Littérature* in 1761, which produced an initial taste of celebrity and distinguished him, in Paris at least, as a man of letters. From 1759 to 1770, Gibbon served on active duty and in reserve with the South Hampshire militia, his deactivation in December 1762 coinciding with the militia's dispersal at the end of the Seven Years’ War. The following year he embarked on the Grand Tour (of continental Europe), which included a visit to Rome.

**The History of the Decline and fall of the Roman Empire: 1776–1788**

Gibbon returned to England in June 1765. His father died in 1770, and after tending to the estate, which was by no means in good condition, there remained quite enough for Gibbon to settle fashionably in London at 7 Bentinck Street, independent of financial concerns. By February 1773, he was writing in earnest, but not without the occasional self-imposed distraction. He took to London society quite easily, joined the better social clubs, including Dr. Johnson's Literary Club, and looked in from time to time on his friend Holroyd in Sussex. He succeeded Oliver Goldsmith at the Royal Academy as 'professor in ancient history' (honorary but prestigious). In late 1774, he was initiated a freemason of the Premier Grand Lodge of England. And, perhaps least productively in that same year, he was returned to the House of Commons for Liskeard, Cornwall through the intervention of his relative and patron, Edward Eliot. He became the archetypal back-bencher, benignly "mute" and "indifferent," his support of the Whig ministry invariably automatic. Gibbon's indolence in that position, perhaps fully intentional, subtracted little from the progress of his writing.

After several rewrites, with Gibbon "often tempted to throw away the labours of seven years," the first volume of what would become his life's major achievement, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, was published on 17 February 1776. Through 1777, the reading public eagerly consumed three editions for which Gibbon was rewarded handsomely: two-thirds of the profits amounting to approximately £1,000. Biographer Leslie Stephen wrote that thereafter, "His fame was as rapid as it has been lasting." And as regards this first volume, "Some warm praise from Hume overpaid the labour of ten years."
Volumes II and III appeared on 1 March 1781, eventually rising "to a level with the previous volume in general esteem." Volume IV was finished in June 1784;[21] the final two were completed during a second Lausanne sojourn (September 1783 to August 1787) where Gibbon reunited with his friend Deyverdun in leisurely comfort. By early 1787, he was "straining for the goal" and with great relief the project was finished in June. Gibbon later wrote:

It was on the day, or rather the night, of 27 June 1787, between the hours of eleven and twelve, that I wrote the last lines of the last page in a summer-house in my garden. ... I will not dissemble the first emotions of joy on the recovery of my freedom, and perhaps the establishment of my fame. But my pride was soon humbled, and a sober melancholy was spread over my mind by the idea that I had taken my everlasting leave of an old and agreeable companion, and that, whatsoever might be the future date of my history; the life of the historian must be short and precarious.

Volumes IV, V, and VI finally reached the press in May 1788, publication having been delayed since March to coincide with a dinner party celebrating Gibbon's 51st birthday (the 8th).[23] Mounting a bandwagon of praise for the later volumes were such contemporary luminaries as Adam Smith, William Robertson, Adam Ferguson, Lord Camden, and Horace Walpole. Smith remarked that Gibbon's triumph had positioned him "at the very head of [Europe's] literary tribe."

Later years: 1789–1794

The years following Gibbon's completion of The History were filled largely with sorrow and increasing physical discomfort. He had returned to London in late 1787 to oversee the publication process alongside Lord Sheffield. With that accomplished, in 1789 it was back to Lausanne only to learn of and be "deeply affected" by the death of Deyverdun, who had willed Gibbon his home, La Grotte. He resided there with little commotion, took in the local society, received a visit from Sheffield in 1791, and "shared the common abhorrence" of the French Revolution.

In a letter to Lord Sheffield on 5 February 1791, Gibbon praised Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France: "Burke's book is a most admirable medicine against the French disease, which has made too much progress even in this happy country. I admire his eloquence, I approve his politics, I adore his chivalry, and I can even forgive his superstition...The French spread so many lies about the sentiments of the English nation, that I wish the most considerable men of all parties and descriptions would join in some public act declaring themselves satisfied with, and resolved to support, our present constitution".

In 1793, word came of Lady Sheffield's death; Gibbon immediately left Lausanne and set sail to comfort a grieving but composed Sheffield. His health began to fail critically in December, and at the turn of the New Year, he was on his last legs.
Gibbon is believed to have suffered from an extreme case of scrotal swelling, probably a hydrocele testis, a condition which causes the scrotum to swell with fluid in a compartment overlying either testicle. In an age when close-fitting clothes were fashionable, his condition led to a chronic and disfiguring inflammation that left Gibbon a lonely figure. As his condition worsened, he underwent numerous procedures to alleviate the condition, but with no enduring success. In early January, the last of a series of three operations caused an unremitting peritonitis to set in and spread, from which he died. The "English giant of the Enlightenment" finally succumbed at 12:45 pm, 16 January 1794 at age 56. He was buried in the Sheffield family graveyard at the parish church in Fletching, Sussex.

Legacy

Gibbon’s work has been criticised for its scathing view of Christianity as laid down in chapters XV and XVI, a situation which resulted in the banning of the book in several countries. Gibbon’s alleged crime was disrespecting, and none too lightly, the character of sacred Christian doctrine, by "treat[ing] the Christian church as a phenomenon of general history, not a special case admitting supernatural explanations and disallowing criticism of its adherents". More specifically, the chapters excoriated the church for "supplanting in an unnecessarily destructive way the great culture that preceded it" and for "the outrage of [practicing] religious intolerance and warfare". Gibbon, though assumed to be entirely anti-religion, was actually supportive to some extent, insofar as it did not obscure his true endeavour – a history that was not influenced and swayed by official church doctrine. Although the most famous two chapters are heavily ironical and cutting about religion, it is not utterly condemned, and its truth and rightness are upheld however thinly.

Gibbon, in letters to Holroyd and others, expected some type of church-inspired backlash, but the utter harshness of the ensuing torrents far exceeded anything he or his friends could possibly have anticipated. Contemporary detractors such as Joseph Priestley and Richard Watson stoked the nascent fire, but the most severe of these attacks was an "acrimonious" piece by the young cleric, Henry Edwards Davis. Gibbon subsequently published his *Vindication* in 1779, in which he categorically denied Davis’ "criminal accusations", branding him a purveyor of "servile plagiarism." Davis followed Gibbon’s *Vindication* with yet another reply (1779).

Gibbon is considered to be a son of the Enlightenment and this is reflected in his famous verdict on the history of the Middle Ages: "I have described the triumph of barbarism and religion." However, politically, he aligned himself with the conservative Edmund Burke’s rejection of the democratic movements of the time as well as with Burke’s dismissal of the “rights of man.”

Gibbon’s work has been praised for its style, his piquant epigrams and its effective irony. Winston Churchill memorably noted, "I set out upon...Gibbon’s *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* [and] was immediately dominated both by the story and the style. ...I devoured Gibbon. I rode triumphantly through it from end to end and
Churchill modelled much of his own literary style on Gibbon’s. Like Gibbon, he dedicated himself to producing a "vivid historical narrative, ranging widely over period and place and enriched by analysis and reflection."

Unusually for the 18th century, Gibbon was never content with second hand accounts when the primary sources were accessible (though most of these were drawn from well-known printed editions). "I have always endeavoured," he says, "to draw from the fountain-head; that my curiosity, as well as a sense of duty, has always urged me to study the originals; and that, if they have sometimes eluded my search, I have carefully marked the secondary evidence, on whose faith a passage or a fact were reduced to depend." In this insistence upon the importance of primary sources, Gibbon is considered by many to be one of the first modern historians:

In accuracy, thoroughness, lucidity, and comprehensive grasp of a vast subject, the ‘History’ is unsurpassable. It is the one English history which may be regarded as definitive. ...Whatever its shortcomings the book is artistically imposing as well as historically unimpeachable as a vast panorama of a great period.

The subject of Gibbon’s writing as well as his ideas and styles have influenced other writers. Besides his influence on Churchill, Gibbon was also a model for Isaac Asimov in his writing of The Foundation Trilogy, which he said involved "a little bit of cribbin’ from the works of Edward Gibbon”.

Evelyn Waugh admired Gibbon’s style but not his secular viewpoint. In Waugh’s 1950 novel Helena, the early Christian author Lactantius worried about the possibility of "a false historian, with the mind of Cicero or Tacitus and the soul of an animal,' and he nodded towards the gibbon who fretted his golden chain and chattered for fruit."

J. C. Stobart, author of The Grandeur that was Rome (1911), wrote of Gibbon that "The mere notion of empire continuing to decline and fall for five centuries is ridiculous...this is one of the cases which prove that History is made not so much by heroes or natural forces as by historians."

**Thomas Carlyle (4 December 1795 – 5 February 1881)**

Thomas Carlyle was a Scottish philosopher, satirical writer, essayist, historian and teacher during the Victorian era. He called economics “the dismal science”, wrote articles for the Edinburgh Encyclopaedia, and became a controversial social commentator.

Coming from a strict Calvinist family, Carlyle was expected to become a preacher by his parents, but while at the University of Edinburgh he lost his Christian faith. Calvinist values, however, remained with him throughout his life. His combination of a religious temperament with loss of faith in traditional Christianity, made Carlyle’s work appealing to many Victorians who were grappling with scientific and political changes that threatened the traditional social order. He brought a trenchant style to his social and political criticism and a complex literary style to works such as The French Revolution: A History (1837). Dickens used Carlyle’s work as a primary source for the events of the French Revolution in his novel A Tale of Two Cities.
Early life and influences

Carlyle was born in Ecclefechan in Dumfriesshire. His parents determinedly afforded him an education at Annan Academy, Annan, where he was bullied and tormented so much that he left after three years. His father was a member of the Burgher secession church. In early life, his family's (and his nation's) strong Calvinist beliefs powerfully influenced the young man.

After attending the University of Edinburgh, Carlyle became a mathematics teacher, first in Annan and then in Kirkcaldy, where Carlyle became close friends with the mystic Edward Irving. (Confusingly, there is another Scottish Thomas Carlyle, born a few years later and also connected to Irving, through his work with the Catholic Apostolic Church.

In 1819–1821, Carlyle returned to the University of Edinburgh, where he suffered an intense crisis of faith and conversion that would provide the material for Sartor Resartus ("The Tailor Retailored"), which first brought him to the public's notice.

Carlyle developed a painful stomach ailment, possibly gastric ulcers, that remained throughout his life and contributed to his reputation as a crotchety, argumentative, and somewhat disagreeable personality. His prose style, famously cranky and occasionally savage, helped cement a reputation of irascibility. He began reading deeply in German literature. Carlyle’s thinking was heavily influenced by German Idealism, in particular the work of Johann Gottlieb Fichte. He established himself as an expert on German literature in a series of essays for Fraser’s Magazine, and by translating German writers, notably Goethe (the novel Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre). He also wrote Life of Schiller (1825).

In 1826, Thomas Carlyle married Jane Baillie Welsh, herself a writer, whom he had met in 1821, during his period of German studies. In 1827, he applied for the Chair of Moral Philosophy at St Andrews University but was not appointed. His home in residence for much of his early life, after 1828, was a farm in Craigenputtock, a house in Dumfriesshire, Scotland where he wrote many of his works.[1] He often wrote about his life at Craigenputtock, "It is certain that for living and thinking in I have never since found in the world a place so favourable.... How blessed, might poor mortals be in the straightest circumstances if their wisdom and fidelity to heaven and to one another were adequately great!”. At the Craigenputtock farm, Carlyle also wrote some of his most distinguished essays, and he began a lifelong friendship with the American essayist Ralph Waldo Emerson.

In 1831, the Carlyles moved to London, settling initially in lodgings at 4 (now 33) Ampton Street, Kings Cross. In 1834, they moved to 5 (now 24) Cheyne Row, Chelsea where they remained until Carlyle's death: the house is now preserved as a museum to his memory. He became known as the "Sage of Chelsea", and a member of a literary circle which included the essayists Leigh Hunt and John Stuart Mill.
In London, Carlyle wrote *The French Revolution: A History* (3 volumes, 1837), as a historical study concerning oppression of the poor, which was immediately successful. That was the start of many other writings in London.

**Early writings**

By 1821, Carlyle abandoned the clergy as a career and focused on making a life as a writer. His first attempt at fiction was "Cruthers and Jonson", one of several abortive attempts at writing a novel. Following his work on a translation of Goethe’s *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, he came to distrust the form of the realistic novel and so worked on developing a new form of fiction. In addition to his essays on German literature, he branched out into wider ranging commentary on modern culture in his influential essays *Signs of the Times* and *Characteristics*.

**Sartor Resartus**

His first major work, *Sartor Resartus* ("The Tailor Retailored") was begun in 1831 at his home (provided for him by his wife Jane Welsh, from her estate), Craigenputtock, and was intended to be a new kind of book: simultaneously factual and fictional, serious and satirical, speculative and historical. It ironically commented on its own formal structure, while forcing the reader to confront the problem of where ‘truth’ is to be found. *Sartor Resartus* was first serialized in *Fraser's Magazine* from 1833 to 1834. The text presents itself as an unnamed editor’s attempt to introduce the British public to Diogenes Teufelsdröckh, a German philosopher of clothes, who is in fact a fictional creation of Carlyle’s. The Editor is struck with admiration, but for the most part is confounded by Teufelsdröckh’s outlandish philosophy, of which the Editor translates choice selections. To try to make sense of Teufelsdröckh’s philosophy, the Editor tries to piece together a biography, but with limited success. Underneath the German philosopher’s seemingly ridiculous statements, there are mordant attacks on Utilitarianism and the commercialization of British society. The fragmentary biography of Teufelsdröckh that the Editor recovers from a chaotic mass of documents reveals the philosopher's spiritual journey. He develops contempt for the corrupt condition of modern life. He contemplates the "Everlasting No" of refusal, comes to the "Centre of Indifference", and eventually embraces the "Everlasting Yea". This voyage from denial to disengagement to volition would later be described as part of the existentialist awakening.

Given the enigmatic nature of *Sartor Resartus*, it is not surprising that it first achieved little success. Its popularity developed over the next few years, and it was published in book form in Boston 1836, with a preface by Ralph Waldo Emerson, influencing the development of New England Transcendentalism. The first English edition followed in 1838.
The Everlasting Yea and No

The Everlasting Yea is Carlyle’s name in the book for the spirit of faith in God in an express attitude of clear, resolute, steady, and uncompromising antagonism to the Everlasting No, and the principle that there is no such thing as faith in God except in such antagonism against the spirit opposed to God.

The Everlasting No is Carlyle’s name for the spirit of unbelief in God, especially as it manifested itself in his own, or rather Teufelsdröckh’s, warfare against it; the spirit, which, as embodied in the Mephistopheles of Goethe, is forever denying – der stets verneint – the reality of the divine in the thoughts, the character, and the life of humanity, and has a malicious pleasure in scoffing at everything high and noble as hollow and void.

In Sartor Resartus, the narrator moves from the "Everlasting No" to the "Everlasting Yea," but only through "The Centre of Indifference," a position of agnosticism and detachment. Only after reducing desires and certainty, aiming at a Buddha-like "indifference", can the narrator realize affirmation. In some ways, this is similar to the contemporary philosopher Søren Kierkegaard’s "leap of faith" in concluding Unscientific Postscript.

Worship of Silence and Sorrow

Based on Goethe’s is having described Christianity as the "Worship of Sorrow", and "our highest religion, for the Son of Man", Carlyle adds, interpreting this, "there is no noble crown, well worn or even ill worn, but is a crown of thorns".

The "Worship of Silence" is Carlyle’s name for the sacred respect for restraint in speech till "thought has silently matured itself, ...to hold one’s tongue till some meaning lie behind to set it wagging," a doctrine which many misunderstand, almost wilfully, it would seem; silence being to him the very womb out of which all great things are born.

The French Revolution

In 1834, Carlyle moved to London from Craigenputtock and began to move among celebrated company. Within the United Kingdom, Carlyle’s success was assured by the publication of his three-volume work The French Revolution: A History in 1837. After the completed manuscript of the first volume was accidentally burned by the philosopher John Stuart Mill’s maid, Carlyle wrote the second and third volumes before rewriting the first from scratch.

The resulting work had a passion new to historical writing. In a politically charged Europe, filled with fears and hopes of revolution, Carlyle’s account of the motivations and urges that inspired the events in France seemed powerfully relevant. Carlyle’s style of historical writing stressed the immediacy of action – often using the present tense.
For Carlyle, chaotic events demanded what he called 'heroes' to take control over the competing forces erupting within society. While not denying the importance of economic and practical explanations for events, he saw these forces as 'spiritual' – the hopes and aspirations of people that took the form of ideas, and were often ossified into ideologies ('formulas' or "isms", as he called them). In Carlyle's view, only dynamic individuals could master events and direct these spiritual energies effectively: as soon as ideological 'formulas' replaced heroic human action, society became dehumanised.

Charles Dickens used Carlyle's work as a primary source for the events of the French Revolution in his novel *A Tale of Two Cities*.

**Heroes and Hero Worship**

These ideas were influential on the development of Socialism, but – like the opinions of many deep thinkers of the time – are also considered to have influenced the rise of Fascism. Carlyle moved towards his later thinking during the 1840s, leading to a break with many old friends and allies, such as Mill and, to a lesser extent, Emerson. His belief in the importance of heroic leadership found form in his book *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*, in which he compared a wide range of different types of heroes, including Odin, Oliver Cromwell, Napoleon, William, Dante, Samuel Johnson, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Robert Burns, John Knox, Martin Luther and the Prophet Muhammad. These lectures of Carlyle's are regarded as an early and powerful formulation of the Great Man theory.

The book was based on a course of lectures he had given. *The French Revolution* had brought Carlyle fame, but little money. His friends worked to set him on his feet by organizing courses of public lectures for him, drumming up an audience and selling guinea tickets. Carlyle did not like lecturing, but found that he could do it, and more importantly that it brought in some much-needed money. Between 1837 and 1840, Carlyle delivered four such courses of lectures. The final course was on "Heroes." From the notes he had prepared for this course, he wrote out his book, reproducing the curious effects of the spoken discourses.

Carlyle was one of the very few philosophers who witnessed the industrial revolution but still kept a transcendental non-materialistic view of the world. The book included people ranging from the field of Religion through to literature and politics. He included people as coordinates and accorded Muhammad a special place in the book under the chapter title "Hero as a Prophet". In his work, Carlyle declared his admiration with a passionate championship of Muhammad as a Hegelian agent of reform, insisting on his sincerity and commenting 'how one man single-handedly, could weld warring tribes and wandering Bedouins into a most powerful and civilized nation in less than two decades.' For Carlyle, the hero was somewhat similar to Aristotle’s "Magnanimous" man – a person who flourished in the fullest sense. However, for Carlyle, unlike Aristotle, the world was filled with contradictions with which the hero had to deal. All heroes will be flawed. Their heroism lay in their creative energy in the face of these difficulties, not in their moral perfection. To sneer at such a person for their failings is the philosophy of those who seek comfort in the conventional. Carlyle called this 'valetism', from the expression 'no man is a hero to his valet.'
Later work

All these books were influential in their day, especially on writers such as Charles Dickens and John Ruskin. However, after the Revolutions of 1848 and political agitations in the United Kingdom, Carlyle published a collection of essays entitled "Latter-Day Pamphlets" (1850) in which he attacked democracy as an absurd social ideal, while equally condemning hereditary aristocratic leadership. Two of these essays, No. I: "The Present Times" and No. II: "Model Prisons" were reviewed by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in April 1850. Carlyle criticized hereditary aristocratic leadership as "deadening," however, he criticized democracy as nonsensical: as though objective truth could be discovered by weighing up the votes for it. Government should come from those most able to lead. But how such leaders were to be found, and how to follow their lead, was something Carlyle could not (or would not) clearly say. Marx and Engels agreed with Carlyle as far as his criticism of the hereditary aristocracy. However they criticized Carlyle's plan to use democracy to find the "Noblest" and the other "Nobles" that are to form the government by the "ablest" persons.

In later writings, Carlyle sought to examine instances of heroic leadership in history. The Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (1845) presented a positive image of Cromwell: someone who attempted to weld order from the conflicting forces of reform in his own day. Carlyle sought to make Cromwell's words live in their own terms by quoting him directly, and then commenting on the significance of these words in the troubled context of the time. Again this was intended to make the 'past' 'present' to his readers.

His essay "Occasional Discourse on the Negro Question" (1849) suggested that slavery should never have been abolished, or else replaced with serfdom. It had kept order, he argued, and forced work from people who would otherwise have been lazy and feckless. This – and Carlyle's support for the repressive measures of Governor Edward Eyre in Jamaica – further alienated him from his old liberal allies. Eyre had been accused of brutalynchings while suppressing a rebellion. Carlyle set up a committee to defend Eyre, while Mill organised for his prosecution. Similar hard-line views were expressed in Shooting Niagara, and after?, written after the passing of the Electoral Reform Act of 1867 in which he "reaffirmed his belief in wise leadership (and wise followership), his disbelief in democracy and his hatred of all workmanship - from brick making to diplomacy - that was not genuine".

Frederick the Great

His last major work was the epic life of Frederick the Great (1858–1865). In this Carlyle tried to show how a heroic leader can forge a state, and help create a new moral culture for a nation. For Carlyle, Frederick epitomized the transition from the liberal Enlightenment ideals of the eighteenth century to a new modern culture of spiritual dynamism: embodied by Germany, its thought and its polity. The book is most famous for its vivid, arguably very biased, portrayal of Frederick's battles, in which Carlyle communicated his vision of almost overwhelming chaos mastered by leadership of genius.
Carlyle called the work his "Thirteen Years War" with Frederick. In 1852, he made his first trip to Germany to gather material, visiting the scenes of Frederick's battles and noting their topography. He made another trip to Germany to study battlefields in 1858. The work comprised six volumes; the first two volumes appeared in 1858, the third in 1862, the fourth in 1864 and the last two in 1865. Emerson considered it “Infinitely the Wittiest book that was ever written.” Lowell pointed out some faults, but wrote: “The figures of most historians seem like dolls stuffed with bran, whose whole substance runs out through any hole that criticism may tear in them; but Carlyle's are so real in comparison, that, if you prick them, they bleed.” The work was studied as a textbook in the military academies of Germany.

**Last Works**

Later writings were generally short essays, notably *The Early Kings of Norway: Also an Essay on the Portraits of John Knox* appeared in 1875, a series on early-medieval Norwegian warlords and an essay attempting to prove that the best-known portrait of John Knox did not depict the Scottish prelate. This was linked to Carlyle’s long interest in historical portraiture, which had earlier fuelled his project to found a gallery of national portraits, fulfilled by the creation of the National Portrait Gallery, London and the Scottish National Portrait Gallery.

Essentially a Romantic, Carlyle attempted to reconcile Romantic affirmations of feeling and freedom with respect for historical and political fact. Many believe that he was always more attracted to the idea of heroic struggle itself, than to any specific goal for which the struggle was being made. However, Carlyle’s belief in the continued use to humanity of the Hero, or Great Man, is stated succinctly at the end of his essay on Mohammed (in *On Heroes, Hero Worship & the Heroic in History*), in which he concludes that: “the Great Man was always as lightning out of Heaven; the rest of men waited for him like fuel, and then they too would flame.”
UNIT-III

MATERIALISTIC INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY

Marx’s theory, which he called "historical materialism" or the "materialist conception of history", is based on Hegel’s claim that history occurs through a dialectic, or clash, of opposing forces. Hegel was a philosophical idealist who believed that we live in a world of appearances, and true reality is an ideal. Marx accepted this notion of the dialectic, but rejected Hegel's idealism because he did not accept that the material world hides from us the "real" world of the ideal; on the contrary, he thought that historically and socially specific ideologies prevented people from seeing the material conditions of their lives clearly.

Marx’s analysis of history is based on his distinction between the means of production, literally those things, like land and natural resources, and technology, that are necessary for the production of material goods, and the social relations of production, in other words, the social relationships people enter into as they acquire and use the means of production. Together these comprise the mode of production; Marx observed that within any given society the mode of production changes, and that European society had progressed from a feudal mode of production to a capitalist mode of production.

The capitalist mode of production is capable of tremendous growth because the capitalist can, and has an incentive to, reinvest profits in new technologies. Marx considered the capitalist class to be the most revolutionary in history, because it constantly revolutionized the means of production. In general, Marx believed that the means of production change more rapidly than the relations of production. For Marx this mismatch between base and superstructure is a major source of social disruption and conflict. The history of the means of production, then, is the substructure of history, and everything else, including ideological arguments about that history, constitutes a superstructure.

Under capitalism people sell their labor-power when they accept compensation in return for whatever work they do in a given period of time (in other words, they are not selling the product of their labor, but their capacity to work). In return for selling their labor power they receive money, which allows them to survive. Those who must sell their labor power to live are "proletarians." The person who buys the labor power, generally someone who does own the land and technology to produce, is a "capitalist" or "bourgeois."

Marx, however, believed that capitalism was prone to periodic crises. He suggested that over time, capitalists would invest more and more in new technologies, and less and less in labor. Since Marx believed that surplus value appropriated from labor is the source of profits, he concluded that the rate of profit would fall even as the economy grew. When the rate of profit falls below a certain point, the result would be a recession or depression in which certain sectors of the economy would collapse. Marx understood that during such a crisis the price of labor would also fall, and eventually make possible the investment in new technologies and the growth of new sectors of the economy.
Marx believed that this cycle of growth, collapse, and growth would be punctuated by increasingly severe crises. Moreover, he believed that the long-term consequence of this process was necessarily the empowerment of the capitalist class and the impoverishment of the proletariat. He believed that were the proletariat to seize the means of production, they would encourage social relations that would benefit everyone equally, and a system of production less vulnerable to periodic crises. In general, Marx thought that peaceful negotiation of this problem was impracticable, and that a massive, well-organized and violent revolution was required. Finally, he theorized that to maintain the socialist system, a proletarian dictatorship must be established and maintained.

Marx held that Socialism itself was an "historical inevitability" that would come about due to the more numerous "Proletarians" having an interest in "expropriating" the "bourgeois exploiters" who had themselves profited by expropriating the surplus value that had been attributable to the proletarians labor in order to establish a "more just" system where there would be greatly improved social relations.

**The Base and the Superstructure**

The base-superstructure model is a theoretical framework that charts the different parts of society, how the elements interact, and how they form a coherent social structure. It is a tool that has been used by Marxists to schematize the shape that society takes at a particular time (hence it is a *historical* model). It has two main elements: the base and the superstructure, both of which can be specified further into two levels.

The base is the economic foundation of society, what Marx describes as “the economic structure” determining “the material conditions of life”. Its first level consists of the *means of production*, i.e. the actual raw materials used (or available, or discovered at the time) in the production process (nature as resource, man as labour; this is the *what* of production) and the nature of the production process itself (i.e. if, e.g., it employs a subsistence method, such as in individual household production; an artisanal system, with individualized producers and no form imposed from the top; or an assembly-line factory system, as in current industrialized mass production; this can be referred to as *technology* in the broadest sense, that is, how the raw materials are converted into economic goods, i.e. the *how* of production. These means of production, according to Marx, are constrained by the historical context; they “depend first of all on the nature of the actual means of subsistence [men] find in existence and have to reproduce”.

This process of materially producing the conditions of existence is, as Marx phrases it, a “social production of [people’s] life,” i.e. in producing material goods for their economic subsistence, men are not Robinson Crusoe’s producing in isolation just for themselves—they necessarily relate to each other, i.e. “men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will”. These relations form the *relations of production*, the second level of the economic base. These are the
relationships that a worker forms with a co-worker, an employee with a boss, an employee with a customer, a worker from this part of the production process (e.g. the packing of cans with sardines) with another worker from that part (e.g. the printing of the corporate logo on the can), etc. Thus, Marx can say, referring to the economic base, that “this mode of production must not be considered simply as being the production of the physical existence of the individuals. Rather, it is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite mode of life on their part”. The economic base, in other words, conditions not only the actual goods produced and how they are produced, but the relations that people form themselves, which, moreover, does not merely refer to economic relations. The most important thing that the relation of production gets to determine is, of course, how its products (the fruits of production) are to be distributed to the people so related (i.e. in specific relations with each other, relations, most often, of exploitation, i.e. relations between the exploiter and the exploited).

Above the economic base (above its two levels) rises “a legal and political superstructure,” the first level of the superstructure. As delineated more specifically by Althusser, this is the political realm he calls the Repressive State Apparatus (RSA) (Gramsci calls this political society), which consists of the particular political system a society adopts, the form of government, the constitution, the laws, and government institutions (including the military).

Above the legal and political structure—simply put, the State—lie all other institutions, i.e. “social [. . .] and intellectual life process in general” that determines the consciousness of men. Here we find what Althusser calls the Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) (Gramsci calls this civil society). These include legal institutions other than the government (e.g. political parties, non-government organizations, etc.), religions, schools, the family, the media, culture—institutions surrounding men, propounding certain ideologies, influencing them how to think, i.e. shaping their consciousness. Thinking itself, the content of thought, and what we take to be true can be found on this level.

What Marx claims (and this is where his materialism becomes evident) is that “the production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness, is at first directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men, the language of real life. Conceiving, thinking, the mental intercourse of men, appears at this stage as the direct efflux of their material behaviour”. At yet another place, he says, “The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political, and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness”.

It would seem then that for Marx, ideology—how we think, what we take to be true—is determined by material things, our economic conditions; that our consciousness simply reflects material conditions that are already there. What we take to be true is already defined by pre-existing material, economic realities, which are simply transposed into the realm of ideas, into the ideology in our head, and it is that ideology that we take as truth.
Marx elaborates that “consciousness [itself] can never be anything else than conscious existence, and the existence of men is their actual [material, economic] life process”. Consciousness itself, ideas, notions of truth—ideology—is all about, has as its content the existence of men, which Marx seems to interpret is nothing other than their material, economic existence. Thought itself, in other words, consciousness, ideology, truth, is nothing but thought about the economic state of things.

Marx reiterates this when he says that “the social structure and the state are continually evolving out of the life-process of definite individuals, but of individuals, not as they may appear in their own or other people’s imagination, but as they really are, i.e. as they operate, produce materially, and hence as they work under definite material limits, presuppositions, and conditions independent of their will”. The shape of and any change in society, then, can be accounted for by the life of individuals—but their material life, their life as materially producing beings, not as abstract thinkers musing about the ideas in their head. Material and economic conditions determine what things look like in society, with a minimal and perhaps even impotent role for ideas and notions of truth.

This is reinforced by Marx’s description of the movement of the social structure, which describes how change comes about in society. Change in the social structure, according to Marx, happens when “at a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto”. This is to say that the conflict that causes societal change, the conflict that changes the shape of society, happens at the base, when economic forces (the means of production) conflict with how they are structured (the relations of production), when “these relations [of production] turn into [. . .] fetters” for the economic forces.

Moreover, “with the change of the economic foundations the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed”. The base then bears the superstructure. All movement originates at the base, which just happens to take the superstructure with it, thereby changing the face of society. Moreover, the movements of the base and the superstructure involve a delay as “no social order ever perishes before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed; and new, higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society itself”. It would seem, then, that Marx is a straightforward materialist, more specifically an economic determinist in the conviction that economics (more specifically: productive forces, i.e. the means of production, the bottom of the bottom level) determines all other aspects of life (including consciousness). (Hawkes, in Ideology, in an attempt to save Marx from economic determinism, blames Engels for this interpretation.)

The seeming reduction of the role of thought, of ideas, of notions of truth, is made worse by what comes to be known as the dominant ideology thesis, in which Marx is interpreted as suggesting that in a given society, there is only one ideology, i.e. one
consciousness, one collective notion of truth. Marx explains that “the class which [controls] the means of production [i.e. the economic base . . .] has control at the same time over the means of mental production [i.e. the superstructure], so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it”. This implies then that there is only one ideology in society: the ideology of the ruling class that dominates society.

Marx continues to explain that “the ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas; hence of the relationships which make the one class the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of its dominance”. The ideology in society then—the only ideology—is not even what can be considered as an accurate notion of truth. Rather, it is simply a way of viewing the state of things such that the rule of the dominant class, whose ideology it is, its hold on the economic mechanisms of a particular society (the factors of production, the structure of production, how things are distributed, who are compensated and with how much, etc.), is perpetuated. The ideology we get, then, our only notion of truth, is a skewed notion at best (or is perhaps un-skewed only for a certain group of people, members of the dominant class). Marx thereby concludes by saying that the dominant class “rule also as thinkers, as producers of ideas, and regulate the production and distribution of the ideas of their age: thus [the ideas of the ruling class] are the ruling ideas of the epoch”.

This dominant ideology thesis is considered a crude reading of Marx. While this reading has some validity, it does not capture the full complexity of Marx’s thought. Despite the crude materialism sometimes attributed to him, Marx himself, in certain places, intimates that he is not an economic determinist. In one of the places where he distinguishes the base from the superstructure, he says, “The material transformation of the economic conditions of production can be determined with the precision of natural science,” and this—with its characteristic precision—is separated from “the legal, political, religious, aesthetic, or philosophic—in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict [in the base] and fight it out”. Perhaps then the base serves as a lever, but by no means can it exactly approximate—since it is not precise—what the superstructure, ideology, is going to look like. In fact, that may be a site in which, coupled with the conflict in the base, men can, in Marx’s words, “fight it out,” to determine the shape society is going to take—which perhaps can affect the base itself.

This is the same question that 20th century Marxist intellectuals would confront, foremost of which are Gramsci and Althusser. Gramsci, reading Marx’s historical (rather than the theoretical) works, makes Marx’s model more dynamic through the concepts of ideologies and hegemony. Althusser, focusing on the State, posits ideology as material and subjectifying, thereby emphasizing the unity of both infrastructure and superstructure. Yet other possibilities are traced by the flat social formation and simultaneous historical moments.
Structuralism

Structuralism is an approach that grew to become one of the most widely used methods of analyzing language, culture, philosophy of mathematics, and society in the second half of the 20th century. 'Structuralism', however, does not refer to a clearly defined 'school' of authors, although the work of Ferdinand is generally considered a starting point. Structuralism is best seen as a general approach with many different variations. As with any cultural movement, the influences and developments are complex.

Put in general terms, structuralism seeks to explore the inter-relationships (the "structures") through which meaning is produced within a culture. A secondary use of structuralism has recently been seen in the philosophy of mathematics. According to structural theory, meaning within a culture is produced and reproduced through various practices, phenomena and activities which serve as systems of signification. A structuralist studies activities as diverse as food preparation and serving rituals, religious rites, games, literary and non-literary texts, and other forms of entertainment to discover the deep structures by which meaning is produced and reproduced within a culture. For example, an early and prominent practitioner of structuralism, anthropologist and ethnographer Claude Levi-Strauss, analyzed cultural phenomena including mythology, kinship, and food preparation.

When used to examine literature, a structuralist critic will examine the underlying relation of elements (the 'structure') in, say, a story, rather than focusing on its content. A basic example is the similarities between West Side Story and Romeo. Even though the two plays occur in different times and places, a structuralist would argue that they are the same story because they have a similar structure - in both cases, a girl and a boy fall in love (or, as we might say, are +LOVE) despite the fact that they belong to two groups that hate each other, a conflict that is resolved by their death. Consider now the story of two friendly families (+LOVE) that make an arranged marriage between their children despite the fact that they hate each other (-LOVE), and that the children resolve this conflict by committing suicide to escape the marriage. A structuralist would argue this second story is an 'inversion' of the first, because the relationship between the values of love and the two pairs of parties involved has been reversed. In sum, a structuralist would thus argue that the 'meaning' of a story lies in uncovering this structure rather than, say, discovering the intention of the author who wrote it.

Saussure's Course

Ferdinand de Saussure is generally seen as the originator of structuralism, specifically in his 1916 book Course in General Linguistics. Although Saussure was, like his contemporaries, interested in historical linguistics, in the Course he developed a more general theory of semiology. This approach focused on examining how the elements of language related to each other in the present ('synchronically' rather than 'diachronically'). He thus focused not on the use of language (parole, or talk) but the
underlying system of language (*langue*) of which any particular utterance was an expression. Finally, he argued that linguistic signs were composed of two parts, a 'signifier' (the sound pattern of a word, either in mental projection - as when we silently recite lines from a poem to ourselves - or in actual, physical realization as part of a speech act) and a 'signified' (the concept or meaning of the word). This was quite different from previous approaches to language which focused on the relationship between words and the things in the world they designated. By focusing on the internal constitution of signs rather than focusing on their relationship to objects in the world, Saussure made the anatomy and structure of language something that could be analyzed and studied.

**Structuralism in linguistics**

Saussure's *Course* influenced many linguists in the period between WWI and WWII. In America, for instance, Leonard Bloomfield developed his own version of structural linguistics, as did Louis Hjelmslev in Scandinavia. In France Antoine Meillet and Émile Benveniste would continue Saussure's program. Most importantly, however, members of the Prague School of linguistics such as Roman Jakobson and Nikolai Trubetzkoy conducted research that would be greatly influential.

The clearest and most important example of Prague School structuralism lies in phonemics. Rather than simply compile a list of which sounds occur in a language, the Prague School sought to examine how they were related. They determined that the inventory of sounds in a language could be analyzed in terms of a series of contrasts. Thus in English the words 'pat' and 'bat' are different because the /p/ and /b/ sounds contrast. The difference between them is that the vocal chords vibrate while saying a /b/ while they do not when saying a /p/. Thus in English there is a contrast between voiced and non-voiced consonants. Analyzing sounds in terms of contrastive features also opens up comparative scope - it makes clear, for instance, that the difficulty Japanese speakers have differentiating between /r/ and /l/ in English is due to the fact that these two sounds are not contrastive in Japanese. While this approach is now standard in linguistics, it was revolutionary at the time. Phonology would become the paradigmatic basis for structuralism in a number of different forms.

**Structuralism in anthropology**

Structural anthropology was first developed by the French anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss in the 1950s. Levi-Strauss applied Saussure's distinction between *langue* and *parole* in his search for the fundamental mental structures of the human mind, arguing that the structures that form the "deep grammar" of society originate in the mind and operate in us unconsciously. Another concept was borrowed from the Prague school of linguistics, where Roman Jacobson and others analysed sounds based on the presence or absence of certain features (such as voiceless vs. voiced). Levi-Strauss included this in his conceptualisation of the universal structures of the mind, which he held to operate based on pairs of binary oppositions such as hot-cold, male-female, culture-nature, cooked-raw, or marriageable vs. tabooed women. In
addition to these more linguistically-focused writings, Levi-Strauss was influenced in advances in information theory and mathematics. A third influence came from Marcel Mauss, who had written on gift exchange systems. Based on Mauss, for instance, Levi-Strauss argued that kinship systems are based on the exchange of women between groups (a position known as 'alliance theory') as opposed to the 'descent' based theory described by Pritchard and Meyer Fortes.

Levi-Strauss writing proved to be immensely popular in the 1960s and 1970s. In Britain authors such as Rodney Needham and Edmund Leach were highly influenced by structuralism. Authors such as Maurice Godelier and Emmanuel Terray combined Marxism with structural anthropology in France. In America, authors such as Marshall Sahlins and James build on structuralism to provide their own analysis of human society. Structural anthropology fell out of favour in the early 1980s due to a number of reasons. D'Andrade (1995) suggests that structuralism in anthropology was eventually abandoned because it made unverifiable assumptions about the universal structures of the human mind. Authors such as Eric Wolf argued that political economy and colonialism should be more at the forefront of anthropology. More generally, criticisms of structuralism by Pierre Bourdieu led to a concern with how cultural and social structures were changed by human agency and practice, a trend which Sherry Ortner has referred to as 'practice theory'.

**Structuralism in the Philosophy of Mathematics**

Structuralism in mathematics is the study of what structures say a mathematical object is, and how the ontology of these structures should be understood. This is a growing philosophy within mathematics that is not without its share of critics.

In 1965, Paul Benacerraf wrote a paper entitled: "What Numbers Could Not Be." This paper is a seminal paper on mathematical structuralism in an odd sort of way: it started the movement by the response it generated. Benacerraf addressed a notion in mathematics to treat mathematical statements at face value, in which case we are committed to a world of an abstract, eternal realm of mathematical objects. Benacerraf's dilemma is how we come to know these objects if we do not stand in causal relation to them. These objects are considered causally inert to the world. Another problem raised by Benacerraf is the multiple set theories that exist by which reduction of elementary number theory to sets is possible. Deciding which set theory is true has not been feasible. Benacerraf concluded in 1965 that numbers are not objects.

The answer to Benacerraf's negative claims is how structuralism became a viable philosophical program within mathematics. The structuralist responds to these negative claims that the essence of mathematical objects is relations that the objects bear with the structure. Structures are exemplified in abstract systems in terms of the relations that hold true for that system.
Structuralism after the War

After WWII, and particularly in the 1960s, Structuralism surged to prominence in France and it was structuralism's initial popularity in this country which led it to spread across the globe.

Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, existentialism such as that practiced by Jean-Paul Sartre was the dominant mood. Structuralism rejected existentialism's notion of radical human freedom and focused instead on the way that human behaviour is determined by cultural, social, and psychological structures. The most important initial work on this score was Claude's 1949 volume *Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Levi-Strauss had known Jacobson during their time together in New York during WWII and was influenced by both Jacobson’s structuralism as well as the American anthropological tradition. In Elementary Structures he examined kinship systems from a structural point of view and demonstrated how apparently different social organizations were in fact different permutations of a few basic kinship structures. In the late 1950s he published *Structural Anthropology*, a collection of essays outlining his program for structuralism.

By the early 1960s structuralism as a movement was coming into its own and some believed that it offered a single unified approach to human life that would embrace all disciplines. Roland Barthes and Jacques Derrida focused on how structuralism could be applied to literature. Jacques (and, in a different way, Jean Piaget) applied structuralism to the study of psychology, blending Freud and Saussure. Michel Foucault’s book *The Order of Things* examined the history of science to study how structures of epistemology, or epistemes shaped how people imagined knowledge and knowing (though Foucault would later explicitly deny affiliation with the structuralist movement). Louis Althusser combined Marxism and structuralism to create his own brand of social analysis. Other authors in France and abroad have since extended structural analysis to practically every discipline.

The definition of ‘structuralism’ also shifted as a result of its popularity. As its popularity as a movement waxed and waned, some authors considered themselves ‘structuralists’ only to later eschew the label. Additionally, the term has slightly different meanings in French and English. In the US, for instance, Derrida is considered the paradigm of post-structuralism while in France he is labelled a structuralist. Finally, some authors wrote in several different styles. Barthes, for instance, wrote some books which are clearly structuralist and others which are clearly not.

Reactions to structuralism

Today structuralism has been superseded by approaches such as post-structuralism and deconstruction. There are many reasons for this. Structuralism has often been criticized for being a historical and for favouring deterministic structural forces over the ability of individual people to act. As the political turbulence of the 1960s and 1970s (and particularly the student uprisings of May 1968) began affecting the academy, issues of power and political struggle moved to the centre of people's attention. In the 1980s, deconstruction and its emphasis on the fundamental ambiguity of language - rather than its crystalline logical structure - became popular. By the end of the century Structuralism was seen as a historically important school of thought, but it was the movements it spawned, rather than structuralism itself, which commanded attention.
Post-structuralism

Post-structuralism is a label formulated by American academics to denote the heterogeneous works of a series of mid-20th-century French and continental philosophers and critical theorists who came to international prominence in the 1960s and '70s. A major theme of post structuralism is instability in the human, due to the complexity of humans themselves and the impossibility of fully escaping structures in order to study them.

Post-structuralism is a response to structuralism. Structuralism is an intellectual movement developed in Europe from the early to mid-20th century. It argued that human culture may be understood by means of a structure—modelled on language (i.e., structural linguistics)—that differs from concrete reality and from abstract ideas—a "third order" that mediates between the two. Post-structuralist authors all present different critiques of structuralism, but common themes include the rejection of the self-sufficiency of the structures that structuralism posits and an interrogation of the binary oppositions that constitute those structures. Writers whose work is often characterised as post-structuralist include Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze, Judith Butler, Jacques Lacan, Jean Baudrillard, and Julia Kristeva, although many theorists who have been called "post-structuralist" have rejected the label.

The movement is closely related to postmodernism. As with structuralism, anti-humanism is often a central tenet. Existential phenomenology is a significant influence; Colin Davis has argued that post-structuralists might just as accurately be called "post-phenomenologists". Some commentators have criticized post structuralism for being radically relativistic or nihilistic; others have objected to its extremity and linguistic complexity. Others see it as a threat to traditional values or professional scholarly standards.

Claude Lévi-Strauss (November 28, 1908 - October 30, 2009)

Claude Lévi-Strauss was a French anthropologist who became one of the twentieth century’s greatest intellectuals by developing structural anthropology as a method of understanding human society and culture. He applied his method to numerous cultural systems, notably kinship structures and mythological patterns. A leading proponent of structuralism, Lévi-Strauss’ influence has been significant not only throughout the social sciences, but also in philosophy, comparative religion, and the study of literature. His life-long quest was to show us the deeper unity we share as human beings, in spite of so many outward differences.

Though thought of as French, Claude Lévi-Strauss was born in Bruxelles, Belgium as the son of an artist and a member of an intellectual, artistic family. When he was six years old, his family began to feel unsafe in the pre-World War II political and economic milieu and decided to move near Versailles in Paris, France to be with Claude’s grandparents.
His grandfather was a rabbi, and this provided the first context for his future work: Claude was an outsider looking in. He could not have been more alien to the French and Jewish cultures. Not only did he feel himself to be an outsider, the Jewish faith led him to be regarded by others as an outsider as well. This remained a theme in his work throughout his life.

He began his university studies in law and philosophy and was deeply interested in classic literature and music. However, he became bored with legal matters and studied psychoanalysis, geology, and political science with great interest. At that time in France, anthropology was not a separate discipline.

He graduated in philosophy from the Sorbonne in 1931, and married Dina Dreyfus in 1932. After a few years of teaching secondary school, in 1935 he took up a last-minute offer to be part of a French cultural mission to Brazil, in which he would serve as a visiting professor at the University of São Paulo until 1939. During this time, Lévi-Strauss became very interested in the social anthropology introduced by Marcel Mauss.

He returned to France in 1939 to join the French Army and take part in the war effort, but after French capitulation to the Germans, being a Jew, he fled Paris. After a series of attempts to obtain passage, Lévi-Strauss secured a series of voyages that eventually brought him to Puerto Rico, where he had to undergo final investigation by the FBI before he could finally gain admission to the United States.

Lévi-Strauss had secured a position in New York teaching at the New School for Social Research along with Jacques Maritain, Henri Focillon, and Russian semiotician Roman Jacobson. He divorced Dreyfus and married Rose Marie Ullmo in 1946, and they had one son, Laurent. He was a founding member of the École Libre des Hautes Études, a university-in-exile for French academics.

During his time as a cultural attaché to the French embassy in Washington DC from 1946 to 1947, Lévi-Strauss entertained Albert Camus, who had gained entrance to the United States after a difficult time because of his communist connections.

Lévi-Strauss returned to Paris in 1948, and received his doctorate from the Sorbonne by submitting, in the French tradition, both a "major" and a "minor" thesis. These were ‘The Family and Social Life of the Nambikwara Indiansand’, ‘The Elementary Structures of Kinship’. He became a professor at the Institut d'Ethnologie, University of Paris, and a research associate at the National Science Research Fund, Paris. Later he served as professor of anthropology at the Collège de France. In 1954, he divorced Ullmo and married Monique Roman and they had one son, Matthieu.

While Lévi-Strauss was well-known in academic circles, it was in 1955 that he became one of France’s best known intellectuals by publishing Tristes Tropiques. This book was essentially a travel novel detailing his time as French expatriate throughout the 1930s. But Lévi-Strauss combined exquisitely beautiful prose, dazzling philosophical meditation, and ethnographic analysis of Amazonian peoples to produce a
masterpiece. The organizers of the literary prize, Prix Goncourt, for instance, lamented that they were not able to award Lévi-Strauss the prize because *Tristes Tropiques* was technically non-fiction. This book served to popularize his other work immensely.

Lévi-Strauss was named to a chair in social anthropology at the Collège de France in 1959. At roughly the same time, he published *Structural Anthropology*, a collection of his essays which provided both examples and programmatic statements about structuralism. Laying the groundwork for establishing anthropology to be accepted as a discipline in France, he began a series of institutions, including the Laboratory for Social Anthropology where new students could be trained, and a new journal, *l'Homme*, for publishing the results of their research.

In 1962, Lévi-Strauss published, what is for many people his most important work, *La Pensée Sauvage*, which concerns primitive thought, forms of thought we all use. The title is a pun untranslatable in English. In French, *pensée* means both "thought" and "pancy," the flower, while *sauvage* means "wild" as well as "savage" or "primitive." In English the book is known as *The Savage Mind*, but this title fails to capture the other possible French meaning of *Wild Pansies*. (Lévi-Strauss suggested the English title be *Pansies for Thought*, a reference to the speech by Ophelia in Shakespeare’s *Hamlet.* The French edition to this day retains a flower on the cover.

As a world-wide celebrity, Lévi-Strauss spent the second half of the 1960s working on his master project, a four-volume study called *Mythologiques*. Lévi-Strauss took a single myth from the tip of South America and followed all of its variations from group to group up through Central America and eventually into the Arctic circle, thus tracing the myth’s spread from one end of the American continent to the other. He accomplished this in a typically structuralist way, examining the underlying structure of relationships between the elements of the story rather than by focusing on the content of the story itself. While *Pensée Sauvage* was a statement of Lévi-Strauss’ big-picture theory, *Mythologiques* was an extended, four-volume example of analysis. Richly detailed and extremely long, it is less widely read than the much shorter and more accessible *Pensée Sauvage*, despite its position as Lévi-Strauss’ master work.

In the twenty-first century, he continued to publish occasional meditations on art, music, and poetry, as well as interviews and reminiscences of earlier periods of his life. He died on October 30, 2009, a few weeks before his 101st birthday.

**Work**

Lévi-Strauss lived in Brazil from 1935 to 1939, and it was during this time that he carried out his first ethnographic fieldwork, conducting periodic research forays into the Mato Grosso and the Amazon Rainforest. He studied first the Guaycuru and Bororo Indian tribes, actually living among them for a while. Several years later, he came back again in a second, year-long expedition to study the Nambikwara and Tupi-Kawahib societies. It was this experience that cemented Lévi-Strauss’s professional identity as an anthropologist.
Throughout the late 1940s and early 1950s, Lévi-Strauss continued to publish and experienced considerable professional success. The war years in New York were formative for Lévi-Strauss in several ways. His relationship with Roman Jakobson helped shape his theoretical outlook (Jakobson and Lévi-Strauss are considered to be two of the central figures on which structuralist thought is based). In addition, Lévi-Strauss was also exposed to American anthropology, especially as espoused by Franz Boas and Bronislaw Malinowski. This gave his early work a distinctive American flavor that helped facilitate its acceptance in the U.S.

Among his many significant publications, The Elementary Structures of Kinship (1949) and The Savage Mind (1962) exemplify his contributions to anthropology.

**The Elementary Structures of Kinship**

*The Elementary Structures of Kinship* was published the next year and instantly came to be regarded as one of the most important works of anthropological kinship to be published. It was reviewed favourably by Simone de Beauvoir, a former classmate at the Sorbonne, as an important statement of the position of women in non-western cultures. A play on the title of Émile Durkheim's famous *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, *Elementary Structures* re-examined how people organized their families by examining the logical structures that underlay relationships rather than their contents. While British anthropologists such as Alfred Reginald Radcliffe-Brown argued that kinship was based on "descent" from a common ancestor, Lévi Strauss argued that kinship was based on the "alliance" between two families that formed when women from one group married men from the other.

**The Savage Mind**

The first half of *The Savage Mind* lays out Lévi-Strauss's theory of culture and mind, while the second half expands this account into a theory of history and social change. This part of the book engaged Lévi-Strauss in a heated debate with Jean-Paul Sartre over the nature of human freedom. Although echoes of this debate between structuralism and existentialism would stimulate many and eventually inspire the work of younger authors such as Pierre Bourdieu, many also believed their debate was a version of the Medieval theological discussions of how many angels could dance on the head of a pin. Sartre's existentialist philosophy committed him to a position that human beings were fundamentally free to act as they pleased, yet he also maintained they were constrained by the ideologies imposed on them by the powerful, as his hard-core leftist views dictated. Lévi-Strauss presented an alternative notion that underlying unity would be found through the comparison of social structures.
Critique

Lévi-Strauss' theories are set forth in *Structural Anthropology* (1958). Briefly, he considered culture a system of symbolic communication, to be investigated with methods that others have used more exclusively in the discussion of novels, political speeches, sports, economic journals, and movies. His reasoning makes best sense against the background of an earlier generation's social theory. Victor Turner and others have critiqued structuralism, like Marxism and secular existentialism, as reducing general expressions of faith and community to mere symbolism, leaving them devoid of real meaning.

Lévi-Strauss was ever-dedicated to the exhaustive analysis of volumes of data. This often shocked and overwhelmed the academic community. He not only utilized a wide range of subject matter, he also utilized an array of scientific methodologies, including mathematical formulas, complex graphic comparisons, cybernetics, modern linguistic theory, and chaos theory, to mention just a few. He seemed to find patterns where no one else could find them, and his method, though rigorous, was unique in each application making it exceedingly difficult for others to replicate. He was criticized for not being an expert in these diverse fields and for utilizing the work of others, rather than limiting his research to the field of his own experience and with languages he was personally adept in. Yet, his attention to detail and precision in method was remarkable and difficult to defeat intellectually.

Lévi-Strauss is often cited as the founder of structural anthropology, and as such chose to use data that emphasized the demands of the social order. He had no difficulty bringing out the inconsistencies and triviality of individualistic accounts. Methods of linguistics became a model for all his earlier examinations of society. "A truly scientific analysis must be real, simplifying, and explanatory," he stated (in *Structural Anthropology*). Phonemic analysis reveals features that are real, in the sense that users of the language can recognize and respond to them. At the same time, a phoneme is an abstraction from language—not a sound, but a category of sound defined by the way it is distinguished from other categories through rules unique to the language. The entire sound-structure of a language can be generated from a relatively small number of rules.

In the study of the kinship systems that first concerned him, he utilized a comprehensive organization of data that had been partly ordered by other researchers. The overall goal was to find out why family relations differed in different South American cultures. The father might have great authority over the son in one group, for example, with the relationship rigidly restricted by taboos. In another group, the mother’s brother would have that kind of relationship with the son, while the father’s relationship was relaxed and playful.

A number of partial patterns had been previously noted. Relations between the mother and father, for example, had some sort of reciprocity with those of father and son—if the mother had a dominant social status and was formal with the father, for example, then the father usually had close relations with the son. But these smaller patterns joined together in inconsistent ways. For Lévi-Strauss, a proper solution to the puzzle was to find a basic unit of kinship which can explain all the variations.
He found this unit in the cluster of four roles—brother, sister, father, son. These are the roles that must be involved in any society that has an incest taboo, requiring a man to obtain a wife from some man outside his own hereditary line. A brother can give away his sister, for example, whose son might reciprocate in the next generation by allowing his own sister to marry exogamously. The underlying demand is a continued circulation of women to keep various clans peacefully related.

Right or wrong, this solution displays essential qualities of the structural position. Even though Lévi-Strauss frequently spoke of treating culture as the product of the axioms and corollaries that underlie it, or the phonemic differences that constitute it, he was concerned with the objective data of field research. He noted that it is logically possible for a different unit of kinship structure to exist—sister, sister's brother, brother's wife, daughter—but there are no real-world examples of relationships that can be derived from that grouping.

Lévi-Strauss' later works are more controversial, in part because they impinge on the subject matter of other scholars. He believed that modern life and all history was founded on the same categories and transformations that he had discovered in the Brazilian back country—*The Raw and the Cooked, From Honey to Ashes, The Naked Man* (to borrow some titles from the *Mythologies*). For instance he compared anthropology to musical serialism.

His voluminous data and ability to defend his analyses have had an impact on neurological brain research, especially in connection to his applications of linguistic phonemes. His work seems to provide preliminary data on underlying connections with universal brain function, and has thus stimulated more research on these topics.

He has argued for a view of human life as existing in two timelines simultaneously, the eventful one of history and the long cycles in which one set of fundamental mythic patterns dominates and then perhaps another. In this respect, his work resembles that of Fernand Braudel, the historian of the Mediterranean and *la longue durée*, the cultural outlook and forms of social organization that persisted for centuries around that sea.

**Marc Leopold Benjamin Bloch (6 July 1886 – 16 June 1944)**

Marc Leopold Benjamin Bloch was a French historian who cofounded the highly influential Annales School of French social history. Bloch was a quintessential modernist. An assimilated Alsatian Jew from an academic family in Paris, he was deeply affected in his youth by the Dreyfus Affair. He studied at the elite École Normale Supérieure; in 1908-9 he studied at Berlin and Leipzig. He fought in the trenches of the Western Front for four years. In 1919 he became Lecturer in Medieval history at Strasbourg University, after the German professors were all expelled; he was called to the Sorbonne in Paris in 1936 as professor of economic history. He is best known for his pioneering studies *French Rural History and Feudal Society* and his posthumously-published unfinished meditation on the writing of history, *The Historian’s Craft*. He was captured and shot by the Gestapo during the German occupation of France for his work in the French Resistance.
Youth and First World War

Born in Lyon to a Jewish family, the son of the professor of ancient history Gustave Bloch, Marc studied at the École Normale Supérieure and Fondation Thiers in Paris, then at Berlin and Leipzig. He was an officer of infantry in World War I, rising to the rank of captain and being awarded the Légion d'honneur. After the war, he went to the university at Strasbourg, then in 1936 succeeded Henri Hauser as professor of economic history at the Sorbonne.

Career

In 1924 he published one of his most famous works *Les rois thaumaturges: étude sur le caractère surnaturel attribué à la puissance royale particulièrement en France et en Angleterre* (translated in English as *The magic-working kings or The royal touch: sacred monarchy and scrofula in England and France*) in which he collected, described and studied the documents pertaining to the ancient tradition that the kings of the Middle Ages were able to cure the disease of scrofula simply by touching people suffering from it. This tradition has its roots in the magical role of kings in ancient societies. This work by Bloch had a great impact not only on the social history of Middle Ages but also on cultural anthropology.

Bloch’s most important work centred on the study of feudalism. He published a large work, available in a two-volume English translation as *Feudal Society*. In some ways, his most innovative work is his monograph *French Rural History*.

Annales

With colleague Lucien Febvre he founded the Annales School in 1929, by starting the new scholarly journal, *Annales d'Histoire Economique et Sociale* ("Annals of economic and social history"), which broke radically with traditional historiography by insisting on the importance of taking all levels of society into consideration and emphasized the collective nature of mentalities.

Bloch has had lasting influence in the field of historiography through his unfinished manuscript ‘*The Historian’s Craft*’, which he was working on at his death. Bloch’s book is often considered one of the most important historiographical works of the 20th century.

Historiography

Bloch was highly interdisciplinary, influenced by the geography of Paul Vidal de la Blache (1845–1918) and the sociology of Émile Durkheim (1858–1917). In *Méthodologie Historique* (written in 1906 but not published until 1988), Bloch rejected the histoire événementielle (event history) of his mentors Charles-Victor Langlois and Charles Seignobos to argue for greater analysis of the role of structural and social phenomena in determining the outcome of historical events. Bloch was trying to reinvent history as a social science, but he departed significantly from Durkheim in his refusal to exclude psychology from history; Bloch maintained that the individual actor should be considered along with social forces. Bloch’s methodology was also greatly influenced by his father, Gustave Bloch, a historian of the ancient world, and by 19th-century scholars such as Gabriel Monod, Ernest Renan, and Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges.
Bloch vigorously supported the idea of international scholarly cooperation and tried unsuccessfully to set up an international journal with American support. Bloch wrote some 500 reviews of German books and articles, while promoting the importance of German historiography and admiring its scholarly rigor, he repeatedly criticized its nationalism and methodological limitations.

**Miracles and mentalities**

In *Les Rois Thaumaturges* (1924) Bloch looked at the long-standing folk belief that the king could cure scrofula by touch. The kings of France and England indeed regularly practised the ritual. Bloch was not concerned with the effectiveness of the royal touch—he acted like an anthropologist in asking why people believed it and how it shaped relations between king and commoner. The book was highly influential in introducing comparative studies (in this case France and England), as well as long-durations studies spanning a thousand years (with specific events used as illustrations). By investigating the impact of rituals, the efficacy of myths, and all the possible sources of collective behaviour, he became the "father of historical anthropology." Bloch's revolutionary charting of mentalities resonated with scholars who were reading Freud and Proust. Stirling examines this essentially stylistic trait alongside Bloch’s peculiarly quixotic idealism, which tempered and sometimes compromised his work through his hope for a truly cooperative model of historical inquiry. While humanizing and questioning him, Stirling gives credit to Bloch for helping to break through the monotonous methodological alternance between positivism and narrative history, creating a new, synthetic version of the historical practice that has since become so ingrained in the discipline that it is typically overlooked.

**Rural history**

Bloch’s own ideas on rural history were best expressed in his masterworks, *French Rural History* (*Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française*, 1931) and *Feudal Society* (1939).

In *L'Individualisme Agraire du XVIIIe Siècle* (1978), Bloch characterized the agrarian reforms of 18th-century France as a "failed revolution," citing the persistence of regional traditions as evidence for their failure. A typical example of the Annales School's "total history," Bloch’s argument weaves the connections between politics, culture, and economics against a backdrop of class conflict to illustrate how "the conscious actions of men have overcome the rhythms of the materialist causality of history." He argued that the anti-feudal sentiment of French peasants expressed in the 1789 cahier de doléances (list of grievances) was linked to the "seigniorial reaction" of the late 18th century in which lords significantly increased feudal dues. Bloch argued that it was this intensified exploitation that provoked peasant revolt, leading to the Revolution.
History of technology

The November 1935 issue of the Annales contains Febvre's introduction that defines three essential approaches to a history of technology: to investigate technology, to understand the progress of technology, and to understand the relationship of technology to other human activities. Bloch’s article, "The Advent and Triumph of the Watermill in Medieval Europe," incorporates these approaches by investigating the connections between technology and broader social issues.

Second World War

In 1939 France declared war on Germany after its invasion and occupation of Poland. As France mobilized its troops, Marc Bloch left his position at the Sorbonne and took up his reserve status as a captain in the French Army at the age of 52. He was encouraged at the time by colleagues both in France and abroad to leave the country. He said it was his personal obligation to stand for the moral imperative.

His memoir of the first days of World War II, Strange Defeat, written in 1940 but not published until 1946, blamed the French military establishment, along with her social and political culture, for the sudden total military defeat and helped after the war to neutralize the traumatic memory of France's failure and to build a new French identity.

Bloch joined the French Resistance in late 1942, driven by ardent patriotism, identification with his Jewish roots and a conception of France as the champion of liberty. His code name was "Narbonne". He was eventually captured by Vichy police in March 1944 and turned over to the Gestapo, which tortured and shot him in June 1944, just as the Nazis realized that the Allies were about to re-conquer France; Bloch became a national martyr after the Allied liberation. Bloch spent his final days in prison writing his essay "The Historian's Craft," which was unfinished at the time of his execution.

Legacy

- Bloch’s focus on the longue durée and his emphasis upon structures underlying events led to misguided accusations of a denial of human agency and a marginalization of political history. In Strange Defeat he clearly states his view that individuals can change events and he castigates the French government’s refusal to trust its own officers in the field of battle, thus leading to the surrender of France to the Nazis.

- In 1998 the University of Social Sciences in Strasbourg was renamed in honour of Bloch. Marc Bloch University became a constituent part of the University of Strasbourg on 1 January 2009.
The Annales School

The Annales School is a group of historians associated with a style of historiography developed by French historians in the 20th century to stress long-term social history. It is named after its scholarly journal Annales d’histoire économique et sociale, which remains the main source of scholarship, along with many books and monographs. The school has been highly influential in setting the agenda for historiography in France and numerous other countries, especially regarding the use of social scientific methods by historians, emphasizing social rather than political or diplomatic themes, and for being generally hostile to the class analysis of Marxist historiography.

The school deals primarily with the pre modern world (before the French Revolution), with little interest in later topics. It has dominated French social history and influenced historiography in Europe and Latin America. Prominent leaders include co-founders Lucien Febvre (1878–1956) and Marc Bloch (1886–1944). The second generation was led by Fernand Braudel (1902–1985) and included Georges Duby (1919–1996), Pierre Goubert (1915–2012), Robert Mandrou (1921–1984), Pierre Chaunu (1923–2009), Jacques Le Goff (1924– ), and Ernest Labrousse (1895–1988). Institutionally it is based on the Annales journal, the SEVPEN publishing house, the Fondation Maison des sciences de l’homme (FMSH), and especially the 6th Section of the École pratique des hautes études, all based in Paris. A third generation was led by Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie (1929–) and includes Jacques Revel, and Philippe Ariès (1914–1984), who joined the group in 1978. The third generation stressed history from the point of view of mentalities, or mentalités. The fourth generation of Annales historians, led by Roger Chartier (1945–), clearly distanced itself from the mentalities approach, replaced by the cultural and linguistic turn, which emphasize analysis of the social history of cultural practices.

The main scholarly outlet has been the journal Annales d’Histoire Economique et Sociale ("Annals of economic and social history"), founded in 1929 by Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch, which broke radically with traditional historiography by insisting on the importance of taking all levels of society into consideration and emphasized the collective nature of mentalities. Its contributors viewed events as less fundamental than the mental frameworks that shaped decisions and practices.

Braudel was editor of Annales from 1956 to 1968, followed by the medievalist Jacques Le Goff. However, Braudel's informal successor as head of the school was Le Roy Ladurie. Noting the political upheavals in Europe and especially in France in 1968, Eric Hobsbawm argues that "in France the virtual hegemony of Braudelian history and the Annales came to an end after 1968, and the international influence of the journal dropped steeply." Multiple responses were attempted by the school. Scholars moved in multiple directions, covering in disconnected fashion the social, economic, and cultural history of different eras and different parts of the globe. By the time of crisis the school was building a vast publishing and research network reaching across France,
Europe, and the rest of the world. Influence indeed spread out from Paris, but few new ideas came in. Much emphasis was given to quantitative data, seen as the key to unlocking all of social history. However, the Annales ignored the developments in quantitative studies underway in the U.S. and Britain, which reshaped economic, political and demographic research. An attempt to require an Annales-written textbook for French schools was rejected by the government. By 1980 postmodern sensibilities undercut confidence in overarching meta-narratives. As Revel notes, the success of the Annales School, especially its use of social structures as explanatory forces contained the seeds of its own downfall, for there is "no longer any implicit consensus on which to base the unity of the social, identified with the real." The Annales School kept its infrastructure, but lost its mentalités.

**The journal**

The journal began in Strasbourg as Annales d’histoire économique et sociale; it moved to Paris and kept the same name from 1929 to 1939. It was successively renamed Annales d’histoire sociale (1939–1942, 1945), Mélanges d’histoire sociale (1942–1944), Annales.Economies, sociétés, civilisations (1946–1994), and Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales (1994–).

In 1962 Braudel and Gaston Berger used Ford Foundation money and government funds to create a new independent foundation, the Fondation Maison des sciences de l’homme (FMSH), which Braudel directed from 1970 until his death. In 1970 the 6th Section and the Annales relocated to the FMSH building. FMSH set up elaborate international networks to spread the Annales gospel across Europe and the world. In 2013 it began publication of an English language edition, with all the articles translated.

The scope of topics covered by the journal is vast and experimental—there is a search for total history and new approaches. The emphasis is on social history, and very long-term trends, often using quantification and paying special attention to geography and to the intellectual world view of common people, or “mentality” (mentalité). Little attention is paid to political, diplomatic, or military history, or to biographies of famous men. Instead the Annales focused attention on the synthesizing of historical patterns identified from social, economic, and cultural history, statistics, medical reports, family studies, and even psychoanalysis.

**Origins**

The Annales was founded and edited by Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre in 1929, while they were teaching at the University of Strasbourg and later in Paris. These authors, the former a medieval historian and the latter an early modernist, quickly became associated with the distinctive Annales approach, which combined geography, history, and the sociological approaches of the Année Sociologique (many members of which were their colleagues at Strasbourg) to produce an approach which rejected the predominant emphasis on politics, diplomacy and war of many 19th and early 20th-century historians as spearheaded by historians whom Febvre called Les Sorbonnistes. Instead, they pioneered an approach to a study of long-term historical structures
(la longue durée) over events and political transformations. Geography, material culture, and what later Annalistes called mentalités, or the psychology of the epoch, are also characteristic areas of study. The goal of the Annales was to undo the work of the Sorbonnistes, to turn French historians away from the narrowly political and diplomatic toward the new vistas in social and economic history.

Cofounder Marc Bloch (1886–1944) was a quintessential modernist who studied at the elite École Normale Supérieure, and in Germany, serving as a professor at the University of Strasbourg until he was called to the Sorbonne in Paris in 1936 as professor of economic history. Bloch was highly interdisciplinary, influenced by the geography of Paul Vidal de la Blache (1845–1918) and the sociology of Émile Durkheim (1858–1917). His own ideas, especially those expressed in his masterworks, French Rural History (Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française, 1931) and Feudal Society, were incorporated by the second-generation Annalistes, led by Fernand Braudel.

**Precepts**

An eminent member of this school, Georges Duby, wrote in the foreword of his book *Le dimanche de Bouvines* that the history he taught relegated the sensational to the sidelines and was reluctant to give a simple accounting of events, but strived on the contrary to pose and solve problems and, neglecting surface disturbances, to observe the long and medium-term evolution of economy, society and civilisation. The Annalistes, especially Lucien Febvre, advocated a histoire totale, or histoire tout court, a complete study of a historic problem.

**Postwar**

Bloch was shot by the Gestapo during the German occupation of France in World War II for his active membership of the French Resistance, and Febvre carried on the Annales approach in the 1940s and 1950s. It was during this time that he mentored Braudel, who would become one of the best-known exponents of this school. Braudel's work came to define a "second" era of Annales historiography and was very influential throughout the 1960s and 1970s, especially for his work on the Mediterranean region in the era of Philip II of Spain. Braudel developed the idea, often associated with Annalistes, of different modes of historical time: l'histoire quasi immobile (motionless history) of historical geography, the history of social, political and economic structures (la longue durée), and the history of men and events, in the context of their structures.

While authors such as Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, Marc Ferro and Jacques Le Goff continue to carry the Annales banner, today the Annales approach has been less distinctive as more and more historians do work in cultural history, political history and economic history.
Mentalités

Bloch’s Les Rois Thaumaturges (1924) looked at the long-standing folk belief that the king could cure scrofula by his thaumaturgic touch. The kings of France and England indeed regularly practiced the ritual. Bloch was not concerned with the effectiveness of the royal touch—he acted instead like an anthropologist in asking why people believed it and how it shaped relations between king and commoner. The book was highly influential in introducing comparative studies (in this case France and England), as well as long durations (“longue durée”) studies spanning several centuries, even up to a thousand years, downplaying short-term events. Bloch’s revolutionary charting of mentalities, or mentalités, resonated with scholars who were reading Freud and Proust. In the 1960s, Robert Mandrou and Georges Duby harmonized the concept of mentalité history with Fernand Braudel’s structures of historical time and linked mentalities with changing social conditions. A flood of mentalité studies based on these approaches appeared during the 1970s and 1980s. By the 1990s, however, mentalité history had become interdisciplinary to the point of fragmentation, but still lacked a solid theoretical basis. While not explicitly rejecting mentalité history, younger historians increasingly turned to other approaches.

Braudel

Fernand Braudel became the leader of the second generation after 1945. He obtained funding from the Rockefeller Foundation in New York and founded the 6th Section of the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Études, which was devoted to the study of history and the social sciences. It became an independent degree-granting institution in 1975 under the name École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS). Braudel’s followers admired his use of the longue durée approach to stress slow, and often imperceptible effects of space, climate and technology on the actions of human beings in the past. The Annales historians, after living through two world wars and incredible political upheavals in France, were deeply uncomfortable with the notion that multiple ruptures and discontinuities created history. They preferred to stress inertia and the longue durée. Special attention was paid to geography, climate, and demography as long-term factors. They believed the continuities of the deepest structures were central to history, beside which upheavals in institutions or the superstructure of social life were of little significance, for history lies beyond the reach of conscious actors, especially the will of revolutionaries. They rejected the Marxist idea that history should be used as a tool to foment and foster revolutions. In turn the Marxists called them conservatives.

Braudel’s first book, La Méditerranée et le Monde Méditerranéen à l’Epoque de Philippe II (1949) (The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II) was his most influential. This vast panoramic view used ideas from other social sciences, employed effectively the technique of the longue durée, and downplayed the importance of specific events and individuals. It stressed geography but not mentalité. It was widely admired, but most historians did not try to replicate it and instead focused on their specialized monographs. The book dramatically raised the worldwide profile of the Annales School.
Regionalism

Before Annales, French history supposedly happened in Paris. Febvre broke decisively with this paradigm in 1912, with his sweeping doctoral thesis on *Philippe II et la Franche-Comté*. The geography and social structure of this region overwhelmed and shaped the king’s policies set in Paris.

The Annales historians did not try to replicate Braudel’s vast geographical scope in *La Méditerranée*. Instead they focused on regions in France over long stretches of time. The most important was the study of the *Peasants of Languedoc* by Braudel’s star pupil and successor Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie. The regionalist tradition flourished especially in the 1960s and 1970s in the work of Pierre Goubert in 1960 on Beauvais and René Bahrel on Basse-Provence. Annales historians in the 1970s and 1980s turned to urban regions, including Pierre Deyon (Amiens), Maurice Garden (Lyon), Jean-Pierre Bardet (Rouen), Georges Freche (Toulouse), and Jean-Claude Perrot (Caen). By the 1970s the shift was underway from the earlier economic history to cultural history and the history of mentalities.

Impact outside France

The Annales School systematically reached out to create an impact on other countries. Its success varied widely. The Annales approach was especially well received in Italy and Poland. Franciszek Bujak (1875–1953) and Jan Rutkowski (1886–1949), the founders of modern economic history in Poland and of the journal *Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych* (1931– ), were attracted to the innovations of the Annales school. Rutkowski was in contact with Bloch and others, and published in the Annales. After the Communists took control in the 1940s Polish scholars were safer working on the Middle Ages and the early modern era rather than contemporary history. After the “Polish October” of 1956 the Sixth Section in Paris welcomed Polish historians and exchanges between the circle of the Annales and Polish scholars continued until the early 1980s. The reciprocal influence between the French school and Polish historiography was particularly evident in studies on the Middle Ages and the early modern era studied by Braudel.

In South America the Annales approach became popular. From the 1950s Federico Brito Figueroa was the founder of a new Venezuelan historiography based largely on the ideas of the Annales School. Brito Figueroa carried his conception of the field to all levels of university study, emphasizing a systematic and scientific approach to history and placing it squarely in the social sciences. Spanish historiography was influenced by the “Annales School” starting in 1950 with Jaime Vincens Vives (1910–1960). In Mexico, exiled Republican intellectuals extended the Annales approach, particularly from the Center for Historical Studies of El Colegio de México, the leading graduate studies institution of Latin America.

British historians, apart from a few Marxists, were generally hostile. Academic historians decidedly sided with Geoffrey Elton’s *The Practice of History* against Edward Hallett Carr’s *What Is History?*. American, German, Indian, Russian and Japanese scholars generally ignored the school. The Americans developed their own form of “new social history” from entirely different routes. Both the American and the Annales historians picked up important family reconstitution techniques from French demographer Louis Henry.
Current

The current leader is Roger Chartier, who is Directeur d’Études at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris, Professeur in the Collège de France, and Annenberg Visiting Professor of History at the University of Pennsylvania. He frequently lectures and teaches in the United States, Spain, Mexico, Brazil and Argentina. His work in Early Modern European History focuses on the history of education, the history of the book and the history of reading. Recently, he has been concerned with the relationship between written culture as a whole and literature (particularly theatrical plays) for France, England and Spain. His work in this specific field (based on the criss-crossing between literary criticism, bibliography, and socio-cultural history) is connected to broader historiographical and methodological interests which deal with the relation between history and other disciplines: philosophy, sociology, anthropology.

Chartier’s typical undergraduate course focuses upon the making, remaking, dissemination, and reading of texts in early modern Europe and America. Under the heading of "practices," his class considers how readers read and marked up their books, forms of note-taking, and the interrelation between reading and writing from copying and translating to composing new texts. Under the heading of "materials," his class examines the relations between different kinds of writing surfaces (including stone, wax, parchment, paper, walls, textiles, the body, and the heart), writing implements (including styluses, pens, pencils, needles, and brushes), and material forms (including scrolls, erasable tables, codices, broadsides and printed forms and books). Under the heading of "places," his class explores where texts were made, read, and listened to, including monasteries, schools and universities, offices of the state, the shops of merchants and booksellers, printing houses, theatres, libraries, studies, and closets. The texts for his course include the Bible, translations of Ovid, Hamlet, Don Quixote, Montaigne’s essays, Pepys’s diary, Richardson’s Pamela, and Franklin’s autobiography.

Lucien Febvre (22 July 1878 - 11 September 1956)

Lucien Febvre; was a French historian best known for the role he played in establishing the Annales School of history. He was the initial editor of the Encyclopédie française together with Anatole de Monzie.

Lucien Febvre was born and brought up in Nancy, in north-eastern France. His father was a philologist, who introduced Febvre to the study of ancient texts and languages, which significantly influenced Febvre’s way of thinking. At the age of twenty, Febvre went to Paris to enrol in the École Normale Supérieure. Between 1899 and 1902, he concentrated on studying history and geography. After his graduation from college, Febvre taught at a provincial lycée, where he worked on his thesis on Philip II of Spain and the Franche-Comté. After the outbreak of World War I in 1914, Febvre was forced to leave his teaching post to join the army, where he served for four years. Febvre took up a position at the University of Strasbourg in 1919 when the province was returned to France. While there, Febvre became acquainted with Marc Bloch, who shared Febvre’s philosophical and political approach, which brought the two men together.
The time Febvre spent in Paris played an enormous role in reshaping his outlook on the world. Prevalent approaches to art, philosophy and modern ways of thinking strongly influenced Febvre. He embraced 20th century modernism to the extent that he later claimed to have become "unturned" from the old world and the old ways of thinking.

In his approach to history, Febvre contextualized events against the geography, psychology and culture of the times about which he wrote. History as a mere collection of historical facts no longer held any interest for Febvre.

Febvre’s first thesis on Philip the Second and the Franche-Comté, published in 1911, showed the strength of this approach. In this work, Febvre tried to demonstrate the context that shows events in their true light. Febvre reconstructed the life of villagers and town dwellers in a small traditional province in France by contextualizing historical events in terms of the geography and environment of the times. By describing Franche-Comté’s rivers, salt mines, vineyards and other surroundings, Febvre created an accurate and true-to-life portrayal of the atmosphere and outlook of the time. With this approach, Febvre was also able to reveal a negative influence that the French Government of the time played in the life of this province. This approach to history is known as histoire totale, or histoire tout court. Later, Febvre’s work would be a paradigm for the "Annales School" and would become a new way of historical thinking.

Another influential work of Febvre dealt with Protestantism. Published in the Revue Historique in 1929, "Une question mal posée" attempted to study popular religion by trying to observe and quantify human behavior. Through an enormous amount of research, Febvre collected information from various monasteries and chapels to study the influence of new wave philosophy in religion and the clergy’s approach to understanding and translating their views to lay people. Through this work, Febvre became very involved in the field of ethnology, a field of study that quantifies human behaviour. Some critics consider this work to be heavily influenced by Febvre’s own views of the surrounding world.

As time went by, Febvre grew increasingly suspicious of theology. He refused to see people as bound by forces beyond their control. He came to the view that religion and old ways of thinking were impractical, maybe even dangerous, in modern times. "In the general confusion of our time," Febvre wrote, "old ideas refuse to die and still find acceptance with the mass of the population." He became convinced that changing religious views and attitudes is as difficult as trying to influence the outcome of any sort of political or social upheavals. He believed that people needed to be educated in order to avoid the dangers of the old ways of thinking.

In 1929, Lucien Febvre, along with his colleague and close friend Marc Bloch, established a scholarly journal, Annales d’Histoire Economique et Sociale (commonly known as the Annales), from which the name of their distinctive style of history was taken. The journal followed Febvre’s approach to describing history. Its approach was to educate the world about the dangers of old-world thinking to avoid possible future
economic and political disasters. Its purpose was to influence academic circles to "study ... the present so as to reach a profounder understanding of the past." This journal was like no other scholarly publication at that time.

The *Annales* was met with a very favorable critical reception and was very successful in its early years. It was in such demand that it was able to increase the frequency of its publications in 1932. However, in 1938 the journal appeared to be running its course and the publishers ceased their support.

In 1933 Febvre was appointed to a chair at the Collège de France. He published vigorously throughout the 1930s and early 40s, although World War II interrupted his work. The war also resulted in the death of Marc Bloch, and so Febvre became the man who carried the *Annales* into the post-war period, most notably by training Fernand Braudel and co-founding the VI section of the École Pratique des Hautes Études, later known as École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS). Febvre died in 1956 in Saint-Amour, France.

**Fernand Braudel (24 August 1902 – 27 November 1985)**

Fernand Braudel was a French historian and a leader of the Annales School. His scholarship focused on three main projects: *The Mediterranean* (1923–49, then 1949–66), *Civilization and Capitalism* (1955–79), and the unfinished *Identity of France* (1970–85). His reputation stems in part from his writings, but even more from his success in making the Annales School the most important engine of historical research in France and much of the world after 1950. As the dominant leader of the Annales School of historiography in the 1950s and 1960s, he exerted enormous influence on historical writing in France and other countries.

Braudel has been considered one of the greatest of the modern historians who have emphasized the role of large-scale socioeconomic factors in the making and writing of history. He can also be considered as one of the precursors of world-systems theory.

Braudel was born in Luméville-en-Ornois (as of 1943, merged with and part of Gondrecourt-le-Château), in the département of the Meuse, France. His father, who was a natural mathematician, aided him in his studies. Braudel also studied a good deal of Latin and a little Greek. At the age of 20, he became an agrégé in history. While teaching at a secondary school in Algeria, 1923–32, he became fascinated by the Mediterranean Sea. From 1932 to 1935 he taught in the Paris lycées of Pasteur, Condorcet, and Henri-IV. He met Lucien Febvre, the co-founder of the influential Annales journal.

By 1900, the French solidified their cultural influence in Brazil through the establishment of the Brazilian Academy of Fine Arts. São Paulo still lacked a university, however, and in 1934 francophile Julio de Mesquita Filho invited anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss and Braudel to help establish one. The result was formation of the new University of São Paulo. Braudel later said that the time in Brazil was the "greatest period of his life."
Braudel returned to Paris in 1937. He had started archival research on his doctorate on the Mediterranean when he fell under the influence of the Annales School around 1938. Around this time he entered the École Pratique des Hautes Études as an instructor in history. He worked with Lucien Febvre, who would later read the early versions of Braudel's magnum opus and provide him with editorial advice.

At the outbreak of war in 1939, he was called up and subsequently taken prisoner in 1940 by the Germans. While a prisoner of war in a camp near Lübeck in Germany, Braudel drafted his great work La Méditerranée et le Monde Méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II (The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II), without access to his books or notes but relying on his prodigious memory and a local library.

Braudel became the leader of the second generation of Annales historians after 1945. In 1947, with Febvre and Charles Morazé, Braudel obtained funding from the Rockefeller Foundation in New York founded the famous Sixième Section for "Economic and social sciences" at the École Pratique des Hautes Études. In 1962 he and Gaston Berger used the Ford Foundation grant and government funds to create a new independent foundation, the Fondation Maison des Sciences de l'Homme (FMSH), which Braudel directed from 1970 until his death. It was housed in the building called "Maison des Sciences de l'Homme". FMSH focused its activities on international networking in order to disseminate the Annales approach to Europe and the world. In 1972 he gave up all editorial responsibility on the journal, although his name remained on the masthead.

In 1962, he wrote A History of Civilizations as the basis for a history course, but its rejection of the traditional event-based narrative was too radical for the French ministry of education, which in turn rejected it.

A feature of Braudel’s work was his compassion for the suffering of marginal people. He articulated that most surviving historical sources come from the literate wealthy classes. He emphasized the importance of the ephemeral lives of slaves, serfs, peasants, and the urban poor, demonstrating their contributions to the wealth and power of their respective masters and societies. His work was often illustrated with contemporary depictions of daily life, rarely with pictures of noblemen or kings.

In 1949 Braudel was elected to the Collège de France upon Febvre’s retirement. He co-founded the academic journal Revue économique in 1950. He retired in 1968. In 1983, he was elected to the Académie française.

**La Méditerranée**

His first book, La Méditerranée et le Monde Méditerranéen à l’Epoque de Philippe II (1949) (The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II) was his most influential.

For Braudel there is no single Mediterranean Sea. There are many seas—indeed a "vast, complex expanse" within which men operates. Life is conducted on the Mediterranean: people travel, fish, fight wars, and drown in its various contexts. And
the sea articulates with the plains and islands. Life on the plains is diverse and complex; the poorer south is affected by religious diversity (Catholicism and Islam), as well as by intrusions – both cultural and economic – from the wealthier north. In other words, the Mediterranean cannot be understood independently from what is exterior to it. Any rigid adherence to boundaries falsifies the situation.

The first level of time, geographical time, is that of the environment, with its slow, almost imperceptible change, its repetition and cycles. Such change may be slow, but it is irresistible. The second level of time comprises long-term social, economic, and cultural history, where Braudel discusses the Mediterranean economy, social groupings, empires and civilizations. Change at this level is much more rapid than that of the environment; Braudel looks at two or three centuries in order to spot a particular pattern, such as the rise and fall of various aristocracies. The third level of time is that of events (histoire événementielle). This is the history of individuals with names. This, for Braudel, is the time of surfaces and deceptive effects. It is the time of the "courte durée" proper and it is the focus of Part 3 of The Mediterranean which treats of "events, politics and people."

Braudel's Mediterranean is centered on the sea, but just as important, it is also the desert and the mountains. The desert creates a nomadic form of social organization where the whole community moves; mountain life is sedentary. Transhumance — that is, the movement from the mountain to the plain, or vice versa in a given season — is also a persistent part of Mediterranean existence.

Braudel's vast, panoramic view used insights from other social sciences, employed the concept of the longue durée, and downplayed the importance of specific events. It was widely admired, but most historians did not try to replicate it and instead focused on their specialized monographs. The book firmly launched the study of the Mediterranean and dramatically raised the worldwide profile of the Annales School.

**Capitalism**

After La Méditerranée, Braudel's most famous work is the three-volume Civilisation Matérielle, Économie et Capitalisme, XVe-XVIIIe (Capitalism and Material Life, 1400-1800), which first appeared in 1979. [Note: Braudel published the first volume of Civilization and Capitalism in 1967, and it was translated as Capitalism and Material Life, 1400–1800 in 1973.] The entire three-volume work is a broad-scale history of the preindustrial modern world, presented in the minute detail demanded by the school called cliometrics, focusing on how people made economies work. Like all his major works, it mixed traditional economic material with a thick description of the social impact of economic events on various facets of everyday life such as food, fashion, and social customs.

Braudel claimed that there are long-term cycles in the capitalist economy which developed in Europe in the 12th century. Particular cities, and later nation-states, follow each other sequentially as centres of these cycles: Venice and Genoa in 13th through 15th centuries (1250–1510), Antwerp in 16th century (1500–1569), Amsterdam in 16th
through 18th centuries (1570–1733), and London (and England) in 18th and 19th centuries (1733–1896). He used the word “structures” to denote a variety of organized behaviours, attitudes, and conventions, as well as literal structures and infrastructures. He argued that structures that were built up in Europe during the Middle Ages contributed to the successes of present-day European-based cultures. He attributed much of this to the long-standing independence of city-states, which, though later subjugated by larger geographic states, were not always completely suppressed—probably for reasons of utility.

Braudel argued that capitalists have typically been monopolists and not, as is usually assumed, entrepreneurs operating in competitive markets. He argued that capitalists did not specialize and did not use free markets. He thus diverged from both liberal (Adam Smith) and Marxian interpretations. In Braudel’s view, under capitalism the state has served as a guarantor of monopolists rather than as the protector of competition usually portrayed. He asserted that capitalists have had power and cunning on their side as they have arrayed themselves against the majority of the population.

According to Braudel, prior to the Annales approach, the writing of history was focused on the courte durée (short span), or on histoire événementielle (a history of events).

His followers admired his use of the longue durée approach to stress the slow and often imperceptible effects of space, climate and technology on the actions of human beings in the past. The Annales historians, after living through two world wars and massive political upheavals in France, were very uncomfortable with the notion that multiple ruptures and discontinuities created history. They preferred to stress inertia and the longue durée, arguing that the continuities in the deepest structures of society were central to history. Upheavals in institutions or the superstructure of social life were of little significance, for history, they argued, lies beyond the reach of conscious actors, especially the will of revolutionaries. They rejected the Marxist idea that history should be used as a tool to foment and foster revolutions. A proponent of historical materialism, Braudel rejected Marxist materialism, stressing the equal importance of infrastructure and superstructure, both of which reflected enduring social, economic, and cultural realities. Braudel’s structures, both mental and environmental, determine the long-term course of events by constraining actions on, and by, humans over duration long enough that they are beyond the consciousness of the actors involved.

Social History

Social History, often called the new social history, is a branch of History that includes history of ordinary people and their strategies of coping with life, history of social organization, and history of social movements and deliberate attempts to induce social change, whether from the top down or from the bottom up. Before the 1960s social history meant either the history of social movements, such as the Populist Party, or the study of everyday life. The latter was a minor topic in history largely ignored by professionals. The "new social history" exploded on the scene in the 1960s, quickly
becoming one of the dominant styles of historiography in the U.S., Britain and Canada. The French version, promulgated by the Annales School, was very well organized and dominated French historiography, and influenced much of Europe and Latin America. After 1990 it was increasingly challenged by cultural history, which emphasizes language and the importance of beliefs and assumptions and their causal role in group behaviour.

The study of the lives of ordinary people was revolutionized in the 1960s by the introduction of sophisticated quantitative and demographic methods, often using individual data from the census and from local registers of births, marriages, deaths and taxes, as well as theoretical models from sociology such as social mobility.

There is no society for social history, but the field is covered in the *Journal of Social History*, edited since 1967 by Peter Stearns. It covers such topics as gender relations; race in American history; the history of personal relationships; consumerism; sexuality; the social history of politics; crime and punishment, and history of the senses.

**Emergence of Subaltern Writers**

The Subaltern Studies Group (SSG) or Subaltern Studies Collective is a group of South Asian scholars interested in the postcolonial and post-imperial societies with a particular focus on those of South Asia while also covering the developing world in general sense. The term Subaltern Studies is sometimes also applied more broadly to others who share many of their views. Their anti-essentialist approach is one of history from below, focused more on what happens among the masses at the base levels of society than among the elite.

The term "subaltern" in this context is an allusion to the work of Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937). It refers to any person or group of inferior rank and station, whether because of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, or religion.

The SSG arose in the 1980s, influenced by the scholarship of Eric Stokes and Ranajit Guha, to attempt to formulate a new narrative of the history of India and South Asia. This narrative strategy most clearly inspired by the writings of Gramsci was explicated in the writings of their "mentor" Ranajit Guha, most clearly in his "manifesto" in Subaltern Studies I and also in his classic monograph The Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency. Although they are, in a sense, on the left, they are very critical of the traditional Marxist narrative of Indian history, in which semi-feudal India was colonized by the British, became politicized, and earned its independence. In particular, they are critical of the focus of this narrative on the political consciousness of elites, who in turn inspire the masses to resistance and rebellion against the British.

Instead, they focus on non-elites — subalterns — as agents of political and social change. They have had a particular interest in the discourses and rhetoric of emerging political and social movements, as against only highly visible actions like demonstrations and uprisings.
Antonio Gramsci (22 January 1891 – 27 April 1937)

Antonio Gramsci was an Italian writer, politician, political theorist, philosopher, sociologist, and linguist. He was a founding member and one-time leader of the Communist Party of Italy and was imprisoned by Benito Mussolini’s Fascist regime. Gramsci was one of the most important Marxist thinkers in the 20th century. He is a notable figure within modern European thought and his writings analyze culture and political leadership. He is known for his theory of cultural hegemony, which describes how states use cultural institutions to maintain power in capitalist societies.

Early life

Gramsci was born in Ales, on the island of Sardinia, the fourth of seven sons of Francesco Gramsci (1860–1937), a low-level official from Gaeta, and his wife, Giuseppina Marcias (1861–1932). Gramsci’s father was of Arbëreshë descent, while his mother belonged to a local landowning family. The senior Gramsci’s financial difficulties and troubles with the police forced the family to move about through several villages in Sardinia until they finally settled in Ghilarza.

In 1898 Francesco was convicted of embezzlement and imprisoned, reducing his family to destitution. The young Antonio had to abandon schooling and work at various casual jobs until his father's release in 1904. As a boy, Gramsci suffered from health problems, particularly a malformation of the spine that stunted his growth (his adult height was less than 5 feet) and left him seriously hunchbacked. For decades, it was reported that his condition had been due to a childhood accident - specifically, having been dropped by a nanny - but more recently it has been suggested that it was due to Pott's disease, a form of tuberculosis that can cause deformity of the spine. Gramsci was also plagued by various internal disorders throughout his life.

Gramsci completed secondary school in Cagliari, where he lodged with his elder brother Gennaro, a former soldier whose time on the mainland had made him a militant socialist. However, Gramsci's sympathies then did not lie with socialism, but rather with the grievances of impoverished Sardinian peasants and miners. They perceived their neglect as a result of privileges enjoyed by the rapidly industrialising North, and they tended to turn to Sardinian nationalism as a response.

Turin

In 1911, Gramsci won a scholarship to study at the University of Turin, sitting the exam at the same time as future cohort Palmiro Togliatti. At Turin, he read literature and took a keen interest in linguistics, which he studied under Matteo Bartoli. Gramsci was in Turin as it was going through industrialization, with the Fiat and Lancia factories' recruiting workers from poorer regions. Trade unions became established, and the first industrial social conflicts started to emerge. Gramsci frequented socialist circles as well as associating with Sardinian emigrants. His worldview shaped by both his earlier experiences in Sardinia and his environment on the mainland, Gramsci joined the Italian Socialist Party in late 1913.
Despite showing talent for his studies, Gramsci had financial problems and poor health. Together with his growing political commitment, these led to his abandoning his education in early 1915. By this time, he had acquired an extensive knowledge of history and philosophy. At university, he had come into contact with the thought of Antonio Labriola, Rodolfo Mondolfo, Giovanni Gentile and, most importantly, Benedetto Croce, possibly the most widely respected Italian intellectual of his day. Such thinkers espoused a brand of Hegelian Marxism to which Labriola had given the name “philosophy of praxis”. Though Gramsci would later use this phrase to escape the prison censors, his relationship with this current of thought was ambiguous throughout his life.

From 1914 onward, Gramsci’s writings for socialist newspapers such as Il Grido del Popolo earned him a reputation as a notable journalist. In 1916 he became co-editor of the Piedmont edition of Avanti!, the Socialist Party official organ. An articulate and prolific writer of political theory, Gramsci proved a formidable commentator, writing on all aspects of Turin’s social and political life.

Gramsci was, at this time, also involved in the education and organisation of Turin workers: he spoke in public for the first time in 1916 and gave talks on topics such as Romain Rolland, the French Revolution, the Paris Commune and the emancipation of women. In the wake of the arrest of Socialist Party leaders that followed the revolutionary riots of August 1917, Gramsci became one of Turin’s leading socialists when he was both elected to the party’s Provisional Committee and made editor of Il Grido del Popolo.

In April 1919 with Togliatti, Angelo Tasca and Umberto Terracini Gramsci set up the weekly newspaper L’Ordine Nuovo (The New Order). In October of the same year, despite being divided into various hostile factions, the Socialist Party moved by a large majority to join the Third International. The L’Ordine Nuovo group was seen by Vladimir Lenin as closest in orientation to the Bolsheviks, and it received his backing against the anti-parliamentary programme of the extreme left Amadeo Bordiga.

Amongst the various tactical debates that took place within the party, Gramsci’s group was mainly distinguished by its advocacy of workers’ councils, which had come into existence in Turin spontaneously during the large strikes of 1919 and 1920. For Gramsci these councils were the proper means of enabling workers to take control of the task of organising production. Although he believed his position at this time to be in keeping with Lenin’s policy of "All power to the Soviets", his stance was attacked by Bordiga for betraying a syndicalist tendency influenced by the thought of Georges Sorel and Daniel DeLeon. By the time of the defeat of the Turin workers in spring 1920, Gramsci was almost alone in his defence of the councils.

**In the Communist Party of Italy**

The failure of the workers’ councils to develop into a national movement led Gramsci to believe that a Communist Party in the Leninist sense was needed. The group around L’Ordine Nuovo declaimed incessantly against the Italian Socialist Party’s...
centrist leadership and ultimately allied with Bordiga’s far larger "abstentionist" faction. On 21 January 1921, in the town of Livorno (Leghorn), the Communist Party of Italy (Partito Comunista d' Italia – PCI) was founded. Gramsci supported against Bordiga the Arditi del Popolo, a militant anti-fascist group which struggled against the Blackshirts.

Gramsci would be a leader of the party from its inception but was subordinate to Bordiga, whose emphasis on discipline, centralism and purity of principles dominated the party's programme until the latter lost the leadership in 1924.

In 1922 Gramsci travelled to Russia as a representative of the new party. Here, he met Julia Schucht, a young violinist whom Gramsci married in 1923 and by whom he had two sons, Delio (born 1924) and Giuliano (born 1926). Gramsci never saw his second son.

The Russian mission coincided with the advent of Fascism in Italy, and Gramsci returned with instructions to foster, against the wishes of the PCI leadership, a united front of leftist parties against fascism. Such a front would ideally have had the PCI at its centre, through which Moscow would have controlled all the leftist forces, but others disputed this potential supremacy: socialists did have a certain tradition in Italy too, while the communist party seemed relatively young and too radical. Many believed that an eventual coalition led by communists would have functioned too remotely from political debate, and thus would have run the risk of isolation.

In late 1922 and early 1923, Benito Mussolini’s government embarked on a campaign of repression against the opposition parties, arresting most of the PCI leadership, including Bordiga. At the end of 1923, Gramsci travelled from Moscow to Vienna, where he tried to revive a party torn by factional strife.

In 1924 Gramsci, now recognised as head of the PCI, gained election as a deputy for the Veneto. He started organizing the launch of the official newspaper of the party, called L’Unità (Unity), living in Rome while his family stayed in Moscow. At its Lyons Congress in January 1926, Gramsci’s theses calling for a united front to restore democracy to Italy were adopted by the party.

In 1926 Joseph Stalin’s manoeuvres inside the Bolshevik party moved Gramsci to write a letter to the Comintern, in which he deplored the opposition led by Leon Trotsky, but also underlined some presumed faults of the leader. Togliatti, in Moscow as a representative of the party, received the letter, opened it, read it, and decided not to deliver it. This caused a difficult conflict between Gramsci and Togliatti which they never completely resolved.

**Imprisonment and death**

On November 9, 1926 the Fascist government enacted a new wave of emergency laws, taking as a pretext an alleged attempt on Mussolini’s life several days earlier. The fascist police arrested Gramsci, despite his parliamentary immunity, and brought him to Roman prison Regina Coeli.
At his trial, Gramsci’s prosecutor stated, "For twenty years we must stop this brain from functioning". He received an immediate sentence of 5 years in confinement on the island of Ustica and the following year he received a sentence of 20 years of prison in Turi, near Bari. In prison his health deteriorated. In 1932, a project for exchanging political prisoners (including Gramsci) between Italy and the Soviet Union failed. In 1934 he gained conditional freedom on health grounds, after visiting hospitals in Civitavecchia, Formia and Rome. He died in 1937, at the "Quisisana" Hospital in Rome at the age of 46. His ashes are buried in the Protestant Cemetery there.

In an interview archbishop Luigi de Magistris, former head of the Apostolic Penitentiary of the Holy See stated that during Gramsci’s final illness, he "returned to the faith of his infancy" and "died taking the sacraments." However, Italian State documents on his death show that no religious official was sent for or received by Gramsci. Other witness accounts of his death also do not mention any conversion to Catholicism or recantation by Gramsci of his atheism.

Thought

Gramsci was one of the most important Marxist thinkers of the twentieth century, and a particularly key thinker in the development of Western Marxism. He wrote more than 30 notebooks and 3000 pages of history and analysis during his imprisonment. These writings, known as the Prison Notebooks, contain Gramsci’s tracing of Italian history and nationalism, as well as some ideas in Marxist theory, critical theory and educational theory associated with his name, such as:

- Cultural hegemony as a means of maintaining and legitimising the capitalist state.
- The need for popular workers’ education to encourage development of intellectuals from the working class.
- An analysis of the modern capitalist state that distinguishes between political society, which dominates directly and coercively, and civil society, where leadership is constituted by means of consent.
- "Absolute historicism".

A critique of economic determinism that opposes fatalistic interpretations of Marxism. A critique of philosophical materialism.

Hegemony

Hegemony was a term previously used by Marxists such as Vladimir Ilyich Lenin to denote the political leadership of the working-class in a democratic revolution. Gramsci greatly expanded this concept, developing an acute analysis of how the ruling capitalist class – the bourgeoisie – establishes and maintains its control.

Orthodox Marxism had predicted that socialist revolution was inevitable in capitalist societies. By the early 20th century, no such revolution had occurred in the most advanced nations. Capitalism, it seemed, was even more entrenched than ever.
Capitalism, Gramsci suggested, maintained control not just through violence and political and economic coercion, but also through ideology. The bourgeoisie developed a hegemonic culture, which propagated its own values and norms so that they became the 'common sense' values of all. People in the working-class (and other classes) identified their own good with the good of the bourgeoisie, and helped to maintain the status quo rather than revolting.

To counter the notion that bourgeois values represented 'natural' or 'normal' values for society, the working class needed to develop a culture of its own. Lenin held that culture was 'ancillary' to political objectives but for Gramsci it was fundamental to the attainment of power that cultural hegemony be achieved first. In Gramsci's view, a class cannot dominate in modern conditions by merely advancing its own narrow economic interests. Neither can it dominate purely through force and coercion. Rather, it must exert intellectual and moral leadership, and make alliances and compromises with a variety of forces. Gramsci calls this union of social forces a 'historic bloc', taking a term from Georges Sorel. This bloc forms the basis of consent to a certain social order, which produces and re-produces the hegemony of the dominant class through a nexus of institutions, social relations and ideas. In this manner, Gramsci developed a theory that emphasized the importance of the political and ideological superstructure in both maintaining and fracturing relations of the economic base.

Gramsci stated that bourgeois cultural values were tied to folklore, popular culture and religion, and therefore much of his analysis of hegemonic culture is aimed at these. He was also impressed by the influence Roman Catholicism had and the care the Church had taken to prevent an excessive gap developing between the religion of the learned and that of the less educated. Gramsci saw Marxism as a marriage of the purely intellectual critique of religion found in Renaissance humanism and the elements of the Reformation that had appealed to the masses. For Gramsci, Marxism could supersede religion only if it met people's spiritual needs, and to do so people would have to think of it as an expression of their own experience.

For Gramsci, hegemonic dominance ultimately relied on a "consented" coercion, and in a "crisis of authority" the "masks of consent" slip away, revealing the fist of force.

**Intellectuals and education**

Gramsci gave much thought to the question of the role of intellectuals in society. Famously, he stated that all men are intellectuals, in that all have intellectual and rational faculties, but not all men have the social function of intellectuals. He saw modern intellectuals not as talkers, but as practically-minded directors and organisers who produced hegemony by means of ideological apparatuses such as education and the media. Furthermore, he distinguished between a "traditional" intelligentsia which sees itself (wrongly) as a class apart from society, and the thinking groups which every class produces from its own ranks "organically". Such "organic" intellectuals do not simply describe social life in accordance with scientific rules, but instead articulate, through the language of culture, the feelings and experiences which the masses could
not express for themselves. The need to create a working-class culture relates to Gramsci’s call for a kind of education that could develop working-class intellectuals, whose task was not to introduce Marxist ideology from without the proletariat, but to renovate and make critical of the status quo the already existing intellectual activity of the masses. His ideas about an education system for this purpose correspond with the notion of critical pedagogy and popular education as theorized and practised in later decades by Paulo Freire in Brazil, and have much in common with the thought of Frantz Fanon. For this reason, partisans of adult and popular education consider Gramsci an important voice to this day.

**State and civil society**

Gramsci’s theory of hegemony is tied to his conception of the capitalist state. Gramsci does not understand the 'state' in the narrow sense of the government. Instead, he divides it between 'political society' (the police, the army, legal system, etc.) – the arena of political institutions and legal constitutional control – and 'civil society' (the family, the education system, trade unions, etc.) – commonly seen as the 'private' or 'non-state' sphere, mediating between the state and the economy. He stresses, however, that the division is purely conceptual and that the two, in reality, often overlap. The capitalist state, Gramsci claims, rules through force plus consent: political society is the realm of force and civil society is the realm of consent.

Gramsci proffers that under modern capitalism, the bourgeoisie can maintain its economic control by allowing certain demands made by trade unions and mass political parties within civil society to be met by the political sphere. Thus, the bourgeoisie engages in passive revolution by going beyond its immediate economic interests and allowing the forms of its hegemony to change. Gramsci posits that movements such as reformism and fascism, as well as the 'scientific management' and assembly line methods of Frederick Taylor and Henry Ford respectively, are examples of this.

Drawing from Machiavelli, he argues that 'The Modern Prince' – the revolutionary party – is the force that will allow the working-class to develop organic intellectuals and an alternative hegemony within civil society. For Gramsci, the complex nature of modern civil society means that a 'war of position', carried out by revolutionaries through political agitation, the trade unions, advancement of proletarian culture, and other ways to create an opposing civil society was necessary alongside a 'war of maneuver' — a direct revolution — in order to have a successful revolution without a danger of a counter-revolution or degeneration.

Despite his claim that the lines between the two may be blurred, Gramsci rejects the state-worship that results from identifying political society with civil society, as was done by the Jacobins and Fascists. He believes the proletarians historical task is to create a 'regulated society' and defines the 'withering away of the state' as the full development of civil society's ability to regulate itself.
Historicism

Gramsci, like the early Marx, was an emphatic proponent of historicism. In Gramsci's view, all meaning derives from the relation between human practical activity (or "praxis") and the "objective" historical and social processes of which it is a part. Ideas cannot be understood outside their social and historical context, apart from their function and origin. The concepts by which we organise our knowledge of the world do not derive primarily from our relation to things (to an objective reality), but rather from the social relations between the users of those concepts. As a result, there is no such thing as an unchanging "human nature". Furthermore, philosophy and science do not "reflect" a reality independent of man. Rather, a theory can be said to be "true" when, in any given historical situation, it expresses the real developmental trend of that situation.

For the majority of Marxists, truth was truth no matter when and where it is known, and scientific knowledge (which included Marxism) accumulated historically as the advance of truth in this everyday sense. On this view, Marxism could not be said to not belong to the illusory realm of the superstructure because it is a science. In contrast, Gramsci believed Marxism was "true" in a socially pragmatic sense: by articulating the class consciousness of the proletariat, Marxism expressed the "truth" of its times better than any other theory. This anti-scientific and anti-positivist stance was indebted to the influence of Benedetto Croce. However, it should be underlined that Gramsci's "absolute historicism" broke with Croce's tendency to secure a metaphysical synthesis in historical "destiny". Though Gramsci repudiates the charge, his historical account of truth has been criticised as a form of relativism.

Critique of "economism"

In a notable pre-prison article entitled "The Revolution against Das Kapital", Gramsci claimed that the October Revolution in Russia had invalidated the idea that socialist revolution had to await the full development of capitalist forces of production. This reflected his view that Marxism was not a determinist philosophy. The principle of the causal "primacy" of the forces of production, he held, was a misconception of Marxism. Both economic changes and cultural changes are expressions of a "basic historical process", and it is difficult to say which sphere has primacy over the other. The belief, widespread within the workers' movement in its earliest years, that it would inevitably triumph due to "historical laws", was, in Gramsci's view, a product of the historical circumstances of an oppressed class restricted mainly to defensive action. Such a fatalistic doctrine was to be abandoned as a hindrance once the working-class became able to take the initiative. Because Marxism is a "philosophy of praxis", it cannot rely on unseen "historical laws" as the agents of social change. History is defined by human praxis and therefore includes human will. Nonetheless, will-power cannot achieve anything it likes in any given situation: when the consciousness of the working-class reaches the stage of development necessary for action, it will encounter historical circumstances that cannot be arbitrarily altered. However, it is not predetermined by historical inevitability or "destiny" as to which of several possible developments will take place as a result.
His critique of economism also extended to that practiced by the syndicalists of the Italian trade unions. He believed that many trade unionists had settled for a reformist, gradualist approach in that they had refused to struggle on the political front in addition to the economic front. For Gramsci, much as the ruling class can look beyond its own immediate economic interests to reorganise the forms of its own hegemony, so must the working-class present its own interests as congruous with the universal advancement of society. While Gramsci envisioned the trade unions as one organ of a counter-hegemonic force in capitalist society, the trade union leaders simply saw these organizations as a means to improve conditions within the existing structure. Gramsci referred to the views of these trade unionists as "vulgar economism", which he equated to covert reformism and even liberalism.

**Critique of materialism**

By virtue of his belief that human history and collective praxis determine whether any philosophical question is meaningful or not, Gramsci's views run contrary to the metaphysical materialism and 'copy' theory of perception advanced by Engels and Lenin, though he does not explicitly state this. For Gramsci, Marxism does not deal with a reality that exists in and for itself, independent of humanity. The concept of an objective universe outside of human history and human praxis was, in his view, analogous to belief in God. Gramsci defined objectivity in terms of a universal intersubjectivity to be established in a future communist society. Natural history was thus only meaningful in relation to human history. In his view philosophical materialism resulted from a lack of critical thought, and could not be said to oppose religious dogma and superstition. Despite this, Gramsci resigned himself to the existence of this arguably cruder form of Marxism. Marxism was a philosophy for the proletariat, a subaltern class, and thus could often only be expressed in the form of popular superstition and common sense. Nonetheless, it was necessary to effectively challenge the ideologies of the educated classes, and to do so Marxists must present their philosophy in a more sophisticated guise, and attempt to genuinely understand their opponents’ views.

**Influence**

Gramsci’s thought emanates from the organized left, but he has also become an important figure in current academic discussions within cultural studies and critical theory. Political theorists from the centre and the right have also found insight in his concepts; his idea of hegemony, for example, has become widely cited. His influence is particularly strong in contemporary political science. His work also heavily influenced intellectual discourse on popular culture and scholarly popular culture studies in whom many have found the potential for political or ideological resistance to dominant government and business interests.

His critics charge him with fostering a notion of power struggle through ideas. They find the Gramscian approach to philosophical analysis, reflected in current academic controversies, to be in conflict with open-ended, liberal inquiry grounded in
apolitical readings of the classics of Western culture. Gramscians would counter that thoughts of "liberal inquiry" and "apolitical reading" are utterly naive; for the Gramscians, these are intellectual devices used to maintain the hegemony of the capitalist class. To credit or blame Gramsci for the travails of current academic politics is an odd turn of history, since Gramsci himself was never an academic, and was in fact deeply intellectually engaged with Italian culture, history, and current liberal thought.

As a socialist, Gramsci’s legacy has been disputed. Togliatti, who led the Party (renamed as Italian Communist Party, PCI) after World War II and whose gradualist approach was a forerunner to Euro communism, claimed that the PCI’s practices during this period were congruent with Gramscian thought. Others, however, have argued that Gramsci was a Left Communist, who would likely have been expelled from his Party if prison had not prevented him from regular contact with Moscow during the leadership of Joseph Stalin.

**Christopher Hill (6 February 1912 – 23 February 2003)**

John Edward Christopher Hill, usually known simply as Christopher Hill, was an English Marxist historian and author of textbooks. Hill was born on 6 February 1912, Bishopthorpe Road, York, to Edward Harold Hill and Janet Augusta (née Dickinson). His father was a solicitor and the family were devout Methodists. He attended St Peter's School, York.[1] At the age of 16, he sat his entrance examination at Balliol College, University of Oxford. The two history tutors, who marked his papers, recognised his ability and offered him a place to forestall any chance he might go to the University of Cambridge.[2] In 1931, Hill had a prolonged holiday in Freiburg, Germany, where he witnessed the rise of the Nazi Party; he later said it contributed significantly to the radicalisation of his politics.

He matriculated into Balliol College in 1931. In 1932, he won the Lothian Prize. He graduated with a first-class Bachelor of Arts degree in modern history in 1934. Whilst at Balliol, Hill became a committed Marxist and joined the Communist Party of Great Britain in the year he graduated.

**Early academic career and war service**

After graduating, he became a fellow of All Souls College. In 1935, he undertook a ten-month trip to Moscow, Soviet Union. There he became fluent in Russian and studied Soviet historical scholarship, particularly that relating to Britain. After returning to England in 1936, he accepted a teaching position as an assistant lecturer at the University College of South Wales and Monmouthshire. During his time at Cardiff, Hill attempted to join the International Brigade and fight in the Spanish Civil War, but was rejected. Instead, he was active in helping Basque refugees, displaced by the war. After two years at Cardiff, he returned to Balliol College in 1938 as a fellow and tutor of history.
Following the outbreak of the Second World War, he joined the British Army, initially as a Private in the Field Security Police. He was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Oxfordshire on 2 November 1940 with the service number 156590. That same year, he took part in a debate among many Marxist historians. At around this time, Hill started to publish his articles and reviews about 17th-century English history. On 19 October 1941, he transferred to the Intelligence Corps. He was seconded to the Foreign Office from 1943 until the war ended.

**Later academic career and politics**

Hill returned to Oxford University after the war to continue his academic work. In 1946, Hill and many other Marxist historians formed the Communist Party Historians Group. In 1949, he applied to be the Chair of History at the newly created Keele University, but was turned down because of his Communist Party affiliations. He helped create the journal Past and Present in 1952, that focused on Social history.

Hill was becoming discontented with the lack of democracy in the Communist Party. However, he stayed in the party, unlike many other intellectuals, after the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956. He finally left the party in the spring of 1957 when one of his reports to the party congress was rejected.

After 1956, Hill’s career ascended to new heights. His studies on 17th-century English history were widely acknowledged and recognised. It was also the year of the publication of his first academic book; *Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament*. These were based on the study of printed sources accessible in the Bodleian Library and on the secondary works produced by other academic historians rather than on research in the surviving archives. In 1965, Hill was elected the Master of Balliol College. He held the post from 1965 to 1978, when he retired (he was replaced by Anthony Kenny). Among those of his students at Balliol was Brian Manning, who went on to develop understanding of the English Revolution.


However, the intellectual tide later turned in favour of the so-called revisionism, which rejected the analyses of Marxist and socialist historians of Hill’s generation and advocated, as an alternative to them, more detailed study of the constitutional and political, cultural and intellectual history of the early to mid-17th centuries. Hill’s later works showed that he continued to work within the parameters of his earlier preoccupations and consequently lost influence upon younger historians. Even so, he was prolific in his publications until the mid-1990s even if he no longer occupied the intellectual centre-stage.
He retired from full-time academia and Balliol College in 1978. He continued to lecture, however, through The Open University for two more years from his home at Wadsley Bridge in Sheffield. In Hill’s later years, he lived with Alzheimer’s disease and required constant care. He died on 23 February 2003 of cerebral atrophy in a nursing home in Chipping Norton, Oxfordshire.

**E. P. Thompson (3 February 1924 – 28 August 1993)**

Edward Palmer "E. P." Thompson was a British historian, writer, socialist and peace campaigner. He is probably best known today for his historical work on the British radical movements in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, in particular The Making of the English Working Class (1963). He also published influential biographies of William Morris (1955) and (posthumously) William Blake (1993) and was a prolific journalist and essayist. He also published the novel The Sykaos Papers and a collection of poetry.

Thompson was one of the principal intellectuals of the Communist Party in Great Britain. Although he left the party in 1956 over the Soviet invasion of Hungary, he nevertheless remained a "historian in the Marxist tradition," calling for a rebellion against Stalinism as a prerequisite for the restoration of communists’ "confidence in our own revolutionary perspectives". Thompson played a key role in the first New Left in Britain in the late 1950s. He was a vociferous left-wing socialist critic of the Labour governments of 1964–70 and 1974–79, and an early and constant supporter of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, becoming during the 1980s the leading intellectual light of the movement against nuclear weapons in Europe.

**Early life**

E.P. Thompson was born in Oxford to Methodist missionary parents: His father, Edward John Thompson was a poet and admirer of the Nobel-prize winning poet Tagore. His older brother was William Frank Thompson, a British officer in World War II, who was captured and shot aiding the Bulgarian anti-fascist partisans.

**Education**

Thompson was educated at two independent schools, being The Dragon School in Oxford and Kingswood School in Bath. He left academic studies in 1941, aged 17, to fight the forces of fascism. During World War II, he served in a tank unit in the Italian campaign, including at the last battle of Cassino. Subsequently, he studied at Corpus Christi College at the University of Cambridge, where he joined the Communist Party of Great Britain. In 1989 he became an Honorary Fellow of that College.

**Life and career**

In 1946, E.P. Thompson formed the Communist Party Historians Group along with Christopher Hill, Eric Hobsbawm, Rodney Hilton, Dona Torr and others. In 1952 this group launched the influential journal Past and Present.
Thompson's first major work was his biography of 'William Morris', written while he was a member of the Communist Party. Subtitled From Romantic to Revolutionary, it was part of an effort by the Communist Party Historians' Group, inspired by Torr, to emphasise the domestic roots of Marxism in Britain at a time when the Communist Party was under attack for always following the Moscow line. It was also an attempt to take Morris back from the critics who for more than 50 years had emphasised his art and downplayed his politics.

Although Morris' political work is well to the fore, Thompson also used his literary talents to comment on aspects of Morris' work, such as his early Romantic poetry, which had previously received relatively little consideration. As the preface to the 2nd edition (1976) notes, the first edition (1955) appears to have received relatively little attention from the literary establishment because of its then-unfashionable Marxist viewpoint. However, the somewhat rewritten second edition was much better received.

The first New Left

After Nikita Khrushchev’s “secret speech” to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956, which revealed that the Soviet party leadership had long been aware of Stalin's crimes, Thompson (with John Saville and others) started a dissident publication inside the CP, called The Reasoner. Six months later, he and most of his comrades left the party in disgust at the Soviet invasion of Hungary.

But Thompson remained what he called a "socialist humanist". With Saville and others, he set up the New Reasoner, a journal that sought to develop a democratic socialist alternative to what its editors considered the ossified official Marxism of the Communist and Trotskyist parties and the managerialist cold war social democracy of the Labour Party and its international allies. The New Reasoner was the most important organ of what became known as the "New Left", an informal movement of dissident leftists closely associated with the nascent movement for nuclear disarmament in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

The New Reasoner combined with the Universities and Left Review to form New Left Review in 1960, though Thompson and others fell out with the group around Perry Anderson who took over the journal in 1962. The fashion ever since has been to describe the Thompson et al. New Left as "the first New Left" and the Anderson et al. group, which by 1968 had embraced Tariq Ali and various Trotskyists, as the second.

Thompson subsequently allied himself with the annual Socialist Register publication. With Raymond Williams and Stuart Hall, he was one of the editors of the 1967 May Day Manifesto, one of the key left-wing challenges to the 1964–70 Labour government of Harold Wilson.
The Making of the English Working Class

Thompson’s most influential work was and remains 'The Making of the English Working Class', published in 1963 while he was working at the University of Leeds. It told the forgotten history of the first working-class political left in the world in the late-18th and early-19th centuries. In his preface to this book, Thompson set out his approach to writing history from below:

I am seeking to rescue the poor stockinger, the Luddite cropper, the "obsolete" hand-loom weaver, the "Utopian" artisan, and even the deluded follower of Joanna Southcott, from the enormous condescension of posterity. Their crafts and traditions may have been dying. Their hostility to the new industrialism may have been backward-looking. Their communitarian ideals may have been fantasies. Their insurrectionary conspiracies may have been foolhardy. But they lived through these times of acute social disturbance, and we did not. Their aspirations were valid in terms of their own experience; and, if they were casualties of history, they remain, condemned in their own lives, as casualties.

Thompson’s work was also significant because of the way he defined "class." To Thompson, class was not a structure, but a relationship:

And class happens when some men, as a result of common experiences (inherited or shared), feel and articulate the identity of their interests as between themselves, and as against other men whose interests are different from (and usually opposed to) theirs. The class experience is largely determined by the productive relations into which men are born—or enter involuntarily. Class-consciousness is the way in which these experiences are handled in cultural terms: embodied in traditions, value-systems, ideas, and institutional forms. If the experience appears as determined, class-consciousness does not. We can see logic in the responses of similar occupational groups undergoing similar experiences, but we cannot predicate any law. Consciousness of class arises in the same way in different times and places, but never in just the same way.

By re-defining class as a relationship that changed over time, Thompson proceeded to demonstrate how class was worthy of historical investigation. He opened the gates for a generation of labour historians, such as David Montgomery and Herbert Gutman, who made similar studies of the American working classes.

A major work of research and synthesis, the book was also important in historiographical terms: with it, Thompson demonstrated the power of an historical Marxism rooted in the experience of real flesh-and-blood workers. It remains on university reading lists 40 years after its publication. Thompson wrote the book while living in Siddal, Halifax, and West Yorkshire and based some of the work on his experiences with the local Halifax population.

Freelance polemicist

Thompson left the University of Warwick in protest at the commercialisation of the academy, documented in the book Warwick University Limited (1971). He continued
to teach and lecture as a visiting professor, particularly in the United States. However, he increasingly worked as a freelance writer, contributing many essays to New Society, Socialist Register and historical journals. In 1978 he published The Poverty of Theory which attacked the structuralist Marxism of Louis Althusser and his followers in Britain on New Left Review (famously saying: "...all of them are Geschichtenscheissenschlopf, unhistorical shit". The title echoes that of Karl Marx’s 1847 polemic against Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, The Poverty of Philosophy and that of philosopher Karl Popper’s 1936 book The Poverty of Historicism. Thompson’s polemic provoked a book-length response from Perry Anderson, Arguments within English Marxism.

During the late 1970s Thompson acquired a large public audience as a critic of the then Labour government’s disregard of civil liberties; his writings from this time are collected in Writing by Candlelight (1980).

**Voice of the peace movement**

From 1980, Thompson was the most prominent intellectual of the revived movement for nuclear disarmament, revered by activists throughout the world. In Britain, his pamphlet Protest and Survive, a parody on the government leaflet Protect and Survive, played a major role in the revived strength of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Just as important, Thompson was, with Coates, Mary and others, an author of the 1980 Appeal for European Nuclear Disarmament, calling for a nuclear-free Europe from Poland to Portugal, which was the founding document of European Nuclear Disarmament. Confusingly, END was both a Europe-wide campaign that comprised a series of large public conferences (the END Conventions), and a small British pressure group.

Thompson played a key role in both END and CND throughout the 1980s, speaking at innumerable public meetings, corresponding with hundreds of fellow activists and sympathetic intellectuals, and doing more than his fair share of committee work. He had a particularly important part in opening a dialogue between the west European peace movement and dissidents in Soviet-dominated Eastern Europe, particularly in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, for which he was denounced as a tool of American imperialism by the Soviet authorities.

He wrote dozens of polemical articles and essays during this period, which are collected in the books Zero Option (1982) and The Heavy Dancers (1985). He also wrote an extended essay attacking the ideologists on both sides of the cold war, Double Exposure (1985) and edited a collection of essays opposing Ronald Reagan’s Strategic Defence Initiative, Star Wars (1985).

William Blake

The last book Thompson finished was Witness Against the Beast: William Blake and the Moral Law (1993). The product of years of research and published shortly after his death, it shows how far Blake was inspired by dissident religious ideas rooted in the thinking of the most radical opponents of the monarchy during the English civil war.

Personal life

In 1948 Thompson married Dorothy Towers, whom he met at Cambridge. A fellow left-wing historian, she wrote studies on women in the Chartist movement, and the biography Queen Victoria: Gender and Power; she was Professor of History at the University of Birmingham. The Thompsons had three children, the youngest of whom is the award-winning children’s writer, Thompson. Thompson died at the age of 69 in Worcester.

E. P. Thompson and his mother wrote There is a Spirit in Europe: A Memoir of Frank Thompson (1947). Frank Thompson was also a friend and confidant of Iris Murdoch, the philosopher and novelist. E. P. Thompson wrote another book about his brother, published in 1996.

Criticism

Leszek Kolakowski wrote a very harsh criticism of Thompson in his 1974 essay "My Correct Views on Everything", picking apart Thompson’s left-wing views. Tony Judt considered this rejoinder so authoritative to claim that "no one who reads it will ever take E.P. Thompson seriously again". His portrait of Thompson elicited some protests from readers, and other left-wing journals came to the defense of Thompson.

Ranajit Guha

Ranajit Guha (born Siddhakati 23 May 1922) is a historian of South Asia who was greatly influential in the Subaltern Studies group, and was the editor of several of the group’s early anthologies. He migrated from India to the UK in 1959, and currently lives in Vienna, Austria.

His Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India is widely considered to be a classic. Aside from this, his founding statement in the first volume of Subaltern Studies set the agenda for the Subaltern Studies group, defining the "subaltern" as "the demographic difference between the total Indian population and all those whom we have described as the ‘elite’."

Sumit Sarkar

Sumit Sarkar (born 1939) is an Indian historian of modern India. He is the author of ‘Swadeshi Movement’. His father was Professor Susobhan Chandra Sarkar, a Head of Department of History at Presidency College, Calcutta and the founder Head of Department of the Department of History, Jadavpur University. His elder sister was Sipra Sarkar, a very well known Professor of History at Jadavpur University, Calcutta. His maternal uncle was Professor Prasanta Chandra Mahalanobis,
India's first planner. His maternal grandfather was Subodh Chandra Mahalanobis, a Professor and Head of Department of Physiology at Presidency College, Calcutta. He is married to fellow historian Tanika Sarkar, who is a Professor of History at Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

He studied at St. Xavier's Collegiate School, Presidency College, Calcutta where he obtained a First Class First in B.A. (Honours) in History, and at the University of Calcutta where he obtained a First Class First in M.A. in History and later, a Ph.D. in the same subject under the supervision of Professor Suren Sen. He was a Research Fellow at Wolfson College, Oxford. He taught for many years as a lecturer at the University of Calcutta, and later as a reader at the University of Burdwan. Until recently, he was Professor of History at the University of Delhi, where he began teaching career in 1976.

He was one of the founding members of the Subaltern Studies Collective. In some of his later writings he has sought to combine an empirical study of themes in late-colonial Indian history with an intervention in current debates about the extent and nature of western colonial domination. He entitled one of his essays "Decline of the Subaltern in Subaltern Studies", criticizing the turn to Foucauldian studies of power-knowledge that left behind many of the empiricist and Marxist efforts of the first two volumes of Subaltern Studies. He writes that the socialist inspiration behind the early volumes led to a greater impact in India itself, while the later volumes focus on western discourse, reified the subaltern-colonizer divide and then rose in prominence in western academia.

He was awarded the Rabindra Puraskar literary award by the West Bengal government in 2004. He returned the award in 2007 in protest against the expulsion of farmers from their land.

Controversy

He contributed a volume to the Towards Freedom project of the Indian Council of Historical Research (ICHR), publication of which was blocked in 2000 by the ICHR under the influence of the Indian government dominated by the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP). The publication of the volume was eventually allowed by the Government of India once the Congress party came to power after the general election of 2004.

Publications

- Towards Freedom: Documents on the Movement for Independence in India, 1946, (New Delhi, 2007)
- Beyond Nationalist Frames: Post-Modernism, Hindu Fundamentalism, History, (Delhi, 2002)
- Writing Social History, (Delhi, 1998)
- Modern India: 1885-1947, (Basingstoke, 1989)
- The Swadeshi Movement in Bengal, 1903-1908, (New Delhi, 1973)
Partha Chatterjee

Partha Chatterjee (born 1947) is a subaltern studies and postcolonial scholar. He is a multi-disciplinary scholar, with special emphasis on political science, anthropology and history. Chatterjee received Fukuoka Asian Culture Prize in 2009 for his contributions to academia.

He completed a B.A.(Hons.) in Political Science at Presidency College of the University of Calcutta and a Ph.D. at the University of Rochester. He is honorary professor of Political Science and was the Director of the Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta and is currently a Professor of Anthropology and South Asian Studies at Columbia in New York. He was a Founder-Member of the Subaltern Studies Collective. He is a Joint-editor of Baromash, a biannual Bengali literary journal published from Calcutta. In addition to numerous books in English, he has published books of essays in Bengali.

Chatterjee has been criticized by several Dalit scholars in India and overseas for ignoring the caste question and eliding it under the subaltern category. He is also a well-known playwright and actor on the Calcutta stage. He appeared in a cameo role in the 2007 Mira Nair film, The Namesake, based upon the novel by Jhumpa Lahiri. He is credited as a 'Reformed Hindu' in the film.
UNIT IV
RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Historiography has undergone great paradigmatic change due to the recent developments in historical understanding. Historians are trying to provide new interpretations for the already used source materials and also use hitherto unused sources. To a certain extent, these new methods of experiments in historical understanding and writing are necessitated by the intellectual interventions of Post-modernism.

Post-modernist thinking has made its impact upon every branch of knowledge and its intervention in historical understanding is crucially significant. The post modern scholars argue that the inferences that the historian draws from evidences are based on personal epistemic values and so several descriptions are possible on the same set of evidences. ‘All texts repress, as much as they express’. Interpretation of the past varies from person to person due to cultural prejudices and personal interests. The cultural bias leads the historian to misleading descriptions of the past. To them, history no longer has a big story to tell. The nation, the working class and even the idea of progress, all dissolve into the discursive construction of post modernism. Continuity and evolution are rejected for discontinuity.

A rich corpus of historical literature has been produced by the post-modern historians. They call for micro level historical studies and negate grand narratives. To them, history is purely subjective and not bothered about objectivity in history, as they consider it as a myth. They give importance to the small incidents of everyday life of ordinary individuals. ‘New Historicism’ developed as a part of post modernism, advocated by Stephen Greenblat and others is a trend in literary criticism and at the same time a method of cultural studies and a practice of historical analysis. It directly challenges the empiricist method and cut across the disciplinary enclaves of history, sociology, anthropology, politics, economics etc. The new Historicists argue that the description of historical events can only at the best be ‘representation’. History becomes a narrative of a particular author’s ideologically positioned view points.

‘Gender studies’ could be considered as a sub-field of history which looks at the past from the perspective of gender, despite its relatively short life. Gender History and its fore-runner ‘Women’s history’ have a rather significant effect on the general historical studies in the recent years. Post – modern criticism of essentialising socially constructed groups, be they gender group or otherwise, pointed out the weakness in various sorts of history. Women have multiple identities influenced by many number of factors including race and class and any examination of history which conflates their experiences, fails to provide an accurate picture.
‘Environmental history’ is the study of human beings and nature and their past inter-relationships. Environmental historians base their understanding of human and nature relations, primarily on historical methodology, but often borrow from the works of scientists and scholars in fields outside history. There are three main strands of environmental history; material environmental history focusing on changes in the biological and physical environment; cultural environmental history focusing on representations of the environment and what it says about a society; and political environmental history focusing on government regulations, laws and official policies. ‘Climate History’ is yet another part of Environmental history is of topical interest today in the light of disputes over climate change. One of the main areas of interest of climate historians is crop yields in relation to climate patterns. A recent study of ‘El-Nino’ patterns suggests that the French revolution was caused in part by the poor crop yields of 1778-89 in Europe, resulting from an unusually strong El-Nino effect.

History of mentalities

The term history of mentalities is a calque on the French histoire des mentalités (which might also be translated as 'history of attitudes', 'history of world-views'), a term referring to the manner of doing history associated with the tournant critique of the latter generation of the Annales School (in particular, the historian of books and reading Roger Chartier).

The history of mentalities focuses not on the wars, great men, and politics which have been the subject matter of most European history-writing since ancient times, but on the wider mindsets of past cultural and social groups. The term might also be seen as an equivalent to, or a hyponym of, cultural history.

Philippe Ariès (21 July 1914 – 8 February 1984)

Philippe Ariès was a French medievalist and historian of the family and childhood, in the style of Georges Duby. Ariès has written many books on the common daily life. His most prominent works regarded the change in the western attitudes towards death.

Ariès regarded himself as a “right-wing anarchist”. He was initially close to the Action française, but with time distanced himself from it, viewing it as excessively authoritarian—hence his self-description as an "anarchist". Ariès likewise contributed to La Nation française, a royalist review. However, he also cooperated with many left-wing French historians and did so especially closely with Michel Foucault, who wrote his obituary.

Paradoxically, during Ariès' life, his work was often better known in the English-speaking world than it was in France itself. He is known above all for his book L'Enfant et la Vie Familiale sous l'Ancien Régime (1960), which was translated into English as Centuries of Childhood (1962). This book stands pre-eminent in the history of childhood, as it was essentially the first book on the subject (although some antiquarian texts were in existence prior to this). Even today, Ariès remains the standard reference
to the topic. Ariès is most famous for his statement that "in medieval society, the idea of childhood did not exist". The central thesis of *Centuries of Childhood* is that attitudes towards children were progressive and evolved over time with economic change and social advancement, until childhood, as a concept and an accepted part of family life, came into being in the 17th century. It was thought that children were too weak to be counted and that they could disappear at any time. But these children were considered as an adult as soon as they could live without the help of their mothers, nanny, or someone else. *Centuries of Childhood* has had mixed fortunes. Ariès’ contribution was profoundly significant both in that it recognised childhood as a social construction rather than as a biological given, and in that it founded the history of childhood as a serious field of study. At the same time, his account of childhood has by now been widely criticised.

Ariès is likewise remembered for his invention of another field of study: the history of attitudes to death and dying. Ariès saw death, like childhood, as a social construction. His seminal work in this ambit is *L'Homme devant la mort* (1977), his last major book, published in the same year when his status as a historian was finally recognised by his induction into the École des hautes études en sciences sociales (EHESS) as a directeur d'études.

**Criticism of Centuries of Childhood**

There has been widespread criticism of the methods that Ariès used to draw his conclusions about the role of childhood in early modern Europe. One of his most noted critics was the historian Geoffrey Elton. Elton’s main criticism of Ariès is paraphrased in Richard J. Evans’s book on historiography, *In Defence of History*: “in everyday life children were indeed dressed differently to adults; they were just put in adult clothes to have their portraits painted”.

That is to say that Ariès took early modern portraits as an accurate representation of the look of early modern families whereas a lot of the clients would use them to improve their status. The assertion that the medieval world was ignorant of childhood has undergone considerable attack from other writers (for example, Kroll 1977, Shahar 1990).

Further criticism of Ariès is found in an article, available online, from 1992 by Harry Hendrick for the Journal of the Economic History Society. Within the article, entitled *Children and Childhood*, Hendrick lists four criticisms of Ariès’s work. "Firstly that his data are either unrepresentative or unreliable. Secondly that he takes evidence out of context, confuses prescription with practice, and uses atypical examples. Thirdly, that he implicitly denies the immutability of the special needs of children, for food, clothing, shelter, affection and conversation. Fourthly, that he puts undue emphasis on the work of moralists and educationalists while saying little of economic and political factors".
Michel Foucault (15 October 1926 – 25 June 1984)

Michel Foucault was a French philosopher, ideas, social, philologist and critic. His theories addressed the relationship between power and knowledge, and how they are used as a form of social control through societal institutions.

Born in Poitiers, France to an upper-middle-class family, Foucault was educated at the Lycée Henri-IV and then the École Normale Supérieure, where he developed an interest in philosophy and came under the influence of his tutors Jean Hyppolite and Louis Althusser. After several years as a cultural diplomat abroad, he returned to France and published his first major book, The History of Madness. After obtaining work between 1960 and 1966 at the University of Clermont-Ferrand, he produced two more significant publications, The Birth of the Clinic and The Order of Things, which displayed his increasing involvement with structuralism, a theoretical movement in social anthropology from which he later distanced himself. These first three histories were examples of a historiographical technique Foucault was developing he called archaeology which he would later give a comprehensive account of in The Archaeology of Knowledge.

From 1966 to 1968, Foucault lectured at the University of Tunis, Tunisia before returning to France, where he became head of the philosophy department at the new experimental university of Paris VIII. In 1970 he was admitted to the Collège de France, membership of which he retained till his death. He also became active in a number of left-wing groups involved in anti-racist campaigns, anti-human rights abuses movements, and the struggle for penal reform. He went on to publish The Archaeology of Knowledge, Discipline and Punish, and The History of Sexuality, his so-called genealogies which emphasized the role power plays in the evolution of discourse in society. Foucault died in Paris of neurological problems compounded by HIV/AIDS; he was the first public figure in France to have died from the disease, with his partner Daniel Defert founding the AIDES charity in his memory.

Foucault rejected the post-structuralist and postmodernist labels later attributed to him, preferring to classify his thought as a critical history of modernity. His thought has been highly influential for both academic and activist groups.

The Archaeology of Knowledge

The Archaeology of Knowledge is a 1969 book by the French philosopher Michel Foucault. It is a methodological and historiographical treatise promoting what Foucault calls "archaeology" or the "archaeological method", an analytical method he implicitly used in his previous works Madness and Civilization, The Birth of the Clinic, and The Order of Things. It is Foucault's only explicitly methodological work.

The premise of the book is that systems of thought and knowledge ("epistemes" or "discursive formations") are governed by rules (beyond those of grammar and logic) which operate in the consciousness of individual subjects and define a system of conceptual possibilities that determines the boundaries of thought in a given domain and period.
Most prominently in its Introduction and Conclusion, the book also becomes a philosophical treatment and critique of phenomenological and dogmatic structural readings of history and philosophy, portraying continuous narratives as naïve ways of projecting our own consciousness onto the past, thus being exclusive and excluding. Characteristically, Foucault demonstrates his political motivations, personal projects and preoccupations, and, explicitly and implicitly, the many influences that inform the discourse of the time.

Theory

Foucault argues that the contemporary study of the history of ideas, although it targets moments of transition between historical worldviews, is ultimately dependent on continuities that break down under close inspection. The history of ideas marks points of discontinuity between broadly defined modes of knowledge, but the assumption that those modes exist as wholes fails to do justice to the complexities of discourse. Foucault argues that "discourses" emerge and transform not according to a developing series of unarticulated, common worldviews, but according to a vast and complex set of discursive and institutional relationships, which are defined as much by breaks and ruptures as by unified themes.

Foucault's defines a "discourse" as a 'way of speaking'. Thus, his method studies only the set of 'things said' in their emergences and transformations, without any speculation about the overall, collective meaning of those statements, and carries his insistence on discourse-in-itself down to the most basic unit of things said: the statement (énoncé). During most of Archaeology, Foucault argues for and against various notions of what are inherent aspects of a statement, without arriving at a comprehensive definition. He does, however, argue that a statement is the rules which render an expression (that is, a phrase, a proposition, or a speech act) discursively meaningful. This concept of meaning differs from the concept of signification: Though an expression is signifying, for instance "The gold mountain is in California"; it may nevertheless be discursively meaningless and therefore have no existence within a certain discourse. For this reason, the "statement" is an existence function for discursive meaning.

Being rules, the "statement" has a special meaning in the Archaeology: it is not the expression itself, but the rules which make an expression discursively meaningful. These rules are not the syntax and semantics that makes an expression signifying. It is additional rules. In contrast to structuralists, Foucault demonstrates that the semantic and syntactic structures do not suffice to determine the discursive meaning of an expression. Depending on whether or not it complies with these rules of discursive meaning, a grammatically correct phrase may lack discursive meaning or, inversely, a grammatically incorrect sentence may be discursively meaningful - even meaningless letters (e.g. "QWERTY") may have discursive meaning. Thus, the meaning of expressions depends on the conditions in which they emerge and exist within a field of discourse; the discursive meaning of an expression is reliant on the succession of
statements that precede and follow it. In short, the "statements" Foucault analysed are not propositions, phrases, or speech acts. Rather, "statements" constitute a network of rules establishing which expressions are discursively meaningful, and these rules are the preconditions for signifying propositions, utterances, or speech acts to have discursive meaning. However, "statements" are also 'events', because, like other rules, they appear (or disappear) at some time.

Foucault's analysis then turns towards the organized dispersion of statements, which he calls discursive formations. Foucault reiterates that the analysis he is outlining is only one possible procedure, and that he is not seeking to displace other ways of analysing discourse or render them as invalid.

Foucault concludes Archaeology with responses to criticisms from a hypothetical critic (which he anticipates will occur after his book is read). Gilles Deleuze describes it as, "the most decisive step yet taken in the theory-practice of multiplicities."

**Local history**

Local history is the study of history in a geographically local context and it often concentrates on the local community. It incorporates cultural and social aspects of history. Historic plaques are one form of documentation of significant occurrences in the past and oral histories are another. Local history is often documented by local historical societies or groups that form to preserve a local historic building or other historic site. Many works of local history are compiled by amateur historians working independently or archivists employed by various organizations. An important aspect of local history is the publication and cataloguing of documents preserved in local or national records which relate to particular areas.

**Geographically contexts**

Local history tends to be less documented than other types, with fewer books and artifacts than that of a country or continent. Many local histories are recorded as oral tales or stories and so are more vulnerable than more well known issues. Artifacts of local history are often collected in local history museums, which may be housed in a historic house or other building. Individual historic sites are inherently local, although they may have national or world history importance as well. Many however have little overall historical impact but add depth to the local area.

**United Kingdom**

The British Association for Local History in the United Kingdom encourages and assists in the study of local history as an academic discipline and as a leisure activity by both individuals and groups. Most historic counties in England have record societies and archaeological and historical societies which coordinate the work of historians and other researchers concerned with that area.
Local history in the UK took a long time to be accepted as an academic discipline. In the 18th and 19th centuries, it was widely regarded as an antiquarian pursuit, suitable for country parsons. The Victoria History of the Counties of England project begun in 1899 in honour of Queen Victoria with the aim of creating an encyclopaedic history of each of the historic counties of England. The project is coordinated by the Institute of Historical Research at the University of London. The first academic post related to local history was at Reading University which appointed a research fellow in local history in 1908. There was a department of local history (but without a professor) at Leicester University from 1947. HPR Finberg was the first Professor of English Local History. He was appointed by Leicester in 1964. Local history continues to be neglected as an academic subject within universities. Academic local historians are often found within a more general department of history or in continuing education.

Local history is rarely taught as a separate subject in British schools. In 1908, a Board of Education circular had urged that schools should pay attention "to the history of the town and district" in which they were situated. In 1952, the Ministry of Education suggested schools should use local material to illustrate national themes.[3] Within the current National Curriculum, pupils at level 4 are expected to "show their knowledge and understanding of local, national and international history".

The Alan Ball Local History Awards were established in the 1980s to recognize outstanding contributions in local history publishing in the UK (both in print and in new media), and to encourage the publishing of such works by public libraries and local authorities.

United States

In the United States of America, local history is usually concentrated on any history of the place and people from a particular village or township. Several villages and townships would comprise one county or county history. Library records are often divided by State, then county, then township/local history. The American Local History Network (ALHN) in the USA provides a focus for accessing independent genealogical and historical resources.

In the United States, 79,000 historic sites are identified as listings on its National Register of Historic Places. State and local municipalities often have additional landmark designations to cover sites of more purely local interest. In addition; many regional and state historical societies maintain regional history and actively seek out missing historical collections.

A new form of local history is the movement of "If This House Could Talk" projects in various urban neighbourhoods in the United States. These small scale locally generated history events encourage an interest in history and provide for open ended participation by the general public. However, there is often no vetting or third party review of the factual evidence that is presented, and therefore such presentations may require oversight by professional third party history organizations if they are to be transcribed into ongoing collections of local history.
Russia, Ukraine and the former Soviet Union

In the USSR, Russia and Russian-speaking post-Soviet states local history is known as *krayevedenie* and taught in primary schools. There are also local history museums known as *krayevedcheskie muzei*.

In Ukraine, the study of local history is known as *krayeznavstvo*. The National Union of Local Lore Researchers of Ukraine (NSKU) is a trade union for researchers of local history in Ukraine. It was founded in 1925 and has 3,000 members.

Artistic genre uses

The Scottish novel, *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1824) by James Hogg, a dark study of criminal psychology and religious fanaticism, is essentially structured in all respects as a local history publication of the kind fashionable in Scotland in Hogg’s lifetime.

Narrative

A narrative (or story) is any account of connected events, presented to a reader or listener in a sequence of written or spoken words, or in a sequence of (moving) pictures. Narratives can be organized in a number of thematic and/or formal/stylistic categories: non-fiction (e.g. New Journalism, creative non-fiction, biographies, and historiography); fictionalized accounts of historical events (e.g. anecdotes, myths, and legends); and fiction proper (i.e. literature in prose, such as short stories and novels, and sometimes in poetry and drama, although in drama the events are primarily being *shown* instead of *told*). Narrative is found in all forms of human creativity and art, including speech, writing, songs, film, television, games, photography, theatre, and visual such as painting (with the modern art movements refusing the narrative in favour of the abstract and conceptual) that describes a sequence of events. The word derives from the Latin verb *narrare*, "to tell", which is derived from the adjective *gnarus*, "knowing" or "skilled".

The word "story" may be used as a synonym of "narrative". It can also be used to refer to the sequence of events described in a narrative. Narratives may also be nested within other narratives, such as narratives told by an unreliable narrator (a character) typically found in noir fiction genre. An important part of narration is the narrative mode, the set of methods used to communicate the narrative through a process narration (see also "Narrative Aesthetics" below).

Along with exposition, argumentation, and description, narration, broadly defined, is one of four rhetorical modes of discourse. More narrowly defined, it is the fiction-writing mode whereby the narrator communicates directly to the reader.

In historiography, according to Lawrence Stone, narrative has traditionally been the main rhetorical device used by historians. In 1979, at a time when the new Social History was demanding a social-science model of analysis, Stone detected a move back toward the narrative. Stone defined narrative as organized chronologically; focused on a
single coherent story; descriptive rather than analytical; concerned with people not abstract circumstances; and dealing with the particular and specific rather than the collective and statistical. He reported that, "More and more of the 'new historians' are now trying to discover what was going on inside people’s heads in the past, and what it was like to live in the past, questions which inevitably lead back to the use of narrative."

Some philosophers identify narratives with a type of explanation. Mark Bevir argues, for example, that narratives explain actions by appealing to the beliefs and desires of actors and by locating webs of beliefs in the context of historical traditions. Narrative is an alternative form of explanation to that associated with natural science.

Historians committed to a social science approach, however, have criticized the narrowness of narrative and its preference for anecdote over analysis, and clever examples rather than statistical regularities.

**Narrative history**

Narrative history is the practice of writing history in a story-based form. It can be divided into two subgenres: the traditional narrative and the modern narrative.

**Traditional narrative** focuses on the chronological order of history; it is event driven and tends to centre upon individuals, action, and intention. For example, in regards to the French Revolution, a historian who works with the traditional narrative might be more interested in the revolution as a single entity (one revolution), centre it in Paris, and rely heavily upon large figures such as Maximilien Robespierre.

Conversely, **modern narrative** typically focuses on structures and general trends. A modern narrative would break from rigid chronology if the historian felt it explained the concept better. In terms of the French Revolution, a historian working with the modern narrative might show general traits that were shared by revolutionaries across France but would also illustrate regional variations from those general trends (many confluent revolutions). Also this type of historian might use different sociological factors to show why different types of people supported the general revolution.

Historians who use the modern narrative might say that the traditional narrative focuses too much on what happened and not enough on why and causation. Also, that this form of narrative reduces history into neat boxes and thereby does an injustice to history. J H Hexter characterised such historians as "lumpers". In an essay on Christopher Hill, he remarked that "lumpers do not like accidents: they would prefer them vanish...The lumping historian wants to put all of the past into boxes...and then to tie all the boxes together into one nice shapely bundle."

Historians who utilize the traditional narrative might say that the modern narrative overburdens the reader with trivial data that had no significant effect on the progression of history; that it is the historian’s duty to take out what is inconsequential from history because to do otherwise might commit an injustice to the reader, who might end up believing that minor trivial events were actually important.
Oral history

Oral history is the collection and study of historical information about individuals, families, important events, or everyday life using audiotapes, videotapes, or transcriptions of planned interviews. These interviews are conducted with people who participated in or observed past events and whose memories and perceptions of these are to be preserved as an aural record for future generations. Oral history strives to obtain information from different perspectives, and most of these cannot be found in written sources. Oral history also refers to information gathered in this manner and to a written work (published or unpublished) based on such data, often preserved in archives and large libraries.

The term is sometimes used in a more general sense to refer to any information about past events that people who experienced them tell anybody else, but professional historians usually consider this to be oral tradition. However, as the Columbia Encyclopaedia explains:

Primitive societies have long relied on oral tradition to preserve a record of the past in the absence of written histories. In Western society, the use of oral material goes back to the early Greek historians Herodotus and Thucydides, both of whom made extensive use of oral reports from witnesses. The modern concept of oral history was developed in the 1940s by Allan Nevins and his associates at Columbia University.

Oral history in modern times

Oral history has become an international movement in historical research. Oral historians in different countries have approached the collection, analysis, and dissemination of oral history in different modes. However, it should also be noted that there are many ways of creating oral histories and carrying out the study of oral history even within individual national contexts. In the words of the Columbia Encyclopaedia:

The discipline came into its own in the 1960s and early 70s when inexpensive tape recorders were available to document such rising social movements as civil rights, feminism, and anti-Vietnam War protest. Authors such as Studs Terkel, Alex Haley, and Oscar Lewis have employed oral history in their books, many of which are largely based on interviews. In another important example of the genre, a massive archive covering the oral history of American music has been compiled at the Music. By the end of the 20th century oral history had become a respected discipline in many colleges and universities. At that time the Italian historian Alessandro Portelli and his associates began to study the role that memory itself, whether accurate or faulty, plays in the themes and structures of oral history. Their published work has since become standard material in the field, and many oral historians now include in their research the study of the subjective memory of the persons they interview.
Oral history in Britain and Northern Ireland

Since the early 1970s, oral history in Britain has grown from being a method in folklore studies to becoming a key component in community histories. Oral history continues to be an important means by which non-academics can actively participate in the compilation and study of history. However, practitioners across a wide range of academic disciplines have also developed the method into a way of recording, understanding, and archiving narrated memories. Influences have included women’s history and labour history.

In Britain the Oral History Society has played a key role in facilitating and developing the use of oral history. A more complete account of the history of oral history in Britain and Northern Ireland can be found at “Making Oral History” on the Institute of Historical Research’s website.

During 1998 and 1999, forty BBC local radio stations recorded personal oral histories from a broad cross-section of the population for the series The Century Speaks. The result was 640 half-hour radio documentaries, broadcast in the final weeks of the millennium, and one of the largest single oral history collections in Europe, the Millennium Memory Bank (MMB). The interview based recordings are held by the British Library Sounds’ in the oral history collection.

Modern oral history in the United States-

Elite studies

In 1948, Alan Nevins, a Columbia University historian, established the Columbia Oral History Research Office, with a mission of recording, transcribing, and preserving oral history interviews. In 1967, American oral historians founded the Oral History Association, and British oral historians founded the Oral History Society in 1969. There are now numerous national organizations and an International Oral History Association, which hold workshops and conferences and publish newsletters and journals devoted to oral history theory and practices.

Oral history began with a focus on national leaders in the United States, but has expanded to include groups representing the entire population. In Britain, the influence of ‘history from below’ and interviewing people who had been ‘hidden from history’ was more influential. However, in both countries elite oral history has emerged as an important strand. Scientists, for example, have been covered in numerous oral history projects. Doel (2003) discusses the use of oral interviews by scholars as primary sources. He lists major oral history projects in the history of science begun after 1950. Oral histories, he concludes, can augment the biographies of scientists and help spotlight how their social origins influenced their research. Doel acknowledges the common concerns historians have regarding the validity of oral history accounts. He identifies studies that used oral histories successfully to provide critical and unique insight into otherwise obscure subjects, such as the role scientists played in shaping US policy after World War II. Interviews furthermore can provide road maps for researching
archives, and can even serve as a fail-safe resource when written documents have been lost or destroyed. Launius shows the huge size and complexity of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) oral history program since 1959. NASA systematically documented its operations through oral histories. They can help to explore broader issues regarding the evolution of a major federal agency. The collection consists primarily of oral histories conducted by scholars working on books about the agency. Since 1996, however, the collection has also included oral histories of senior NASA administrators and officials, astronauts, and project managers, part of a broader project to document the lives of key agency individuals. Launius emphasizes efforts to include such less-well-known groups within the agency as the Astrobiology Program, and to collect the oral histories of women in NASA.

**Folklore roots and ordinary people in the United States**

Contemporary oral history involves recording or transcribing eyewitness accounts of historical events. Some anthropologists started collecting recordings (at first especially of Native American folklore) on phonograph cylinders in the late 19th century. In the 1930s, the Federal Writers’ Project—part of the Works Progress Administration (WPA)—sent out interviewers to collect accounts from various groups, including surviving witnesses of the Civil War, slavery, and other major historical events. The Library of Congress also began recording traditional American music and folklore onto acetate discs. With the development of audio tape recordings after World War II, the task of oral historians became easier.

In 1946, David P. Boder, a professor of psychology at the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago, travelled to Europe to record long interviews with “displaced persons”—most of them Holocaust survivors. Using the first device capable of capturing hours of audio—the wire recorder—Boder came back with the first recorded Holocaust testimonials and in all likelihood the first recorded oral histories of significant length.

Many state and local historical societies have oral history programs. Sinclair Kopp report on the Oregon Historical Society's program. It began in 1976 with the hiring of Charles Digregorio, who had studied at Columbia with Nevins. Thousands of sound recordings, reel-to-reel tapes, transcriptions, and radio broadcasts have made it one of the largest collections of oral history on the Pacific Coast. In addition to political figures and prominent businessmen, the Oregon Historical Society has done interviews with minorities, women, farmers, and other ordinary citizens, who have contributed extraordinary stories reflecting the state’s cultural and social heritage. Hill (2004) encourages oral history projects in high school courses. She demonstrates a lesson plan that encourages the study of local community history through interviews. By studying grassroots activism and the lived experiences of its participants, her high school students came to appreciate how African Americans worked to end Jim Crow laws in the 1950s.
Oral history in post-dictatorships-

Czech oral history

Czech oral history (likewise the oral history applied in others so called post communist countries) did not experience that building period in 1960s and 1970s, partly at the beginning in 1980s, where in the world is spoken about social movement more than a method. In 1970s and 1980s in Czech Republic (similarly in other countries of so-called socialist block) was OH absolutely unknown. History and historians did not know about it. Isolate attempts to invite witnesses for scientific project ended without accomplishment (ideological task, guiltlessness of method, imperfect technique, etc.). Hypothetically, if the OH had been discovered earlier for Czech historians, it could have acted positive and surely combative activist role (as A. Freund. P. Thomson and many others speak about it) like in other authoritative regimes. It could have aimed at enquiry of proscribe groups: dissent or prisoners of conscience. To cognate research or any other allusion about just mentioned groups of fellow – citizen was until 1989 totally avoided by communist historiography. Oral History was for the first time used in the mid 1990s but we can speak about some kind of progress for past six years, as Sean Field speaks about it, when it has transformed from disregard and criticized to possibly respect. In last three years one can even speak about boom of Oral History. In 2000, The Oral History Centre (COH) at the Institute of Contemporary History, Academy of Sciences, Czech Republic (AV ČR) was established.

Italian Oral History

Alessandro Portelli is an Italian Oral Historian. He is known for his work which compared workers’ experiences in Harlan County, Kentucky and Terni, Italy.

Spanish oral history

Because of repression during the Franco dictatorship (1939–75), the development of oral history in Spain was quite limited until the 1970s. It became well-developed in the early 1980s, and often had a focus on the Civil War years (1936–39), especially regarding the losers whose stories had been suppressed. The field was based at the University of Barcelona. Professor Mercedes Vilanova was a leading exponent, and combined it with her interest in quantification and social history. The Barcelona group sought to integrate oral sources with traditional written sources to create mainstream, not ghettoized, historical interpretations. They sought to give a public voice to neglected groups, such as women, illiterates, political leftists, and ethnic minorities.

Methods

Historians, folklorists, anthropologists, sociologists, journalists, linguists, and many others employ some form of interviewing in their research. Although multi-disciplinary, oral historians have promoted common ethics and standards of practice, most importantly the attaining of the “informed consent” of those being interviewed. Usually this is achieved through a deed of gift, which also establishes copyright ownership that is critical for publication and archival preservation.
Oral historians generally prefer to ask open-ended questions and avoid leading questions that encourage people to say what they think the interviewer wants them to say. Some interviews are “life reviews”, conducted with people at the end of their careers. Other interviews focus on a specific period or a specific event in people’s lives, such as in the case of war veterans or survivors of a hurricane.

Feldstein considers oral history to be akin to journalism, both are committed to uncovering truths and compiling narratives about people, places, and events. Feldstein says each could benefit from adopting techniques from the other. Journalism could benefit by emulating the exhaustive and nuanced research methodologies used by oral historians. The practice of oral historians could be enhanced by utilizing the more sophisticated interviewing techniques employed by journalists, in particular, the use of adversarial encounters as a tactic for obtaining information from a respondent.

The first oral history archives focused on interviews with prominent politicians, diplomats, military officers, and business leaders. By the 1960s and ‘70s, interviewing began to be employed more often when historians investigated history from below. Whatever the field or focus of a project, oral historians attempt to record the memories of many different people when researching a given event. Interviewing a single person provides a single perspective. Individuals may misremember events or distort their account for personal reasons. By interviewing widely, oral historians seek points of agreement among many different sources, and also record the complexity of the issues.

The nature of memory—both individual and community—is as much a part of the practice of oral history as are the stories collected.

Legal interpretation and relationship to historical truth

In 1997 the Supreme Court of Canada, in the Delgamuukw v. British Columbia trial, ruled that oral histories were just as important as written testimony. Of oral histories, it said "that they are tangential to the ultimate purpose of the fact-finding process at trial – the determination of the historical truth."

Organization

National and international organizations promote scholarship in the field. The Oral History Review is a scholarly journal begun in 1974. The Oral History Journal in Britain was established two years before the Review.

Micro history

Carlo Ginzburg one of the best-known historians identified with micro history, traces the first use of this term to an American scholar, George R. Stewart. In his book, Pickett’s Charge : A Micro history of the Final Charge at Gettysburg, July 3, 1863, published in 1959, Stewart uses the term. The book is centre on an event which lasted for only jabot twenty minutes.
In 1968, Luis Gonzalez used the term micro history' in the subtitle of his book which deals with the changes experienced over four centuries by a tiny, 'forgotten' village in Mexico. In fact, as Gonzalez himself pointed out, the term was also used in 1960 by Fernando Braudel. But, for Braudel, it had a negative connotation' and was synonymous with the 'history of events'. The word appears in a novel by Raymond Queneau in 1965. This novel was translated into Italian by Italo Calvino in 1967. From this and from its use in Primo Levi’s The Periodic Table (1975) that this word first came to be used extensively for certain kind of historical practice. Giovanni Levi was the first Italian historian to extensively use this term.

Thus micro history, as a conceivable historical practice, emerged during the 1970s and the 1980s in Italy. Although it had its variants in Germany in Alltagsgeschichte or the 'history of everyday life' and in France and the United States in the new cultural history, it is the Italian micro historians who set most of the agenda for writing this version of history.

Carlo Ginzburg, Giovanni Levi, Carlo Poni, Edoardo Grendi and Gianna Pomata are some of the Italian historian's fichu made the word famous through their writings. Ginzburg’s The Cheese and the Worms': The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller (1976), ' The Enigma opera: Pier Della Francesca (1981), and Ecstasies: Deciphering the Witches’ Sabbath (1990), and Giovanni Levi's Inheriting Power: The Story of an Exorcist (1985) are some of the representative texts of this historiographical trend.

The Italian journal Quaderni Storici, right since its foundation in 1966, has served as the channel for this trend in historiography. However, micro history is part of a wider trend which includes intensive local and individual studies by Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie in France, Hans Medick in Germany, and Robert Darnton and Natalie Zeon Davis in the US.

Micro history is a late modern, sometimes, postmodern, response to the problems of modern historiography. The micro historians are critical of not only the Rankean paradigm, but also the macro historical paradigms developed by Marxism, the Annals School and even the old social history.

The micro historians do not have an optimistic view about the various benefits brought about by the modern technology. Thus the objection to the macro historical discourse is not only, methodological, but also ethical and political. The macro historical conception, they argue, praise the achievements of modernization, modern science and technology while ignoring the human cost; they also neglect the experiences of the 'little people' who has to bear the brunt of 'progress'. The micro historians define their historiographical practice against approach of the analytical 41 social science, met history of Marxism and the non-human grand history of the Annales School, particularly Braudel.

The micro historians trace the origins of this trend to the crisis of macro history in the 1970s. There was an increasing disenchantment with grand narratives and the social scientific studies based on quantitative data not because these approaches were
inherently wrong but because they did not capture the reality at the micro level. According to the micro historians, the attempt should be ‘to open history to peoples who would be left out by other methods’ and ‘to elucidate historical causation on the level of small groups where most of life takes place’.

Giovanni Levi, one of the founders of this trend, points out that it is now generally accepted that ‘the 1970s and 1980s were almost universally years of crisis for the prevailing optimistic belief that the world would be rapidly and radically transformed along revolutionary lines’.

Moreover, ‘many of the hopes and mythologies which had previously guided a major part of the cultural debate, including the realm of historiography, were proving to be not so much invalid as inadequate in the face of the unpredictable consequences of political events and social realities - events and realities which were very far from conforming to the optimistic models proposed by the great Marxist or functionalist systems’.

This crisis also entailed conceptual and methodological failure to comprehend the reality at the ground day-to-day level. Levi states that the ‘conceptual apparatus with which social scientists of all persuasions interpreted current or past change was weighed down by a burden of inherited positivism.

Forecasts of social behaviour were proving to be demonstrably erroneous and this failure of existing systems and paradigms required not so much the construction of a new general social theory as a complete revision of existing tools of research’.

Micro history was one response to this comprehensive crisis. It was a groundbreaking and radical response and it took the historiography away from its focus on the ‘big structures, large processes and huge comparisons’. Instead, it concentrated on the small units in society. It was severely critical of the large quantitative studies and macro level discourses because it distorted the reality at small level.

It focused on the small units and on the lives of the individuals living within those units. It was felt that this would lead to better understanding of reality at small level. As Giovanni Levi put it: ‘The unifying principle of all micro historical research is the belief that microscopic observation will reveal factors previously unobserved.’

However, according to Levi, it was not at the theoretical level that its significance should be seen. Micro history is ‘essentially a historiographical practice whereas its theoretical references are varied and, in a sense, eclectic’. It was a historiographical experiment which has ‘no body of established orthodoxy to draw on’.

There were various other reactions to this crisis. One of them was, in the words of Levi, the resort to ‘a desperate relativism, neo-idealism or even the return to a philosophy riddled with irrationality’. However, Levi believed that the ‘historical research is not a purely rhetorical and aesthetic activity’.
He firmly takes the side of historians and social scientists who believe that there is a reality outside the texts and it is possible to comprehend it. Thus the micro historian is 'not simply concerned with the interpretation of meanings but rather with defining the ambiguities of the symbolic world, the plurality of possible interpretations of it and the struggle which takes place over symbolic as much as over material resources'. Thus, for Levi, micro history is poised delicately between the approach of the analytical social sciences and the postmodernist relativism. Micro history thus had a very specific location within the so-called new history.

It was not simply a question of correcting those aspects of academic historiography which no longer appeared to function. It was more important to refute relativism, irrationalism and the reduction of the historian's work to a purely rhetorical activity which interprets texts and not events themselves.'

Carlo Ginzburg supports Levi 'against the relativist positions, including the one warmly espoused by Ankersmit that reduce historiography to a textual dimension, depriving it of any cognitive value'.

The adherents of micro history in Italy had started as Marxists and, in keeping with their Marxist past, they retain three elements of the Marxist theory of history. They believe:

i) That social and economic inequality exists in all societies;

ii) That culture is not completely autonomous, but is associated with economic forces; and

iii) that history is nearer to social sciences than to poetry and is, therefore, based on facts and requires rigorous analysis. Moreover, the subject matter the historians deal with is real. Thus micro history, although recognizing that 'all phases through which research unfolds are constructed and not given', is categorized, according to Ginsburg, by 'an explicit rejection of the skeptical implications (postmodernist, if you will) so largely present in European and American historiography of the 1980s and early 1990s'.

It is defined by its 'insistence on context, exactly the opposite of the isolated contemplation of the fragmentary advocated by Ankersmit'. It focuses on what Edoardo Grendi, one of its ideologues, called the 'exceptional normal'. Methodologically, as Levi points out, it is characterized 'as a practice based on the reduction of the scale of observation, on a microscopic analysis and an intensive study of the documentary material'. He further emphasizes that 'For micro history the reduction of scale is an analytical procedure, which may be applied anywhere independently of the dimensions of the object analyzed'.

The micro historians believe that it is only at the small level that the real nature of various values and beliefs held by people may be revealed. Roger Chertier, commenting on Ginzburg's famous book, The Cheese and the Worms, captures this aspect of micro history clearly : 'It is this reduced scale, and probably on this scale alone, that we can understand, without deterministic reduction, the relationships between systems of beliefs, of values and representations on the one hand, and social affiliations on the other.'
The study of the small scale is also undertaken by the cultural anthropologists, led by Clifford Geertz, whose method of thick description finds resonance in some of the works of these historians. However, there are many points of differences between the two. Firstly, the micro historians accord more importance to theory than what Geertz and his followers do. Secondly, they are not willing to go far in the direction of relativism. And, lastly, they criticize a homogeneous conception of culture in the works of Geertz.

As Levi says:

'It seems to me that one of the main differences of perspective between micro history and interpretive anthropology is that the latter sees a homogeneous meaning in public signs and symbols whereas micro history seeks to define and measure them with reference to the multiplicity of social representations they produce.'

Levi summarizes the basic features of micro history: 'the reduction of scale, the debate about rationality, the small clue as scientific paradigm, the role of the particular (not, however, in opposition to the social), the attention to reception and narrative, a specific definition of context and the rejection of relativism'.

But micro historians should not be viewed as a monolithic bloc even in Italy. There are wide differences between them. On the one hand, there is Levi who is theoretically much closer to the analytical history and believes that history is a social science, and not a work of art.

On the other hand, Gianna Pomata believes that there is 'a dazzling prospect of a history that would be thoroughly up to the most rigorous standards of the craft while also matching, in terms of vitality and intensity of vision, the work of art'. Carlo Ginzburg stands somewhere in the middle. On the whole, it may be said, as Georg G.Iggers points out, that micro history 'has never been able to escape the framework of larger structures and transformations in which history takes place'.

However, it can be said in defence of the micro historians that it is a conscious choice and not some theoretical slip. Most of them have chosen to criticize the methodology of macro history; but, at the same time, they have thoroughly rejected the relativism associated with the linguistic turn, postmodernism, and cultural relativism.
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• To enable the students to understand history of the discipline of history.
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• Influence of Religion - regional histories - historical consciousness in myth and legends.

UNIT II - Diffusion of Knowledge - Humanistic Approach

• Segmentisation of Knowledge - Bacon - Descartes - Cartesianism - Vicco -anti-Cartesianism.
• Enlightenment Modernity - Secularisation and Scrutiny of Sources in History- use of regional language for writing history.
• Positivism - Social Physics - Ranke and Berlin Revolution.
• Philosophy of History Hegal - Giest - Dialectics.
• Toynbee, Spengler - Herder and Zeist.
• Narratives - Gibbon and Carlyle

UNIT III - Materialistic Interpretation of History

• Critique of positivism - Marx
• Base and Superstructure
• Structuralism
• Saussure - Claude Levi Strauss
• Annals - March Bloc - Lefebvre - Braudal.
• Social history and History from below - emergence of subaltern writers -Gramsci - Christopher Hill - E.P. Thompson, Ranajith Guha - Sumit Sarkar -Partha Chatterjee.

UNIT IV - Recent Developments

• History of Mentalities - Philip Aries - Foucault and Archaeology of Knowledge.
• Local History
• Narratives
• Contemporary issues - oral history - micro history.

**Readings:**

Carr. E.H: *What is History?*

Burke Peter: *The French Historical Revolution*


Barnes Robert M and H Raymond Pickard: *Philosophy of History*


Collingwood. R.G: *The Idea of History*


Marwick Arthur: *Nature of History*


Sheik Ali: *History Its Theory and Method*


Sreedharan. E: *A Text book of Historiography*

**Further Readings:**

Rouse. A.L: *The Use of History*

Philips (ed): *Historians of India Pakistan and Ceylon*

Cannadian David: *What is History Now*

Hobsbaum. E.J: *On History*
