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UNIT-1

HISTORY AS A DISCIPLINE

Throughout the world, studying history is an essential element of good liberal arts education. Knowledge of history is indispensable to understanding who we are and where we fit in the world. As a discipline, history is the study of the past. In other words, historians study and interpret the past. In order to do this, they must find evidence about the past, ask questions of that evidence, and come up with explanations that make sense of what the evidence says about the people, events, places, and time periods under consideration. Because it is impossible for a single historian to study the history of all people, events, places, and time periods, historians develop specialties within the discipline.

Historians may study the history of particular groups of people (e.g., women’s history or African-American history), they may study particular events (e.g., history of the Vietnam War or the Crusades), they may study the history of a single country or region (e.g., Pacific Northwest history or Chinese history), or they may confine their interest to a limited time period (e.g., early American history or Medieval history).

In addition to limiting the scope of their historical study, historians also take different approaches to their inquiries. For example, they may decide to look at the cultural or social relationships between the people they are studying, at the intellectual or religious debates within a particular society or group, at the political or economic history of a country or region, or at the history of the environment or science and technology during a pivotal time frame. Because different historians take different approaches to their research and writing, and because individual historians bring different perspectives and different questions to their work, historical interpretations are constantly changing and evolving.

The study of history is therefore dynamic and forever new. Far from being the study of facts and dates, understanding history means understanding how to read and interpret the past. It is through reading and interpreting our various pasts that we can know and understand the present and the future.

Why study History?

People live in the present. They plan for and worry about the future. History, however, is the study of the past. Given all the demands that press in from living in the present and anticipating what is yet to come, why bother with what has been? Given all the desirable and available branches of knowledge, why insist—as most American educational programs do—on a good bit of history? And why urge many students to study even more history than they are required to? Any subject of study needs justification: its advocates must explain why it is worth attention. Most widely accepted subjects—and history is certainly one of them—attract some people who simply like the information and modes of thought involved. But audiences less spontaneously drawn to the subject and more doubtful about why to bother need to know what the purpose is. Historians do not perform heart transplants, improve highway design, or arrest criminals. In a society that quite
correctly expects education to serve useful purposes, the functions of history can seem more
difficult to define than those of engineering or medicine. History is in fact very useful, actually
indispensable, but the products of historical study are less tangible, sometimes less immediate, than
those that stem from some other disciplines.

In the past history has been justified for reasons we would no longer accept. For instance, one of
the reasons history holds its place in current education is because earlier leaders believed that a
knowledge of certain historical facts helped distinguish the educated from the uneducated; the
person who could reel off the date of the Norman conquest of England (1066) or the name of the
person who came up with the theory of evolution at about the same time that Darwin did (Wallace)
was deemed superior—a better candidate for law school or even a business promotion. Knowledge
of historical facts has been used as a screening device in many societies, from China to the United
States, and the habit is still with us to some extent. Unfortunately, this use can encourage mindless
memorization—a real but not very appealing aspect of the discipline.

History should be studied because it is essential to individuals and to society, and because it harbors
beauty. There are many ways to discuss the real functions of the subject—as there are many
different historical talents and many different paths to historical meaning. All definitions of
history's utility, however, rely on two fundamental facts.

**History helps us understand people and societies**

In the first place, history offers a storehouse of information about how people and societies
behave. Understanding the operations of people and societies is difficult, though a number of
disciplines make the attempt. An exclusive reliance on current data would needlessly handicap our
efforts. How can we evaluate war if the nation is at peace—unless we use historical materials? How
can we understand genius, the influence of technological innovation, or the role that beliefs play in
shaping family life, if we don't use what we know about experiences in the past? Some social
scientists attempt to formulate laws or theories about human behavior. But even these recourses
depend on historical information, except for in limited, often artificial cases in which experiments
can be devised to determine how people act. Major aspects of a society's operation, like mass
elections, missionary activities, or military alliances, cannot be set up as precise experiments.
Consequently, history must serve, however imperfectly, as our laboratory, and data from the past
must serve as our most vital evidence in the unavoidable quest to figure out why our complex
species behaves as it does in societal settings. This, fundamentally, is why we cannot stay away
from history: it offers the only extensive evidential base for the contemplation and analysis of how
societies function, and people need to have some sense of how societies function simply to run their
own lives.

**History helps us understand change and how the society we live in came to be**

The second reason history is inescapable as a subject of serious study follows closely on the first.
The past causes the present, and so the future. Any time we try to know why something
happened—whether a shift in political party dominance in the American Congress, a major change
in the teenage suicide rate, or a war in the Balkans or the Middle East—we have to look for factors
that took shape earlier. Sometimes fairly recent history will suffice to explain a major development,
but often we need to look further back to identify the causes of change. Only through studying
history can we grasp how things change; only through history can we begin to comprehend the factors that cause change; and only through history can we understand what elements of an institution or a society persist despite change.

The importance of history in explaining and understanding change in human behavior is no mere abstraction. Take an important human phenomenon such as alcoholism. Through biological experiments scientists have identified specific genes that seem to cause a proclivity toward alcohol addiction in some individuals. This is a notable advance. But alcoholism, as a social reality, has a history: rates of alcoholism have risen and fallen, and they have varied from one group to the next. Attitudes and policies about alcoholism have also changed and varied. History is indispensable to understanding why such changes occur. And in many ways historical analysis is a more challenging kind of exploration than genetic experimentation. Historians have in fact greatly contributed in recent decades to our understanding of trends (or patterns of change) in alcoholism and to our grasp of the dimensions of addiction as an evolving social problem.

One of the leading concerns of contemporary American politics is low voter turnout, even for major elections. A historical analysis of changes in voter turnout can help us begin to understand the problem we face today. What were turnouts in the past? When did the decline set in? Once we determine when the trend began, we can try to identify which of the factors present at the time combined to set the trend in motion. Do the same factors sustain the trend still, or are there new ingredients that have contributed to it in more recent decades? A purely contemporary analysis may shed some light on the problem, but a historical assessment is clearly fundamental—and essential for anyone concerned about American political health today.

History, then, provides the only extensive materials available to study the human condition. It also focuses attention on the complex processes of social change, including the factors that are causing change around us today. Here, at base, are the two related reasons many people become enthralled with the examination of the past and why our society requires and encourages the study of history as a major subject in the schools.

The importance of history in our own lives

These two above fundamental reasons for studying history underlie more specific and quite diverse uses of history in our own lives. History well told is beautiful. Many of the historians who most appeal to the general reading public know the importance of dramatic and skillful writing—as well as of accuracy. Biography and military history appeal in part because of the tales they contain. History as art and entertainment serves a real purpose, on aesthetic grounds but also on the level of human understanding. Stories well done are stories that reveal how people and societies have actually functioned, and they prompt thoughts about the human experience in other times and places. The same aesthetic and humanistic goals inspire people to immerse themselves in efforts to reconstruct quite remote pasts, far removed from immediate, present-day utility. Exploring what historians sometimes call the "pastness of the past"—the ways people in distant ages constructed their lives—involves a sense of beauty and excitement, and ultimately another perspective on human life and society.
History contributes to moral understanding

History also provides a terrain for moral contemplation. Studying the stories of individuals and situations in the past allows a student of history to test his or her own moral sense, to hone it against some of the real complexities individuals have faced in difficult settings. People who have weathered adversity not just in some work of fiction, but in real, historical circumstances can provide inspiration. "History teaching by example" is one phrase that describes this use of a study of the past—a study not only of certifiable heroes, the great men and women of history who successfully worked through moral dilemmas, but also of more ordinary people who provide lessons in courage, diligence, or constructive protest.

History provides identity

History also helps provide identity, and this is unquestionably one of the reasons all modern nations encourage its teaching in some form. Historical data include evidence about how families, groups, institutions and whole countries were formed and about how they have evolved while retaining cohesion. For many Americans, studying the history of one's own family is the most obvious use of history, for it provides facts about genealogy and (at a slightly more complex level) a basis for understanding how the family has interacted with larger historical change. Family identity is established and confirmed. Many institutions, businesses, communities, and social units, such as ethnic groups in the United States, use history for similar identity purposes. Merely defining the group in the present pales against the possibility of forming an identity based on a rich past. And of course nations use identity history as well—and sometimes abuse it. Histories that tell the national story, emphasizing distinctive features of the national experience, are meant to drive home an understanding of national values and a commitment to national loyalty.

Studying history is essential for good citizenship

A study of history is essential for good citizenship. This is the most common justification for the place of history in school curricula. Sometimes advocates of citizenship history hope merely to promote national identity and loyalty through a history spiced by vivid stories and lessons in individual success and morality. But the importance of history for citizenship goes beyond this narrow goal and can even challenge it at some points.

History that lays the foundation for genuine citizenship returns, in one sense, to the essential uses of the study of the past. History provides data about the emergence of national institutions, problems, and values—it's the only significant storehouse of such data available. It offers evidence also about how nations have interacted with other societies, providing international and comparative perspectives essential for responsible citizenship. Further, studying history helps us understand how recent, current, and prospective changes that affect the lives of citizens are emerging or may emerge and what causes are involved. More important, studying history encourages habits of mind that are vital for responsible public behavior, whether as a national or community leader, an informed voter, a petitioner, or a simple observer.
What skills does a student of history develop?

What does a well-trained student of history, schooled to work on past materials and on case studies in social change, learn how to do? The list is manageable, but it contains several overlapping categories.

**The Ability to Assess Evidence:** The study of history builds experience in dealing with and assessing various kinds of evidence—the sorts of evidence historians use in shaping the most accurate pictures of the past that they can. Learning how to interpret the statements of past political leaders—one kind of evidence—helps form the capacity to distinguish between the objective and the self-serving among statements made by present-day political leaders. Learning how to combine different kinds of evidence—public statements, private records, numerical data, visual materials—develops the ability to make coherent arguments based on a variety of data. This skill can also be applied to information encountered in everyday life.

**The Ability to Assess Conflicting Interpretations:** Learning history means gaining some skill in sorting through diverse, often conflicting interpretations. Understanding how societies work—the central goal of historical study—is inherently imprecise, and the same certainly holds true for understanding what is going on in the present day. Learning how to identify and evaluate conflicting interpretations is an essential citizenship skill for which history, as an often-contested laboratory of human experience, provides training. This is one area in which the full benefits of historical study sometimes clash with the narrower uses of the past to construct identity. Experience in examining past situations provides a constructively critical sense that can be applied to partisan claims about the glories of national or group identity. The study of history in no sense undermines loyalty or commitment, but it does teach the need for assessing arguments, and it provides opportunities to engage in debate and achieve perspective.

**Experience in Assessing Past Examples of Change:** Experience in assessing past examples of change is vital to understanding change in society today—it's an essential skill in what we are regularly told is our "ever-changing world." Analysis of change means developing some capacity for determining the magnitude and significance of change, for some changes are more fundamental than others. Comparing particular changes to relevant examples from the past helps students of history develop this capacity. The ability to identify the continuities that always accompany even the most dramatic changes also comes from studying history, as does the skill to determine probable causes of change. Learning history helps one figure out, for example, if one main factor—such as a technological innovation or some deliberate new policy—accounts for a change or whether, as is more commonly the case, a number of factors combine to generate the actual change that occurs.

Historical study, in sum, is crucial to the promotion of that elusive creature, the well-informed citizen. It provides basic factual information about the background of our political institutions and about the values and problems that affect our social well-being. It also contributes to our capacity to use evidence, assess interpretations, and analyze change and continuities. No one can ever quite deal with the present as the historian deals with the past—we lack the perspective for this feat; but we can move in this direction by applying historical habits of mind, and we will function as better citizens in the process.
History is useful in the World of Work

History is useful for work. Its study helps create good businesspeople, professionals, and political leaders. The number of explicit professional jobs for historians is considerable, but most people who study history do not become professional historians. Professional historians teach at various levels, work in museums and media centers, do historical research for businesses or public agencies, or participate in the growing number of historical consultancies. These categories are important—indeed vital—to keep the basic enterprise of history going, but most people who study history use their training for broader professional purposes. Students of history find their experience directly relevant to jobs in a variety of careers as well as to further study in fields like law and public administration. Employers often deliberately seek students with the kinds of capacities historical study promotes. The reasons are not hard to identify: students of history acquire, by studying different phases of the past and different societies in the past, a broad perspective that gives them the range and flexibility required in many work situations. They develop research skills, the ability to find and evaluate sources of information, and the means to identify and evaluate diverse interpretations. Work in history also improves basic writing and speaking skills and is directly relevant to many of the analytical requirements in the public and private sectors, where the capacities to identify, assess, and explain trends is essential. Historical study is unquestionably an asset for a variety of work and professional situations; even though it does not, for most students, lead as directly to a particular job slot, as do some technical fields. But history particularly prepares students for the long haul in their careers, its qualities helping adaptation and advancement beyond entry-level employment. There is no denying that in our society many people who are drawn to historical study worry about relevance. In our changing economy, there is concern about job futures in most fields. Historical training is not, however, an indulgence; it applies directly to many careers and can clearly help us in our working lives.

What kind of history should we study?

The question of why we should study history entails several subsidiary issues about what kind of history should be studied. Historians and the general public alike can generate a lot of heat about what specific history courses should appear in what part of the curriculum. Many of the benefits of history derive from various kinds of history, whether local or national or focused on one culture or the world. Gripping instances of history as storytelling, as moral example, and as analysis come from all sorts of settings. The most intense debates about what history should cover occur in relation to identity history and the attempt to argue that knowledge of certain historical facts marks one as an educated person. Some people feel that in order to become good citizens students must learn to recite the preamble of the American constitution or be able to identify Thomas Edison—though many historians would dissent from an unduly long list of factual obligations. Correspondingly, some feminists, eager to use history as part of their struggle, want to make sure that students know the names of key past leaders such as Susan B. Anthony. The range of possible survey and memorization chores is considerable—one reason that history texts are often quite long.

There is a fundamental tension in teaching and learning history between covering facts and developing historical habits of mind. Because history provides an immediate background to our own life and age, it is highly desirable to learn about forces that arose in the past and continue to affect the modern world. This type of knowledge requires some attention to comprehending the
development of national institutions and trends. It also demands some historical understanding of key forces in the wider world. The ongoing tension between Christianity and Islam, for instance, requires some knowledge of patterns that took shape over 12 centuries ago. Indeed, the pressing need to learn about issues of importance throughout the world is the basic reason that world history has been gaining ground in American curriculums. Historical habits of mind are enriched when we learn to compare different patterns of historical development, which means some study of other national traditions and civilizations.

The key to developing historical habits of mind, however, is having repeated experience in historical inquiry. Such experience should involve a variety of materials and a diversity of analytical problems. Facts are essential in this process, for historical analysis depends on data, but it does not matter whether these facts come from local, national, or world history—although it's most useful to study a range of settings. What matters is learning how to assess different magnitudes of historical change, different examples of conflicting interpretations, and multiple kinds of evidence. Developing the ability to repeat fundamental thinking habits through increasingly complex exercises is essential. Historical processes and institutions that are deemed especially important to specific curriculums can, of course, be used to teach historical inquiry. Appropriate balance is the obvious goal, with an insistence on factual knowledge not allowed to overshadow the need to develop historical habits of mind.

Exposure to certain essential historical episodes and experience in historical inquiry are crucial to any program of historical study, but they require supplement. No program can be fully functional if it does not allow for whimsy and individual taste. Pursuing particular stories or types of problems, simply because they tickle the fancy, contributes to a rounded intellectual life. Similarly, no program in history is complete unless it provides some understanding of the ongoing role of historical inquiry in expanding our knowledge of the past and, with it, of human and social behavior. The past two decades have seen a genuine explosion of historical information and analysis, as additional facets of human behavior have been subjected to research and interpretation. And there is every sign that historians are continuing to expand our understanding of the past. It's clear that the discipline of history is a source of innovation and not merely a framework for repeated renderings of established data and familiar stories.

Why study history? The answer is because we virtually must, to gain access to the laboratory of human experience. When we study it reasonably well, and so acquire some usable habits of mind, as well as some basic data about the forces that affect our own lives, we emerge with relevant skills and an enhanced capacity for informed citizenship, critical thinking and simple awareness. The uses of history are varied. Studying history can help us develop some literally "salable" skills, but its study must not be pinned down to the narrowest utilitarianism. Some history—that confined to personal recollections about changes and continuities in the immediate environment—is essential to function beyond childhood. Some history depends on personal taste, where one finds beauty, the joy of discovery, or intellectual challenge. Between the inescapable minimum and the pleasure of deep commitment comes the history that, through cumulative skill in interpreting the unfolding human record, provides a real grasp of how the world works.
Meaning and Scope of History

History (from Greek ἱστορία - historia, meaning "inquiry, knowledge acquired by investigation") is the discovery, collection, organization, and presentation of information about past events. History can also mean the period of time after writing was invented. Scholars who write about history are called historians. It is a field of research which uses a narrative to examine and analyse the sequence of events, and it sometimes attempts to investigate objectively the patterns of cause and effect that determine events. Historians debate the nature of history and its usefulness. This includes discussing the study of the discipline as an end in itself and as a way of providing "perspective" on the problems of the present. The stories common to a particular culture, but not supported by external sources (such as the legends surrounding King Arthur) are usually classified as cultural heritage rather than the "disinterested investigation" needed by the discipline of history. Events of the past prior to written record are considered prehistory.

Amongst scholars, the 5th-century BC Greek historian Herodotus is considered to be the "father of history", and, along with his contemporary Thucydides, forms the foundations for the modern study of history. Their influence, along with other historical traditions in other parts of their world, has spawned many different interpretations of the nature of history which has evolved over the centuries and is continuing to change. The modern study of history has many different fields including those that focus on certain regions and those which focus on certain topical or thematical elements of historical investigation. Often history is taught as part of primary and secondary education, and the academic study of history is a major discipline in University studies.

Aristotle regarded it as a "systematic account of a set of natural phenomena, whether or not chronological ordering was a factor in the account." The term "history" has now come to be applied to accounts of events that are narrated in a chronological order, and deal with the past of mankind. E. H. Carr defined history as an "unending dialogue between the present and the past." Jawaharlal Nehru observed that man’s growth from barbarism to civilization is supposed to be the theme of history." Will Durant called history "a narrative of what civilized men have thought or done in the past time."

B. Shiekh Ali writes, “With the passage of time the scope of history has been widened and new areas are included in it. History is gradually assuming all the three dimensions, as its main job is to narrate what happened, to discuss how it happened and to analyse why it happened. It is growing in its extent as well.” History is one of the oldest subjects. In ancient period there were only some good historians and their writings were only limited to a few wars, military achievement and religion etc. Only some particular events were recorded by them, and mostly their historical works were confined in praise of the kings who patronised them. So the area of history had not much scope. But now-a-days the situation has undergone a great change and the scope of history has widened.

As the society developed the scope of history has been undergoing constant change. There are three important aspects, first to record what has happened second why and how did it happened and third how it has happened. Historians have presented the historical events with critical approach instead of mere cataloguing the events and also describing the rise and fall of dynasties, lifestyle of the rulers and also customs and conventions. Today the historians discuss activities of common men also. History has developed its own independent status. Earlier it is closely linked with
philosophy or politics, but now it describes not only beliefs, moral customs of society but also duties of a common man in society. Indeed, the historians are going to include every field of study. Thus scope is widening day by day. A Chinese proverb makes the position of common men quite significant. The great men are public misfortune as it is the common man who has played the vital role in assisting the great man to achieve fame. The rank and file of the Napoleonic legion shed their blood but fame went to their master. Therefore the historians have switched over their attention to the ordinary men, women and children.

The scope of history is now comprehensive, because every aspect of human activities is covered. Now-a-days historians are studying government laws, legends, folklore and art and they also cover every phenomenon whether philosophical, material, emotional, social or political which has concerned with men. The main concern of a historian is to study human achievement whether it is in science, technology or invention. He is not satisfied only by describing the role of dynasties but he also studies art, science and economics. On the whole ‘scope of his study has become so comprehensive that no activity of human being is left untouched’.

In the present age micro history writing has gained significance. The scholars now are attracted by intensive study of rural systems and institution. They show their keen interest in social and economic developments. The historians also show their interest in labour developments, class struggle, art, craft, industry and other changes in the society. The status of women is also a field of discussion among the scholars. Now more emphasis is being given to writing of philosophy of history. Marx, Hegel, Spengler and Comte are eminent scholars who painted out the progress and decline of societies. At last it is quite clear that history had wide area of study and its scope is widening day by day.

Some scholars point out that historians are presenting history in two ways. First they collect data about the events and secondly they interpret and describe the causes of these events. So it is clear that the first way of writing history concerns with objectivity and there is subjectivity in the latter. Trevelyen says that a historian is required to perform three functions which include scientific, imaginative and literary. Now the scope of history covers whole aspect of mankind, whether it is nature or man. In fact study of nature has significant role in the history. Because big mountains, rivers and hills influence human advancement. So while writing history one cannot ignore their importance.

The scope of history has now widened after the discovery of many ancient coins and inscriptions. These inscriptions paved the way for archaeology further widened the knowledge of ancient history. These provide an account of ancient man and his lifestyle. The archaeologists opened new grounds for historians through their excavations in many parts of the world. They now conclude that human life could be traced back the period much earlier that commonly held. Thus these discoveries are responsible for pushing back the history by millions of years.

History is now assuming a universal character. Because earlier world was divided into a social, political and cultural units and these units considered themselves superior. As civilizations of India, China and Iran considered themselves superior than others. But after advancement of communication many countries of world came closer to each other. They knew each other and a feeling of oneness developed. As a result a unified culture developed and history assumed universal character. Prof. Elton has rightly remarked, “All good historical writing is universal history in the sense that it remembers the universal while dealing with part of it.”
At present great emphasis is given on systematic and exhaustive collection of source material as well as adoption of a critical attitude in making their assessment. Till nineteenth century study of history is limited only to political events. But now social, moral, economic and literary life of the people is also studied. At last whole outlook and approach has changed, they are moving towards close to common men. A new concept of historical relativism has widened the scope of history.

**History of the Historian’s Craft**

One who continually studies and writes about history is known as a *historian*. It is a professional occupation, and generally only those with graduate degrees are given the title of historian. Historians spend their careers researching history and the significance of various events in history. Often, they aim to make a cohesive narrative of given parts of history. Historians usually specialize in a specific time period, but command widespread knowledge in all time periods. A historian generally must have a doctorate (PhD) degree in their chosen field of study. To be successful, historians must regularly publish works based on their research. A history student's doctoral thesis often develops into his or her first book. Many students get an undergraduate education in history as preparation for a different field, such as law or philosophy.

The job market for historians is relatively limited, as knowledge of history isn't seen as a great asset to most enterprises. A historian will usually find work at a library or university, where he can continue his work and research. Archival centers and government agencies also regularly employ historians. Many historians choose to teach so that they can be responsible for passing their views of history down to the rest of society. Finally, some historians choose to work as freelance consultants and, for a set fee, conduct research for their clients as needed. Some historians are more active than others, and actually visit and explore the sites of historical events of interest in order to gain more information or insight. Others confine themselves to the depths of archives and libraries, searching for the elusive passages that will allow them to continue their work. Either way, their research into the past provides insight about how society advanced to its present state.

A historian usually chooses to specialize in the field that most interests him. This can be as broad as “medieval history” or as specific as “Civil War history.” Sometimes, historians even specialize in “pre-history,” the time before written history. Such specialist is known as a historian of pre-history. One issue of debate for historians is neutrality. Traditionally, a historian is supposed to conduct his work as neutrally as possible to give an unbiased representation of historical events. However, some historians choose to allow personal opinion to influence their choices in recording the past. Some historians find this practice to be unacceptable, while others have no issue with it.

**Marc Bloch and the craft of the Historian**

Marc Léopold Benjamin Bloch (6 July 1886 -16 June 1944) was a medieval French historian, University Professor and French Army officer. Bloch was a founder of the Annales School, 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.
Marc Bloch’s *The Historian’s Craft*, written in 1944 while Bloch was in a prisoner of war camp and before he was executed. Bloch seemed to distil so much wisdom in this short book. Bloch explained simply many things about the historian’s craft. Bloch explained why he had found it necessary to do anthropological fieldwork in a nonindustrial society. Living even further into a new technological order, he had realized how distantly my agrarian ancestors were becoming. Bloch explained that ‘successive technological revolutions have immeasurably widened the psychological gap between generations. With some reason, perhaps, the man of the age of electricity and of the airplane feels himself removed from his masters’.

Yet this does not absolve us from the duty to live and participate and try to understand our own world, for ‘Misunderstanding of the present is the inevitable consequence of ignorance of the past. But a man may wear himself out just as fruitlessly in seeking to understand the past, if he is totally ignorant of the present.’ As he continues, ‘This faculty of understanding the living is, in very truth, the master quality of the historian.’ Bloch stressed the need for comparison. He himself compared many parts of Europe, and his stray remarks on the similarity between Japanese and European feudalism was one of the inspirations for my later work on Japan. He wrote that ‘there is no true understanding without a certain range of comparison’.

Working on the borders between disciplines, trespassing into anthropology, sociology, demography, we felt encouraged by his remarks that we should pursue topics across apparent boundaries, following where the problems lead. ‘The good historian is like the giant of the fairy tale. He knows that wherever he catches the scent of human flesh, there his quarry lies.’ There is no way of breaking up the past or the present into watertight compartments, ‘For in the last analysis it is human consciousness which is the subject matter of history.’ All history is linked, ‘for the only true history, which can advance only through mutual aid, is universal history’.

Bloch stressed the need to assemble large bodies of material from which to generalize, and to organize this properly so that it could be used efficiently. He realized that ‘One of the most difficult tasks of the historian is that of assembling those documents which he considers necessary’. This is partly because for every problem many different kinds of material are needed. ‘It would be sheer fantasy to imagine that for each historical problem there is a unique type of document with a specific sort of use. On the contrary, the deeper the research, the more the light of the evidence must converge from sources of many different kinds.’ And then, as the material is being assembled, it is necessary to think carefully about how to organize and index it, for ‘to neglect to organize rationally what comes to us as raw material is in the long run to deny time – hence, history itself’.

Bloch also stressed the need to cross-question historical sources in the manner of a detective. He explains why this is the case, for ‘even when most anxious to bear witness, that which the text tells us expressly has ceased to be the primary object of our attention today. Ordinarily, we prick up our ears far more eagerly when we are permitted to overhear what was never intended to be said’. We therefore need to interrogate our materials; ‘From the moment when we are no longer resigned to purely and simply recording the words of our witnesses, from the moment we decide to force them to speak, even against their will, cross-examination becomes more necessary than ever. Indeed it is the prime necessity of well-conducted historical research’. Finally, we found ourselves particularly struck by his warnings concerning the almost universal temptation to move into abstract and vacuous high-level theorizing, or particularistic delving into details. Maintaining the tension between general questions, and detailed research is extremely difficult. Bloch’s passage on this has
constantly remained in my mind, just as his own example in a life of working to preserve this tension is an inspiration to us all.

‘For history, the danger of a split between preparation and execution is double-edged. At the outset, it cruelly vitiates the great attempts at interpretation. Because of it, these not only fail in their primary duty of the patient quest for truth, but, deprived of that perpetual renewal, that constantly reborn surprise, which only the struggle with documents can supply; they inevitably lapse into a ceaseless oscillation between stereotyped themes imposed by routine. But technical work suffers no less. No longer guided from above, it risks being indefinitely marooned upon insignificant or poorly propounded questions. There is no waste more criminal than that of erudition running, as it were, in neutral gear, nor any pride more vainly misplaced than that in a tool valued as an end in itself.’

Marc Bloch on the Royal Touch’

Many of the qualities which have made Marc Bloch one of the most respected historians of the century are evident in this newly translated work, which was written when Bloch was aged 37. It is enormously erudite, highly imaginative, clearly and simply written (and excellently translated it seems). It treats a complex, important and hitherto largely neglected theme without over-simplification or patronage. It opens up questions, and brings together fragments from diverse sources to present a most enjoyable mosaic. Bloch was willing to learn from other disciplines such as ethnography and psychology, if they seemed to help. Equally at home in French or English archives, written or visual evidence, the medieval or early modern period, it is an amazing achievement for a man in his mid-thirties.

Bloch’s main problem is to explain how people believed in various royal ‘wonderworking power when they did not in fact heal’. How are we to explain this ‘collective error’? The major aspect of the healing power was the belief that the touch of a king could cure ‘scrofula’, a term used in practice to cover many kinds of complaint affecting the head, eyes and neck, but especially the tubercular inflammation of the lymph glands of the neck. This was a painful and often deadly illness. The fact that it was more lethal than Bloch thought is, as Keith Thomas has pointed out, one of the few modifications that need to be made to Bloch’s work.

It is possible to gain some figures of the large numbers who came to be healed, and one of the fascinations of the subject is that these can be used as an index of the popularity and sacred veneration accorded to the monarchy or a particular monarch. In the thirty-second year of his reign, Edward I ‘blessed’ 1219 people, in his eighteenth year 1736; Edward II was much less in demand, but Edward III again blessed widely. In France, Louis XIV was also very popular. Ill of gout one Easter he was unable to touch, and consequently faced with nearly three thousand sufferers at Pentecost. The Stuart kings were particularly popular; in just over four years from 1660 Charles II touched more than 23,000 people. The Hanoverians did not practice the royal touch, and the Stuarts took the art away with them. During they interregnum they had also maintained a monopoly, and ‘an ingenious merchant ran organized tours by sea for the English or Scottish scrofula sufferers to the Low Country towns where the prince had his meagre court’.

Bloch’s approach is a narrative one, on the whole. He establishes, as far as possible, the origins of the belief, and shows how it fitted alongside other ideas concerning the divine nature of kingship. He links the decline of touching to a ‘deep-down shattering of faith in the supernatural character of
royalty that had taken place almost imperceptibly in the hearts and souls of the two nations’. He admits, however, that beyond political causes, he is unable to explain the reasons for this ‘shattering of faith’. Nor are there reasons for the emergence of the phenomenon very clear, despite the much greater detail provided. One of the difficulties, to which Bloch constantly alludes, is to separate general causes, a general ‘collective consciousness’ or mode of thought which allowed such miraculous things to be accepted, an absence of a barrier between natural and supernatural which we find hard to comprehend, from particular chains of events. The latter level of explanation seeks to understand why this phenomenon emerged and then disappeared at a particular point in time in two such countries as England and France. As to the problem of how people came to believe that the cures worked, Bloch concentrates on two explanations. He points out that a number of sufferers may have been cured through belief in the healers if their illness was not in fact tubercular, but psycho-somatic. He then shows how human beings in need will turn a healing rate that is hardly higher than would randomly be expected if the disease were untreated into a basis for hope and action. Probably we would now stress his first interpretation more heavily, but otherwise his conclusions seem unassailable. Two questions which Bloch raises without really attempting to answer are the local attitudes to healing by touch, and the way in which such healing was just one part of a whole semi-magical world view which historians had hardly started to investigate. As he writes, ‘the notion of the royal miracle would seem to have been related to a whole magical outlook upon the universe’. But he himself failed to develop this hint, and healing did not come through the local records of the period to study healing by touch undertaken by men other than the King. It is therefore fortunate that an English historian who matched Bloch in erudition, imagination, clarity and width of vision should have taken up his work.

Keith Thomas’ Religion and the Decline of Magic (1971) provides a study of magical beliefs within which Bloch’s work can be more fully appreciated, and Thomas also contributed some very valuable information on healing by touch in England. The two are complementary works, and need to be read in conjunction. Together they help to escape the rationalist preoccupations of most 19th century historians and open out a new dimension in the study of the past.

**Quotations about history and the historian's craft**

The following are a series of quotations about history and the historian's craft. They have been culled from a variety of sources and they appear here in totally random order. Their purpose is to incite, energize and stimulate your historical imagination.

"'History,' Stephen said, 'is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake.'" *James Joyce*

"Since history has no properly scientific value, its only purpose is educative. And if historians neglect to educate the public, if they fail to interest it intelligently in the past, then all their historical learning is valueless except in so far as it educates themselves." *G. M. Trevelyan.*

"To each eye, perhaps, the outlines of a great civilization present a different picture. In the wide ocean upon which we venture, the possible ways and directions are many; and the same studies which have served for my work might easily, in other hands, not only receive a wholly different treatment and application, but lead to essentially different conclusions." *Jacob Burckhardt*
"History is the witness that testifies to the passing of time; it illuminates reality, vitalizes memory, provides guidance in daily life, and brings us tidings of antiquity." Cicero

"The past is useless. That explains why it is past." Wright Morris

"Faithfulness to the truth of history involves far more than a research, however patient and scrupulous, into special facts. Such facts may be detailed with the minutest exactness, and yet the narrative, taken as a whole, may be unmeaning or untrue. The narrator must seek to imbue himself with the life and spirit of the time. He must study events in their bearings near and remote; in the character, habits, and manners of those who took part in them. He must himself be, as it were, a sharer or a spectator of the action he describes." Francis Parkman

"History . . . is indeed little more than the register of the crimes, follies, and misfortunes of mankind." Edward Gibbon

"There is properly no history; only biography." Ralph Waldo Emerson

"The study of history is the best medicine for a sick mind; for in history you have a record of the infinite variety of human experience plainly set out for all to see; and in that record you can find yourself and your country both examples and warnings; fine things to take as models, base things rotten through and through, to avoid." Livy

"What experience and history teach is this—that people and governments never have learned anything from history, or acted on principles deduced from it." G. W. F. Hegel

"Everything must be recaptured and relocated in the general framework of history, so that despite the difficulties, the fundamental paradoxes and contradictions, we may respect the unity of history which is also the unity of life." Fernand Braudel

"The function off the historian is neither to love the past nor to emancipate himself from the past, but to master and understand it as the key to the understanding of the present." E. H. Carr

"If you do not like the past, change it." William L. Burton

"History does nothing, possesses no enormous wealth, and fights no battles. It is rather man, the real, living man, who does everything, possesses, fights. It is not History, as if she were a person apart, who uses men as a means to work out her purposes, but history itself is nothing but the activity of men pursuing their purposes." Karl Marx

"An historian should yield himself to his subject, become immersed in the place and period of his choice, standing apart from it now and then for a fresh view." Samuel Eliot Morison

"History is for human self-knowledge. Knowing yourself means knowing, first, what it is to be a person; secondly, knowing what it is to be the kind of person you are; and thirdly, knowing what it is to be the person you are and nobody else is. Knowing yourself means knowing what you can do; and since nobody knows what they can do until they try, the only clue to what man can do is what
man has done. The value of history, then, is that it teaches us what man has done and thus what man is."  **R. G. Collingwood**

"History is more or less bunk."  **Henry Ford**

"Those historians should give their own country a break, I grant you; but not so as to state things contrary to fact. For there are plenty of mistakes made by writers out of ignorance, and which any man finds it difficult to avoid. But if we knowingly write what is false, whether for the sake of our country or our friends or just to be pleasant, what difference is there between us and hack writers? Readers should be very attentive to and critical of historians, and they in turn should be constantly on their guard."  **Polybius**

"You have reckoned that history ought to judge the past and to instruct the contemporary world as to the future. The present attempt does not yield to that high office. It will merely tell how it really was."  **Leopold von Ranke**

"Time in its irresistible and ceaseless flow carries along on its flood all created things and drowns them in the depths of obscurity. . . . But the tale of history forms a very strong bulwark against the stream of time, and checks in some measure its irresistible flow, so that, of all things done in it, as many as history has taken over it secures and binds together, and does not allow them to slip away into the abyss of oblivion."  **Anna Comnena**

"Only a good-for-nothing is not interested in his past."  **Sigmund Freud**

"Every past is worth condemning."  **Friedrich Nietzsche**

"The historian does simply not come in to replenish the gaps of memory. He constantly challenges even those memories that have survived intact."  **Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi**

"Each age tries to form its own conception of the past. Each age writes the history of the past anew with reference to the conditions uppermost in its own time."  **Frederick Jackson Turner.**

**Positivism**

A trend in bourgeois philosophy which declares natural (empirical) sciences to be the sole source of true knowledge and rejects the cognitive value of philosophical study. Positivism emerged in response to the inability of speculative philosophy (e.g. Classical German Idealism) to solve philosophical problems which had arisen as a result of scientific development. Positivists went to an opposite extreme and rejected theoretical speculation as a means of obtaining knowledge. Positivism declared false and senseless all problems, concepts and propositions of traditional philosophy on being, substances, causes, etc., that could not be solved or verified by experience due to a high degree of abstract nature. Positivism claims to be a fundamentally new, non-metaphysical ("positive") philosophy, modelled on empirical sciences and providing them with a methodology. Positivism is essentially empiricism brought to extreme logical consequences in certain respects: inasmuch as any knowledge is empirical knowledge in one form or another, no speculation can be knowledge. Positivism has not escaped the lot of traditional philosophy, since its own propositions
(rejection of speculation, phenomenalism, etc.) turned out to be unverifiable by experience and, consequently, metaphysical.

Positivism was founded by Auguste Comte, who introduced the term "positivism". Historically, there are three stages in the development of positivism. The exponents of the first were Comte, E. Littré and P. Laffitte in France, J S Mill and Herbert Spencer in England. Alongside the problems of the theory of knowledge (Comte) and logic (Mill), the main place in the first Positivism was assigned to sociology (Comte's idea of transforming society on the basis of science, Spencer's organic theory of society).

The rise of the second stage in Positivism - empirio-criticism - dates back to the 1870s - 1890s and is associated with Ernst Mach and Avenarius, who renounced even formal recognition of objective real objects, which was a feature of early Positivism. In Machism, the problems of cognition were interpreted from the viewpoint of extreme psychologism, which was merging with subjectivism.

The rise and formation of the latest Positivism, or neo-positivism, is linked up with the activity of the Vienna Circle (O. Neurath, Carnap, Schlick, Frank and others) and of the Berlin Society for Scientific Philosophy (Reichenbach and others), which combined a number of trends: logical atomism, logical positivism, semantics (close to these trends are Percy Bridgman's operationalism and the pragmatism of William James et. al). The main place in the third positivism is taken by the philosophical problems of language, symbolic logic, the structure of scientific investigations, and others. Having renounced psychologism, the exponents of the third positivism took the course of reconciling the logic of science with mathematics, the course of formalisation of epistemological problems.

Historicism

Historicism is a mode of thinking that assigns a central and basic significance to a specific context, such as historical period, geographical place and local culture. As such it is in contrast to individualist theories of knowledges such as empiricism and rationalism, which neglects the role of traditions. Historicism therefore tends to be hermeneutical, because it places great importance on cautious, rigorous and contextualized interpretation of information and/or relativist, because it rejects notions of universal, fundamental and immutable interpretations. The term has developed different and divergent, though loosely related, meanings. Elements of historicism appear in the writings of Italian philosopher G. B. Vico and French essayist Michel de Montaigne, and became fully developed with the dialectic of G. W. F. Hegel, influential in 19th-century Europe. The writings of Karl Marx, influenced by Hegel, also contain historicism. The term is also associated with the empirical social sciences and the work of Franz Boas.

Historicism may be contrasted with reductionist theories, which suppose that all developments can be explained by fundamental principles (such as in economic determinism), or theories that posit historical changes as result of random chance.

The Austrian-English philosopher Karl Popper attacked a peculiar version of historicism along with the (hard) determinism and holism which he argued were at its root. However, Popper's determinist definition of historicism tends to conflict with the contingency that others view as central to the
concept, as expressed earlier in the article regarding the definition of Historicism. In his Poverty of Historicism, he warns against the "inexorable laws of historical destiny", which implies that historicism is indeed a theory that can be reduced to universal, immutable truths. But, this is in sharp contrast with the contextually relative interpretation of historicism that its proponents argue for. Also Talcott Parsons criticized historicism as a case of idealistic fallacy in *The Structure of Social Action* (1937).

### Historical Materialism

Historical materialism is a methodological approach to the study of society, economics, and history, first articulated by Karl Marx (1818-1883) as "the materialist conception of history". Historical materialism looks for the causes of developments and changes in human society in the means by which humans collectively produce the necessities of life. The non-economic features of a society (e.g. social classes, political structures, ideologies) are seen as being an outgrowth of its economic activity. The classic brief statement of the theory was made by Marx in the preface to ‘*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*’ (1859):

“My inquiry led me to the conclusion that neither legal relations nor political forms could be comprehended whether by themselves or on the basis of a so-called general development of the human mind, but that on the contrary they originate in the material conditions of life, the totality of which Hegel, following the example of English and French thinkers of the eighteenth century, embraces within the term "civil society"; that the autonomy of this civil society, however, has to be sought in political economy. The study of this, which I began in Paris, I continued in Brussels, where I moved owing to an expulsion order issued by M. Guizot. The general conclusion at which I arrived and which, once reached, became the guiding principle of my studies can be summarised as follows:

In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure, and to which correspond definite forms of consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political, and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or — this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms — with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development, of the productive forces, these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead, sooner or later, to the transformation of the whole, immense, superstructure.

In studying such transformations, it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic, or philosophic — in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained
from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production.

Since Marx's time, the theory has been modified and expanded by thousands of Marxist thinkers. It now has many variants.

**Key ideas**

Historical materialism started from a fundamental underlying reality of human existence: that in order for human beings to survive and continue existence from generation to generation, it is necessary for them to produce and reproduce the material requirements of life. While this may seem obvious, Marx was the first to explain that this was the foundation for understanding human society and historical development. Marx then extended this premise by asserting the importance of the fact that, in order to carry out production and exchange, people have to enter into very definite social relations, most fundamentally *production relations*.

However, production does not get carried out in the abstract, or by entering into arbitrary or random relations chosen at will. Human beings collectively work on nature but do not do the same work; there is a division of labor in which people not only do different jobs, but according to Marxist theory, some people live from the work of others by owning the means of production. How this is accomplished depends on the type of society. Production is carried out through very definite relations between people. And, in turn, these production relations are determined by the level and character of the productive forces that are present at any given time in history. For Marx, productive forces refer to the means of production such as the tools, instruments, technology, land, raw materials, and human knowledge and abilities in terms of using these means of production.

Writers who identify with historical materialism usually postulate that society has moved through a number of types or modes of production. That is, the character of the production relations is determined by the character of the productive forces; these could be the simple tools and instruments of early human existence, or the more developed machinery and technology of present age. The main modes of production Marx identified generally include primitive communism or tribal society (a prehistoric stage), ancient society, feudalism and capitalism. In each of these social stages, people interact with nature and produce their living in different ways. Any surplus from that production is allotted in different ways. Ancient society was based on a ruling class of slave owners and a class of slaves; feudalism based on landowners and serfs; and capitalism based on the capitalist class and the working class. The capitalist class privately owns the means of production, distribution and exchange (e.g. factories, mines, shops and banks) while the working class live by exchanging their socialized labour with the capital class for wages.

Marx identified the production relations of society (arising on the basis of given productive forces) as the economic base of society. He also explained that on the foundation of the economic base there arise certain political institutions, laws, customs, culture, etc., and ideas, ways of thinking, morality, etc. These constituted the political/ideological superstructure of society. This superstructure not only has its origin in the economic base, but its features also ultimately correspond to the character and development of that economic base, i.e. the way people organize society is determined by the economic base and the relations that arise from its mode of production.
Historical materialism can be seen to rest on the following principles:

- 1. The basis of human society is how humans work on nature to produce the means of subsistence.
- 2. There is a division of labour into social classes (relations of production) based on property ownership where some people live from the labour of others.
- 3. The system of class division is dependent on the mode of production.
- 4. The mode of production is based on the level of the productive forces.
- 5. Society moves from stage to stage when the dominant class is displaced by a new emerging class, by overthrowing the "political shell" that enforces the old relations of production no longer corresponding to the new productive forces. This takes place in the superstructure of society, the political arena in the form of revolution, whereby the underclass "liberates" the productive forces with new relations of production, and social relations, corresponding to it.

Marx's clearest formulation of his "Materialist Conception of History" was in the 1859 Preface to his book ‘A contribution to the Critique of Political Economy’, whose relevant passage is reproduced here:

"In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or — this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms — with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic — in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production."

Perhaps the most influential recent defense of this passage and of relevant Marxian and Marxist assertions is G.A. Cohen's *Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence*. 
Key implications in the study and understanding of history

Many writers note that historical materialism represented a revolution in human thought and a break from previous ways of understanding the underlying basis of change within various human societies. The theory shows what Marx called "coherence" in human history, because each generation inherits the productive forces developed previously and in turn further develops them before passing them on to the next generation. Further that this coherence increasingly involves more of humanity the more the productive forces develop and expand to bind people together in production and exchange. This understanding counters the notion that human history is simply a series of accidents, either without any underlying cause or caused by supernatural beings or forces exerting their will on society. This posits that history is made as a result of struggle between different social classes rooted in the underlying economic base.

Marx's materialism

While the "historical" part of historical materialism does not cause a comprehension problem (i.e., it means the present is explained by analysing the past), the term materialism is more difficult. Historical materialism uses "materialism" to make two separate points, where the truth or falsehood of one point does not affect the others.

Firstly, there is metaphysical or philosophical materialism, in which matter-in-motion is considered primary and thought about matter-in-motion, or thought about abstractions, secondary.

Secondly, there is the notion that economic processes form the material base of society upon which institutions and ideas rest and from which they derive. While the economy is the base structure of society, it does not follow that everything in history is determined by the economy, just as every feature of a house is not determined by its foundations. Thus, there is the idea that in the capitalist mode of production the behaviour of actors in the market economy (means of production, distribution and exchange, the relations of production) plays the major role in configuring society.

Historical materialism and the future

In his analysis of the movement of history, Marx predicted the breakdown of capitalism (as a result of class struggle and the falling rate of profit), and the establishment in time of a communist society in which class-based human conflict would be overcome. The means of production would be held in the common ownership and used for the common good.

Marxist beliefs about history

"Society does not consist of individuals, but expresses the sum of interrelations, the relations within which these individuals stand."

— Karl Marx, Grundrisse, 1858

According to Marxist theorists, history develops in accordance with the following observations:
1. Social progress is driven by progress in the material, productive forces a society has at its disposal (technology, labour, capital goods, etc.)

2. Humans are inevitably involved in production relations (roughly speaking, economic relationships or institutions), which constitute our most decisive social relations.

   Production relations progress, with a degree of inevitability, following and corresponding to the development of the productive forces. Relations of production help determine the degree and types of the development of the forces of production. For example, capitalism tends to increase the rate at which the forces develop and stresses the accumulation of capital.

3. Both productive forces and production relations progress independently of mankind's strategic intentions or will.

4. The superstructure -- the cultural and institutional features of a society, its ideological materials—is ultimately an expression of the mode of production (which combines both the forces and relations of production) on which the society is founded.

5. Every type of state is a powerful institution of the ruling class; the state is an instrument which one class uses to secure its rule and enforce its preferred production relations (and its exploitation) onto society.

6. State power is usually only transferred from one class to another by social and political upheaval.

7. When a given style of production relations no longer supports further progress in the productive forces, either further progress is strangled, or 'revolution' must occur.

8. The actual historical process is not predetermined but depends on the class struggle, especially the organization and consciousness of the working class.

**Alienation and freedom**

Hunter-gatherer societies were structured so that the economic forces and the political forces were one and the same. The elements of force and relation operated together, harmoniously. In the feudal society, the political forces of the kings and nobility had their relations with the economic forces of the villages through serfdom. The serfs, although not free, were tied to both forces and, thus, not completely alienated. Capitalism, Marx argued, completely separates the economic and political forces, leaving them to have relations through a limiting government. He takes the state to be a sign of this separation - it exists to manage the massive conflicts of interest which arise between classes in all those societies based on property relations.

**The history of historical materialism**

Marx's attachment to materialism arose from his doctoral research on the philosophy of Epicurus, as well as his reading of Adam Smith and other writers in classical political economy. Historical materialism builds upon the idea that became current in philosophy from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries that the development of human society has moved through a series of stages, from hunting and gathering, through pastoralism and cultivation, to commercial society. Friedrich Engels wrote: "I use 'historical materialism' to designate the view of the course of history, which seeks the
ultimate causes and the great moving power of all important historic events in the economic development of society, in the changes in the modes of production and exchange, with the consequent division of society into distinct classes and the struggles of these classes."

**Warnings against misuse**

"One has to "leave philosophy aside", one has to leap out of it and devote oneself like an ordinary man to the study of actuality, for which there exists also an enormous amount of literary material, unknown, of course, to the philosophers... Philosophy and the study of the actual world have the same relation to one another as masturbation and sexual love." Marx himself took care to indicate that he was only proposing a guideline to historical research (*Leitfaden* or *Auffassung*), and was not providing any substantive "theory of history" or "grand philosophy of history", let alone a "master-key to history". Numerous times, he and Engels expressed irritation with dilettante academics who sought to knock up their skimpy historical knowledge as quickly as possible into some grand theoretical system that would explain "everything" about history. To their great annoyance, the materialist outlook was used as an excuse for not studying history.

In the 1872 Preface to the French edition of Das Kapital Vol. 1, Marx also emphasised that "There is no royal road to science, and only those who do not dread the fatiguing climb of its steep paths have a chance of gaining its luminous summits". Reaching a scientific understanding was hard work. Conscientious, painstaking research was required, instead of philosophical speculation and unwarranted, sweeping generalisations. But having abandoned abstract philosophical speculation in his youth, Marx himself showed great reluctance during the rest of his life about offering any generalities or universal truths about human existence or human history. The first explicit and systematic summary of the materialist interpretation of history published, *Anti-Dühring*, was written by Friedrich Engels.

One of the aims of Engels's polemic *Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science* was to ridicule the easy "world schematism" of philosophers, who invented the latest wisdom from behind their writing desks. Towards the end of his life, in 1877, Marx wrote a letter to the editor of the Russian paper *Otetchestvennye Zapisky*, which significantly contained the following disclaimer: "If Russia is tending to become a capitalist nation after the example of the Western European countries, and during the last years she has been taking a lot of trouble in this direction - she will not succeed without having first transformed a good part of her peasants into proletarians; and after that, once taken to the bosom of the capitalist regime, she will experience its pitiless laws like other profane peoples. That is all. But that is not enough for my critic. He feels himself obliged to metamorphose my historical sketch of the genesis of capitalism in Western Europe into an historico-philosophic theory of the marche generale imposed by fate upon every people, whatever the historic circumstances in which it finds itself, in order that it may ultimately arrive at the form of economy which will ensure, together with the greatest expansion of the productive powers of social labour, the most complete development of man. But I beg his pardon. (He is both honouring and shaming me too much.)"

Marx goes on to illustrate how the same factors can in different historical contexts produce very different results, so that quick and easy generalisations are not really possible. To indicate how seriously Marx took research, it is interesting to note that when he died, his estate contained several cubic metres of Russian statistical publications (it was, as the old Marx observed, in Russia that his
ideas gained most influence). But what is true is that insofar as Marx and Engels regarded historical processes as law-governed processes, the possible future directions of historical development were to a great extent limited and conditioned by what happened before. Retrospectively, historical processes could be understood to have happened by necessity in certain ways and not others, and to some extent at least, the most likely variants of the future could be specified on the basis of careful study of the known facts. Towards the end of his life, Engels commented several times about the abuse of historical materialism.

In a letter to Conrad Schmidt dated August 5, 1890, he stated that "And if this man (i.e., Paul Barth) has not yet discovered that while the material mode of existence is the primum agens this does not preclude the ideological spheres from reacting upon it in their turn, though with a secondary effect, he cannot possibly have understood the subject he is writing about. The materialist conception of history has a lot of [dangerous friends] nowadays, to whom it serves as an excuse for not studying history. Just as Marx used to say, commenting on the French "Marxists" of the late 70s: "All I know is that I am not a Marxist." In general, the word "materialistic" serves many of the younger writers in Germany as a mere phrase with which anything and everything is labeled without further study, that is, they stick on this label and then consider the question disposed of. But our conception of history is above all a guide to study, not a lever for construction after the manner of the Hegelian. All history must be studied afresh; the conditions of existence of the different formations of society must be examined individually before the attempt is made to deduce them from the political, civil law, aesthetic, philosophic, religious, etc., views corresponding to them. Up to now but little has been done here because only a few people have got down to it seriously. In this field we can utilize heaps of help, it is immensely big, and anyone who will work seriously can achieve much and distinguish himself. But instead of this too many of the younger Germans simply make use of the phrase historical materialism (and everything can be turned into a phrase) only in order to get their own relatively scanty historical knowledge — for economic history is still in its swaddling clothes! — constructed into a neat system as quickly as possible, and they then deem themselves something very tremendous. And after that a Barth can come along and attack the thing itself, which in his circle has indeed been degraded to a mere phrase."

Finally, in a letter to Franz Mehring dated 14 July 1893, Engels stated:

"...there is only one other point lacking, which, however, Marx and I always failed to stress enough in our writings and in regard to which we are all equally guilty. That is to say, we all lay, and were bound to lay, the main emphasis, in the first place, on the derivation of political, juridical and other ideological notions, and of actions arising through the medium of these notions, from basic economic facts. But in so doing we neglected the formal side — the ways and means by which these notions, etc., come about — for the sake of the content. This has given our adversaries a welcome opportunity for misunderstandings, of which Paul Barth is a striking example."

**Historical materialism in Marxist thought**

In 1880, about three years before Marx died; Friedrich Engels indicated that he accepted the usage of the term "historical materialism". Recalling the early days of the new interpretation of history, he stated:"We, at that time, were all materialists, or, at least, very advanced free-thinkers, and to us it appeared inconceivable that almost all educated people in England should believe in all sorts of impossible miracles, and that even geologists like Buckland and Mantell should contort the facts of
their science so as not to clash too much with the myths of the book of Genesis; while, in order to find people who dared to use their own intellectual faculties with regard to religious matters, you had to go amongst the uneducated, the "great unwashed", as they were then called, the working people, especially the Owenite Socialists". (Preface to the English edition of his pamphlet *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*)

In a foreword to his essay *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of ClassicalGerman Philosophy* (1886), three years after Marx's death, Engels claimed confidently that "In the meantime, the Marxist world outlook has found representatives far beyond the boundaries of Germany and Europe and in all the literary languages of the world."In his old age, Engels speculated about a new cosmology or ontology which would show the principles of dialectics to be universal features of reality. He also drafted an article on 'The part played by labour in the transition from Ape to Man', apparently a theory of anthropogenesis which would integrate the insights of Marx and Charles Darwin. (This is discussed by Charles Woolfson in 'The Labour Theory of Culture: a Re-examination of Engels Theory of Human Origins').

At the very least, Marxism had now been born, and "historical materialism" had become a distinct philosophical doctrine, subsequently elaborated and systematised by intellectuals like Eduard Bernstein, Karl Kautsky, Georgi Plekhanov and Nikolai Bukharin. Even so, up to the 1930s many of Marx's earlier works were still unknown, and in reality most self-styled Marxists had not read beyond Capital Vol. 1. Isaac Deutscher provides an anecdote about the knowledge of Marx in that era:

"Capital is a tough nut to crack, opined Ignacy Daszyński, one of the best known socialist "people's tribunes" around the turn of the 20th century, but anyhow he had not read it. But, he said, Karl Kautsky had read it, and written a popular summary of the first volume. He hadn't read this either, but Kazimierz Kelles-Krauz, the party theoretician, had read Kautsky's pamphlet and summarised it. He also had not read Kelles-Krauz's text, but the financial expert of the party, Hermann Diamand, had read it and had told him, i.e. Daszynski, everything about it".

After Lenin's death in 1924, Marxism was transformed into Marxism-Leninism and from there to Maoism or Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in Chinawhich some regard as the "true doctrine" and others as a "state religion".

In the early years of the 20th century, historical materialism was often treated by socialist writers as interchangeable with dialectical materialism, a formulation never used by Friedrich Engels however. According to many Marxists influenced by Soviet Marxism, historical materialism is a specifically sociological method, while dialectical materialism refers to a more general, abstract, philosophy. The Soviet orthodox Marxist tradition, influential for half a century, based itself on Joseph Stalin's pamphlet *Dialectical and Historical Materialism* and on textbooks issued by the "Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union".

**Recent versions of historical materialism**
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Several scholars have argued that historical materialism ought to be revised in the light of modern scientific knowledge. Jürgen Habermas believes historical materialism "needs revision in many respects", especially because it has ignored the significance of communicative action. Göran Therborn has argued that the method of historical materialism should be applied to historical materialism as intellectual tradition, and to the history of Marxism itself. In the early 1980s, Paul Hirst and Barry Hindess elaborated a structural Marxism interpretation of historical materialism. Regulation theory, especially in the work of Michel Aglietta, draws extensively on historical materialism. Spiral dynamics shows similarities to historical materialism.

**Criticisms**

Philosopher of science Karl Popper, in his *Conjectures and Refutations*, critiqued such claims of the explanatory power or valid application of historical materialism by arguing that it could explain or explain away any fact brought before it, making it unfalsifiable. Underlying the dispute among historians are the different assumptions made about the definition or concept of "history" and "historiography". Different historians take a different view of what it is all about, and what the possibilities of historical and social scientific knowledge are. Broadly, the importance of the study of history lies in the ability of history to explain the present. John Bellamy Foster asserts that historical materialism is important in explaining history from a scientific perspective, by following the scientific method, as opposed to belief-system theories like Creationism and Intelligent Design, which do not base their beliefs on verifiable facts and hypotheses.

**New History**

A group of American historians who were dissatisfied with the exclusively Political, constitutional and military emphasis of 19th century historical writings, advocated the theory of ‘new history’. They argued that historical writings neglect the vast areas of human experience and its relevance to contemporary problems. Charles A. Beard and Carl Becker, J.H. Robinson were the three important spokesmen of the American ‘new history’. The new history was envisaged to be useful in explaining the present. It emphasizes the fact that history should not be regarded as stationary subject and that it is bound to alter its ideals and aims with the general progress of the society. The New Historians encouraged the interdisciplinary approach by which the reader of history they argued, should get the benefit of the knowledge from other disciplines also. They held a Pragmatic evolutionary approach to history in order to make the people understand themselves and the problems of mankind, instead of seeking lessons from history. No history could make a permanent contribution to knowledge and that historical synthesis could be true only ' relatively to the needs of the age which fashioned it'.

**The Annales Paradigm**

The Annales School is a highly influential style of historiography developed by French historians in the twentieth century. It emphasizes social history and rejects Marxism. The school deals primarily with a pre-modern world before the French Revolution of the 1790s, with little interest in later topics. It has dominated French social history and influenced historiography in Europe and Latin America. The success of the school has crowded out Marxist historiography in France. The school has had a small impact in the United States, apart from European demographic history.
Institutionally it is based on the *Annales* journal, the SEVPEN publishing house, the Fondation Maison des sciences de l'homme (FMSH), and especially the sixth Section of the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, all in Paris. Prominent leaders include co-founders Marc Bloch (1886-1944) and Lucien Febvre (1878-1956). The second generation was led by Fernand Braudel (1902-1985) and included Georges Duby [1919-1996], Pierre Goubert (1910- ), Robert Mandrou (1921-84), Pierre Chaunu (1923-2009), Jacques Le Goff (1924- ) and Ernest Labrousse (1895-1988). A third generation was led by Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie (1929- ) and includes Jacques Revel, and Philippe Ariès (1914-84), a political conservative who joined the group in 1978. The third generation stressed history from the point of view of mentalités. The fourth generation of Annales historians, led by Roger Chartier, clearly distanced itself from the mentalities approach, which has fallen into disuse in France, replaced by the cultural and linguistic turn which emphasizes analysis of the social history of cultural practices. A similar cultural approach (with different origins) is very popular in the United States in the twenty-first century as well.

The main scholarly outlet has been the journal founded in 1929, *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 mentalités. They rejected Marxism, and downplayed material factors as less important than the mental framework ("mentalités") that shaped decisions.

Braudel was editor of *Annales* 1956-68, followed by Jacques Le Goff, a medievalist. However Braudel's informal successor as head of the school was Le Roy Ladurie, who was unable to maintain a consistent focus. 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 1960s the school was building a vast publishing and research network reaching across France, Europe and the world. Influence spread out from Paris but did not come in. Much emphasis was given to quantitative data, seen as the key to unlock all of social history. But Paris ignored the powerful developments in quantitative studies underway in the U.S. and Britain, which reshaped economic, political and demographic research in those countries, while France fell behind. An attempt to require an *Annales*-written textbook for French schools was rejected by the government. By 1980 postmodern sensibilities undercut confidence in overarching paradigms. The *Annales School* kept its infrastructure, but lost its mentalités.

The journal

The journal, founded in Strasbourg, moved to Paris and continues today as *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Social*. 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.

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 "mentalités" ("mentalités" in French). 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.

Marc Bloch

Marc Bloch (1886-1944) was the co-founder of the Annales School, and a quintessential modernist. He studied at the elite École Normale Supérieure, and in Germany, serving as a professor at the University of Strassbourg 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 Annales, led by Fernand Braudel.

Mentalités

Bloch, Marc. Les Rois Thaumaturges (1924) looked at the long-standing folk belief that the king could cure scrofula by 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 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 a thousand years, downplaying short-term events. Bloch's revolutionary charting of 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-80s. 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 École Pratique des Hautes Etudes, which was devoted to the study of history and the social sciences. It became an independent degree-granting institution—one of the central institutions of the School. 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 of 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 overwhelmed and shaped the king's policies.

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 Baehrel on Basse-Provence. *Annales* historians in the 1970s and 1980s turned to urban regions, including Pierre Deyon (Amiens), Maurice Garden (Lyons), 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. It 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).British historians, apart from a few Marxists, were generally hostile. 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.
Fourth generation

The leader of the fourth generation 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, México, 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 sociocultural history) is connected to broader historiographical and methodological interests who 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, theaters, 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.

Structuralism

Structuralism is an intellectual movement that developed in France in the 1950s and 1960s, in which human culture is analyzed semiotically (i.e., as a system of signs). Structuralism originated in the structural linguistics of Ferdinand de Saussure and the subsequent Prague and Moscow schools of linguistics. Just as structural linguistics was facing serious challenges from the likes of Noam Chomsky and thus fading in importance in linguistics, structuralism appeared in academia in the second half of the 20th century and grew to become one of the most popular approaches in academic fields concerned with the analysis of language, culture, and society. The structuralist mode of reasoning has been applied in a diverse range of fields, including anthropology, sociology, psychology, literary criticism, and architecture. The most famous thinkers associated with structuralism include the linguist Roman Jakobson, the anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss, the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan, the philosopher and historian Michel Foucault, the Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser, and the literary critic Roland Barthes. As an intellectual movement, structuralism came to take existentialism's pedestal in 1960s France.

Structuralism argues that a specific domain of culture may be understood by means of a structure—modelled on language—that is distinct both from the organizations of reality and those of ideas or the imagination—the "third order". In Lacan's psychoanalytic theory, for example, the structural order of "the Symbolic" is distinguished both from "the Real" and "the Imaginary"; similarly, in
Althusser's Marxist theory, the structural order of the capitalist mode of production is distinct both from the actual, real agents involved in its relations and from the ideological forms in which those relations are understood. According to Alison Assiter, four ideas are common to the various forms of structuralism. First, that a structure determines the position of each element of a whole. Second, that every system has a structure. Third, structural laws deal with co-existence rather than change. Fourth, structures are the "real things" that lie beneath the surface or the appearance of meaning.

In the 1970s, structuralism was criticised for its rigidity and ahistoricism. Despite this, many of structuralism's proponents, such as Jacques Lacan, continue to assert an influence on continental philosophy and many of the fundamental assumptions of some of structuralism's critics (who have been associated with "post-structuralism") are a continuation of structuralism.

The work of Ferdinand de Saussure on linguistics, along with that of the Prague and Moscow schools, is generally considered to be the origin of structuralism. Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, existentialism, such as that propounded by Jean-Paul Sartre, was the dominant European intellectual movement. Structuralism surged to prominence in France in its wake, particularly in the 1960s. The initial popularity of structuralism in France led to its spread across the globe. The term "structuralism" itself appeared in the works of French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss, and gave rise, in France, to the "structuralist movement", which spurred the work of such thinkers as Louis Althusser, the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan, as well as the structural Marxism of Nicos Poulantzas. Most members of this movement did not describe themselves as being a part of any such movement. Structuralism is closely related to semiotics. Structuralism rejected the concept of human freedom and choice and focused instead on the way that human behavior is determined by various structures. The most important initial work on this score was Claude Lévi-Strauss's 1949 volume *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Lévi-Strauss had known Jakobson during their time together in New York during the Second World War and was influenced by both Jakobson'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. Blending Freud and De Saussure, the French (post)structuralist Jacques Lacan applied structuralism to psychoanalysis and, in a different way, Jean Piaget applied structuralism to the study of psychology. But Jean Piaget, who would better define himself as constructivist, considers structuralism as "a method and not a doctrine" because for him "there exists no structure without a construction, abstract or genetic" Michel Foucault's book *The Order of Things* examined the history of science to study how structures of epistemology, or episteme, shaped the way in which people imagined knowledge and knowing (though Foucault would later explicitly deny affiliation with the structuralist movement). In much the same way, American historian of science Thomas Kuhn addressed the structural formations of science in his seminal work *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* - its title alone arguably[who?] evincing a stringent structuralist approach. Though less concerned with "episteme", Kuhn nonetheless remarked at how coteries of scientists operated under and applied a standard praxis of 'normal science,' deviating from a standard 'paradigm' only in
instances of irreconcilable anomalies that question a significant body of their work. Blending Marx and structuralism was another French theorist, Louis Althusser, who introduced his own brand of structural social analysis, giving rise to structural Marxism. 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. The term has slightly different meanings in French and English. In the US, some academics coined the term "Post-structuralism" to label first Derrida's work, and then that of a disparate ensemble of intellectuals. By contrast, in France Derrida is labeled a structuralist. Finally, some authors wrote in several different styles. Barthes, for instance, wrote some books which are clearly structuralist and others which clearly are not. According to the US academics who coined the term, Post-structuralism attempted to distinguish itself from the simple use of the structural method. Deconstruction was an attempt to break with structuralistic thought. Some intellectuals, such as Julia Kristeva for example, took structuralism (and Russian formalism) for a starting point to later become prominent post-structuralists. Structuralism has had varying degrees of influence in the social sciences: a great deal in the field of sociology.

**Structuralism in linguistics**

In Ferdinand de Saussure's *Course in General Linguistics* (written by Saussure's colleagues after his death and based on student notes), the analysis focuses not on the *use* of language (called "parole", or speech), but rather on the underlying system of language (called "langue"). This approach examines how the elements of language relate to each other in the present, synchronically rather than diachronically. Saussure argued that linguistic signs were composed of two parts:

1. a "signifier" (the "sound pattern" of a word, either in mental projection—as when one silently recites lines from a poem to one's self—or in actual, physical realization as part of a speech act)
2. a "signified" (the concept or meaning of the word)

This was quite different from previous approaches that focused on the relationship between words and the things in the world that they designate. Other key notions in structural linguistics include paradigm, syntagm, and value (though these notions were not fully developed in Saussure's thought). A structural "idealism" is a class of linguistic units (lexemes, morphemes or even constructions) that are possible in a certain position in a given linguistic environment (such as a given sentence), which is called the "syntagm". The different functional role of each of these members of the paradigm is called "value" (*valeur* in French). Saussure's *Course* influenced many linguists between World War I and World War II. In the United States, for instance, Leonard Bloomfield developed his own version of structural linguistics, as did Louis Hjelmslev in Denmark and Alf Sommerfelt in Norway. In France Antoine Meillet and Émile Benveniste continued Saussure's project. Most importantly, however, members of the Prague school of linguistics such as Roman Jakobson and Nikolai Trubetzkoy conducted research that would be greatly influential. However, by the 1950s Saussure's linguistic concepts were under heavy criticism and were soon largely abandoned by practicing linguists: "Saussure's views are not held, so far as I know, by modern linguists, only by literary critics and the occasional philosopher. [Strict adherence to Saussure] has elicited wrong film and literary theory on a grand scale. One can find dozens of
books of literary theory bogged down in signifiers and signifieds, but only a handful that refer to Chomsky.

The clearest and most important example of Prague school structuralism lies in phonemics. Rather than simply compiling 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 sounds /p/ and /b/ represent distinct phonetics because there are cases (minimal pairs) where the contrast between the two is the only difference between two distinct words (e.g. 'pat' and 'bat'). Analyzing sounds in terms of contrastive features also opens up comparative scope—it makes clear, for instance, that the difficulty Japanese speakers have differentiating /r/ and /l/ in English is because these 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 fields.

**Structuralism in anthropology and sociology**

According to structural theory in anthropology and social anthropology, meaning is produced and reproduced within a culture through various practices, phenomena and activities that serve as systems of signification. A structuralist approach may study 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 the culture. For example, an early and prominent practitioner of structural anthropology, anthropologist and ethnographer Claude Lévi-Strauss, analyzed in the 1950s cultural phenomena including mythology, kinship (the alliance theory and the incest taboo), and food preparation. In addition to these studies, he produced more linguistically-focused writings in which he applied Saussure's distinction between langue and parole in his search for the fundamental 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. Lévi-Strauss took inspiration from information theory and mathematics.

Another concept utilised in structural anthropology came from the Prague school of linguistics, where Roman Jakobson and others analyzed sounds based on the presence or absence of certain features (such as voiceless vs. voiced). Lévi-Strauss included this in his conceptualization of the universal structures of the mind, which he held to operate based on pairs of binary oppositionssuch as hot-cold, male-female, culture-nature, cooked-raw, or marriageable vs. tabooed women.

A third influence came from Marcel Mauss (1872–1950), who had written on gift-exchange systems. Based on Mauss, for instance, Lévi-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 Edward Evans-Pritchard and Meyer Fortes. While replacing Marcel Mauss at his Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes chair, Lévi-Strauss' writing became widely popular in the 1960s and 1970s and gave rise to the term "structuralism" itself.

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 the United States, authors such as Marshall Sahlins and James
Boon built on structuralism to provide their own analysis of human society. Structural anthropology fell out of favour in the early 1980s for a number of reasons. D'Andrade suggests that this was 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 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'.

Some anthropological theorists, however, while finding considerable fault with Lévi-Strauss's version of structuralism, did not turn away from a fundamental structural basis for human culture. The Biogenetic Structuralism group for instance argued that some kind of structural foundation for culture must exist because all humans inherit the same system of brain structures. They proposed a kind of Neuroanthropology which would lay the foundations for a more complete scientific account of cultural similarity and variation by requiring an integration of cultural anthropology and neuroscience—a program that theorists such as Victor Turner also embraced.

**Structuralism in literary theory and criticism**

In literary theory, structuralist criticism relates literary texts to a larger structure, which may be a particular genre, a range of intertextual connections, a model of a universal narrative structure, or a system of recurrent patterns or motifs. Structuralism argues that there must be a structure in every text, which explains why it is easier for experienced readers than for non-experienced readers to interpret a text. Hence, everything that is written seems to be governed by specific rules, or a "grammar of literature", that one learns in educational institutions and that are to be unmasked. A potential problem of structuralist interpretation is that it can be highly reductive, as scholar Catherine Belsey puts it: "the structuralist danger of collapsing all difference." An example of such a reading might be if a student concludes the authors of West Side Story did not write anything "really" new, because their work has the same structure as Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet. In both texts a girl and a boy fall in love (a "formula" with a symbolic operator between them would be "Boy + Girl") despite the fact that they belong to two groups that hate each other ("Boy's Group - Girl's Group" or "Opposing forces") and conflict is resolved by their death. Structuralist readings focus on how the structures of the single text resolve inherent narrative tensions. If a structuralist reading focuses on multiple texts, there must be some way in which those texts unify themselves into a coherent system. The versatility of structuralism is such that a literary critic could make the same claim about a story of two friendly families ("Boy's Family + Girl's Family") that arrange a marriage between their children despite the fact that the children hate each other ("Boy - Girl") and then the children commit suicide to escape the arranged marriage; the justification is that the second story's structure is an 'inversion' of the first story's structure: the relationship between the values of love and the two pairs of parties involved have been reversed.

Structuralistic literary criticism argues that the "literary banter of a text" can lie only in new structure, rather than in the specifics of character development and voice in which that structure is expressed. Literary structuralism often follows the lead of Vladimir Propp, Algirdas Julien Greimas, and Claude Lévi-Strauss in seeking out basic deep elements in stories, myths, and more recently, anecdotes, which are combined in various ways to produce the many versions of the ur-story or ur-myth.
There is considerable similarity between structural literary theory and Northrop Frye's archetypal criticism, which is also indebted to the anthropological study of myths. Some critics have also tried to apply the theory to individual works, but the effort to find unique structures in individual literary works runs counter to the structuralist program and have an affinity with New Criticism.

Reactions to structuralism

Today structuralism is less popular than approaches such as post-structuralism and deconstruction. There are many reasons for this. Structuralism has often been criticized for being ahistorical and for favoring deterministic structural forces over the ability of people to act. As the political turbulence of the 1960s and 1970s (and particularly the student uprisings of May 1968) began affecting academia, issues of power and political struggle moved to the center of people's attention. The ethnologist Robert Jaulin defined another ethnological method which clearly pitted itself against structuralism.

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 the movements that it spawned, rather than structuralism itself, commandeered attention. Some observers have strongly criticized structuralism or even dismissed it in toto. Anthropologist Adam Kuper argued that "Structuralism' came to have something of the momentum of a millennial movement and some of its adherents felt that they formed a secret society of the seeing in a world of the blind. Conversion was not just a matter of accepting a new paradigm. It was, almost, a question of salvation."

Post-structuralism

Post-structuralism is a label formulated by American academics to denote the heterogeneous works of a series of French intellectuals who came to international prominence in the 1960s and '70s. The label primarily encompasses the intellectual developments of certain mid-20th-century French and continental philosophers and theorists. The post-structuralist movement is difficult to summarize, but may be broadly understood as a body of distinct responses to structuralism. An intellectual movement developed in Europe from the early to mid-20th century, Structuralism argued that human culture may be understood by means of a structure—modeled on language (i.e., structural linguistics)—that is distinct both from the organizations of reality and the organization of ideas and imagination—a "third order." The precise nature of the revision or critique of structuralism differs with each post-structuralist author, though 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 and Julia Kristeva.

The movement is closely related to postmodernism. As with structuralism, anti-humanism, as a rejection of the enlightenment subject, is often a central tenet. Existential phenomenology is a significant influence; one commentator has argued that post-structuralists might just as accurately be called "post-phenomenologists."

Some have argued that the term "post-structuralism" arose in Anglo-American academia as a means of grouping together continental philosophers who rejected the methods and assumptions of
analytical philosophy. Further controversy owes to the way in which loosely-connected thinkers tended to dispense with theories claiming to have discovered absolute truths about the world. Although such ideas generally relate only to the metaphysical (for instance, metanarratives of historical progress, such as those of dialectical materialism), many commentators have criticized the movement as relativist, nihilist, or simply indulgent to the extreme. Many so-called "post-structuralist" writers rejected the label and there is no manifesto.

Post-structuralism emerged in France during the 1960s as an antinomian movement critiquing structuralism. The period was marked by political anxiety, as students and workers alike rebelled against the state in May 1968, nearly causing the downfall of the French government. At the same time, however, the support of the French Communist Party (FCP) for the oppressive policies of the USSR contributed to popular disillusionment with orthodox Marxism. As a result, there was increased interest in alternative radical philosophies, including feminism, western Marxism, anarchism, phenomenology, and nihilism. These disparate perspectives, which Michel Foucault later labeled "subjugated knowledges," were all linked by being critical of dominant Western philosophy and culture. Post-structuralism offered a means of justifying these criticisms, by exposing the underlying assumptions of many Western norms.

Two key figures in the early post-structuralist movement were Jacques Derrida and Roland Barthes. In a 1966 lecture "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Science", Jacques Derrida presented a thesis on an apparent rupture in intellectual life. Derrida interpreted this event as a "decentering" of the former intellectual cosmos. Instead of progress or divergence from an identified centre, Derrida described this "event" as a kind of "play." Although Barthes was originally a structuralist, during the 1960s he increasingly favored post-structuralist views. In 1968, Barthes published "The Death of the Author" in which he announced a metaphorical event: the "death" of the author as an authentic source of meaning for a given text. Barthes argued that any literary text has multiple meanings, and that the author was not the prime source of the work's semantic content. The "Death of the Author," Barthes maintained, was the "Birth of the Reader," as the source of the proliferation of meanings of the text. In a 1976 lecture series, Foucault briefly summarized the general impetus of the post-structuralist movement:

...For the last ten or fifteen years, the immense and proliferating criticizability of things, institutions, practices, and discourses; a sort of general feeling that the ground was crumbling beneath our feet, especially in places where it seemed most familiar, most solid, and closest to us, to our bodies, to our everyday gestures. But alongside this crumbling and the astonishing efficacy of discontinuous, particular, and local critiques, the facts were also revealing something... beneath this whole thematic, through it and even within it; we have seen what might be called the insurrection of subjugated knowledges.

Post-structuralist philosophers like Derrida and Foucault did not form a self-conscious group, but each responded to the traditions of phenomenology and structuralism. Phenomenology, often associated with two German philosophers Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger, rejected previous systems of knowledge and attempted to examine life "just as it appears" (as phenomena). Both movements rejected the idea that knowledge could be centred on the human knower, and sought what they considered a more secure foundation for knowledge. In phenomenology this foundation would be experience itself; in structuralism, knowledge was to be founded on the "structures" that make experience possible: concepts, and language or signs. Post-structuralism, in turn, argued that founding knowledge either on pure experience (phenomenology) or systematic
structures (structuralism) was impossible. This impossibility was meant not to be a failure or loss, but a cause for "celebration and liberation."

Theory-General practices

Post-structural practices generally operate on some basic assumptions:

Post-structuralists hold that the concept of "self" as a separate, singular, and coherent entity is a fictional construct. Instead, an individual comprises tensions between conflicting knowledge claims (e.g. gender, race, class, profession, etc.). Therefore, to properly study a text a reader must understand how the work is related to his or her own personal concept of self. This self-perception plays a critical role in one's interpretation of meaning. While different thinkers' views on the self (or the subject) vary, it is often said to be constituted by discourse(s). Lacan's account includes a psychoanalytic dimension, while Derrida stresses the effects of power on the self. This is thought to be a component of post-modernist theory.

The author's intended meaning, such as it is (for the author's identity as a stable "self" with a single, discernible "intent" is also a fictional construct), is secondary to the meaning that the reader perceives. Post-structuralism rejects the idea of a literary text having a single purpose, a single meaning, or one singular existence. Instead, every individual reader creates a new and individual purpose, meaning, and existence for a given text. To step outside of literary theory, this position is generalizable to any situation where a subject perceives a sign. Meaning (or the signified, in Saussure's scheme, which is as heavily presumed upon in post-structuralism as in structuralism) is constructed by an individual from a signifier. This is why the signified is said to 'slide' under the signifier, and explains the talk about the "primacy of the signifier." A post-structuralist critic must be able to use a variety of perspectives to create a multifaceted interpretation of a text, even if these interpretations conflict with one another. It is particularly important to analyze how the meanings of a text shift in relation to certain variables, usually involving the identity of the reader.

Destabilized meaning

In the post-structuralist approach to textual analysis, the reader replaces the author as the primary subject of inquiry. This displacement is often referred to as the "destabilizing" or "decentering" of the author, though it has its greatest effect on the text itself. Without a central fixation on the author, post-structuralists examine other sources for meaning (e.g., readers, cultural norms, other literature, etc.). These alternative sources are never authoritative, and promise no consistency. In his essay "Signification and Sense," Emmanuel Lévinas remarked on this new field of semantic inquiry:

...language refers to the position of the listener and the speaker, that is, to the contingency of their story. To seize by inventory all the contexts of language and all possible positions of interlocutors is a senseless task. Every verbal signification lies at the confluence of countless semantic rivers. Experience, like language, no longer seems to be made of isolated elements lodged somehow in a Euclidean space... [Words] signify from the "world" and from the position of one who is looking.

Deconstruction
A major theory associated with Structuralism was binary opposition. This theory proposed that there are certain theoretical and conceptual opposites, often arranged in a hierarchy, which human logic has given of text. Such binary pairs could include Enlightenment/Romantic, male/female, speech/writing, rational/emotional, signifier/signified, symbolic/imaginary.

Post-structuralism rejects the notion of the essential quality of the dominant relation in the hierarchy, choosing rather to expose these relations and the dependency of the dominant term on its apparently subservient counterpart. The only way to properly understand these meanings is to deconstruct the assumptions and knowledge systems which produce the illusion of singular meaning. This act of deconstruction illuminates how male can become female, how speech can become writing, and how rational can become emotional.

**Structuralism vs. Post-structuralism**

Structuralism was an intellectual movement in France in the 1950s and 1960s that studied the underlying structures in cultural products (such as texts) and used analytical concepts from linguistics, psychology, anthropology and other fields to interpret those structures. It emphasized the logical and scientific nature of its results.

Post-structuralism offers a study of how knowledge is produced and a critique of structuralist premises. It argues that because history and culture condition the study of underlying structures it is subject to biases and misinterpretations. To understand an object (e.g. one of the many meanings of a text), a post-structuralist approach argues, it is necessary to study both the object itself and the systems of knowledge that produced the object.

**Historical vs. descriptive view**

Post-structuralists generally assert that post-structuralism is historical, and classify structuralism as descriptive. This terminology relates to Ferdinand de Saussure's distinction between the views of historical (diachronic) and descriptive (synchronic) reading. From this basic distinction, post-structuralist studies often emphasize history to analyze descriptive concepts. By studying how cultural concepts have changed over time, post-structuralists seek to understand how those same concepts are understood by readers in the present. For example, Michel Foucault's Madness and Civilization is both a history and an inspection of cultural attitudes about madness. The theme of history in modern Continental thought can be linked to such influences as Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Friedrich Nietzsche's On the Genealogy of Morals and Martin Heidegger's Being and Time.

Structuralists also seek to understand the historical interpretation of cultural concepts, but focus their efforts on understanding how those concepts were understood by the author in his or her own time, rather than how they may be understood by the reader in the present.

**Scholars between both movements**

The uncertain distance between structuralism and post-structuralism is further blurred by the fact that scholars generally do not label themselves as post-structuralists. In some cases (e.g. Roland Barthes), scholars associated with structuralism became noteworthy in post-structuralism as well. Three of the most prominent post-structuralists were first counted among the so-called "Gang of Four" of structuralism par excellence: Jacques Lacan, Roland Barthes, and Michel Foucault.
works of Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze, and Julia Kristeva are also counted as prominent examples of post-structuralism.

The critical reading carried out by these thinkers sought to find contradictions that an author includes, supposedly inevitably, in his work. Those inconsistencies are used to show that the interpretation and criticism of any literature is in the hands of the reader and includes that reader's own cultural biases and assumptions. While many structuralists first thought that they could tease out an author's intention by close scrutiny, they soon argued that textual analysis discovered so many disconnections that it was obvious that their own experiences lent a view that was unique to them.

Some observers from outside the post-structuralist camp have questioned the rigor and legitimacy of the field in academia. American philosopher John Searle argued in 1990 that "The spread of 'poststructuralist' literary theory is perhaps the best known example of a silly but noncatastrophic phenomenon." Similarly, physicist Alan Sokal in 1997 criticized "the postmodernist/poststructuralist gibberish that is now hegemonic in some sectors of the American academy." Literature scholar Norman Holland argued that post-structuralism was flawed due to reliance on Saussure's linguistic model, which was seriously challenged by the 1950s and was soon abandoned by linguists: "Saussure's views are not held, so far as I know, by modern linguists, only by literary critics and the occasional philosopher. [Strict adherence to Saussure] has elicited wrong film and literary theory on a grand scale. One can find dozens of books of literary theory bogged down in signifiers and signifieds, but only a handful that refer to Chomsky."

**Major works and concepts**

**Eco and the open text**

When *The Open Work* was written by Umberto Eco (1962) it was in many (or all) senses post-structuralist. The influence of this work is, however, complex: Eco worked closely with Barthes, and in the second Preface to the book (1967), Eco explicitly states his post-structuralist position and the assonance with his friend's position. The entire book is a critique of a certain concept of "structure" and "form," giving to the reader a strong power in understanding the text.

**Barthes and the need for metalanguage**

Although many may have felt the necessity to move beyond structuralism, there was clearly no consensus on how this ought to occur. Much of the study of post-structuralism is based on the common critiques of structuralism. Roland Barthes is of great significance with respect to post-structuralist theory. In his work, *Elements of Semiology* (1967), he advanced the concept of the "metalanguage". A metalanguage is a systematized way of talking about concepts like meaning and grammar beyond the constraints of a traditional (first-order) language; in a metalanguage, symbols replace words and phrases. Insofar as one metalanguage is required for one explanation of first-order language, another may be required, so metalanguages may actually replace first-order languages. Barthes exposes how this structuralist system is regressive; orders of language rely upon a metalanguage by which it is explained, and therefore deconstruction itself is in danger of becoming a metalanguage, thus exposing all languages and discourse to scrutiny. Barthes' other works contributed deconstructive theories about texts.
Derrida's lecture at Johns Hopkins

The occasional designation of post-structuralism as a movement can be tied to the fact that mounting criticism of structuralism became evident at approximately the same time that structuralism became a topic of interest in universities in the United States. This interest led to a 1966 conference at Johns Hopkins University that invited scholars who were thought to be prominent post-structuralists, including Derrida, Barthes, and Lacan. Derrida's lecture at that conference, "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Human Sciences," often appears in collections as a manifesto against structuralism. Derrida's essay was one of the earliest to propose some theoretical limitations to structuralism, and to attempt to theorize on terms that were clearly no longer structuralist.

The element of "play" in the title of Derrida's essay is often erroneously taken to be "play" in a linguistic sense, based on a general tendency towards puns and humour, while social constructionism as developed in the later work of Michel Foucault is said to create a sense of strategic agency by laying bare the levers of historical change. The importance of Foucault's work is seen by many to be in its synthesis of this social/historical account of the operations of power.

Post-Modernism

"Modernity" is that period - nearly a century - beginning well before Second World War and ending well after it, in which science established facts, political theory established the social state, secularism overcame religious opinion, and the notion of shame was denied or explained away with various social conventions. It was an era dominated by the thought of Freud and Marx. Its tendency was towards the legitimacy of the social welfare state. Sweden represents its culmination.

"Post Modern" embraces a period from about 1980 to the present, characterized by the emergence of the postindustrial information economy, replacing the previous classes of aristocracy, middle class, and working class with the new paradigm: information elite, middle class, and underclass. The phrase also implies a nation-state challenged by new world views: feminism, multiculturalism, environmentalism, etc; old scientific certainties called into question; the replacement of mechanical metaphors with cybernetic ones.

Postmodernism rejects the modernist ideals of rationality, virility, artistic genius, and individualism, in favor of being anti-capitalist, contemptuous of traditional morality, and committed to radical egalitarianism. The most recent feature of PostModernism is the rise of Political Correctness and the attempt to purge dissenting opinion from the ranks of the academic/artistic/professional brahmin caste, together with a systematic attack on excellence in all fields. Post Modernism is an anti-Enlightenment position wherein adherents believe that what has gone before, as "Modernism", is inappropriately dependent on Reason, Rationalism, and Wisdom, and is, furthermore, inherently elitist, non-multicultural and therefore oppressive.

Finding fertile ground in academic departments of literature (particularly literary criticism), art history, and sociology - and more recently in history and political "science", its origin can be traced to the French academy of the 1970's whose proponents are now called "deconstructionists", the essence of which is that in any literary creation (any "text"), the actual meaning of the screed is to be found in the reader, not in the author. That is to say, it is futile to try and know what an author meant by what is written, but what you can know is what you interpret from what you have read.
and that becomes the true meaning. A Text, the postmodernist insists, is "ultimately self-contradictory". (Except, of course, the texts written by postmodernists!)

In the sense that the Enlightenment encapsulated an acquired series of rational observations into Truths, and then wove those Truths into a coherent philosophy of the world, general laws which apply to it, and the consequences of such laws to its inhabitants, the postmodernists reject the notion that anything can be resolved to be True. Everything is in the mind of the beholder: relative, forever shifting; and anything perceived to be a "fact" is the mere disillusionment of a cultural bias. With such a philosophy, adherents can move beyond the critique of books to the critique of anything, even science, about which they tend to be supremely ignorant. But in the land of the blind, the one-eyed man is King, and in postmodernism, the man in best possession of obscurantist jargonism is Professor and Chairman of the Department.

Postmodernism is the unifying philosophy of the academic left which has replaced discredited Marxism. It might also be claimed that Marxism has morphed into postmodernism. Like all academic foolishness, it has an argot of jargon, tropes and incoherent phraseology recapitulated continuously by the cognoscenti. It distills, ultimately, to mere posturing as a substitute for intellectual fervor. Although nothing, according to the postmodernist, can be determined to be "true", postmodernism itself is, of course, True.

Paying homage at the postmodernist altar are all sorts of new academic disciplines, chief of which are "women's studies", "black studies", and "interdisciplinary studies", and an assortment of nutty crusades such as campus Political Correctness and even environmental wackiness: look at "global warming" for example—the greatest Hoax in human history. Nothing is true, and the Believer worships at that altar. These are the truly disenchanted: coagulated in the academy after having been rejected in the real world, they continue their search for a nihilistic nirvana.

**New Historicism**

It is an approach to literary criticism and literary theory based on the premise that a literary work should be considered a product of the time, place, and circumstances of its composition rather than as an isolated creation. New Historicism has its roots in a reaction to the "New Criticism" — a philosophy which argues that everything you need to know is in the text itself, as provided by the author. New Historicism developed in the 1980s and gained widespread influence in the 1990s. New Historicists aim simultaneously to understand the work through its historical context and to understand cultural and intellectual history through literature. New Historicism claims to be a more neutral approach to historical events, and is sensitive towards different cultures.

H. Aram Veeser, introducing an anthology of essays, *The New Historicism* (1989), noted some key assumptions that continually reappear in New Historicist discourse; they were:

- that every expressive act is embedded in a network of material practices;
- that every act of unmasking, critique and opposition uses the tools it condemns and risks falling prey to the practice it exposes;
- that literary and non-literary "texts" circulate inseparably;
- that no discourse, imaginative or archival, gives access to unchanging truths, nor expresses inalterable human nature;
that a critical method and a language adequate to describe culture under capitalism participate in the economy they describe.

**Orientalism**

Orientalism may refer to a range of perceptions and attitudes evinced by the western scholarship towards the Indian civilisation in the 18th and early 19th centuries and since then to a wider intellectual exercise at global level to study and interpret the East in relation to the West. The term 'Orientalism' first came into currency in France in the 1830s, and since then has been employed in a variety of ways to refer to Oriental scholarship, to represent a certain genre of romantic-fantasy literature, architecture and painting and most importantly, to mark out a certain kind of ideological understanding of the East by the West.

The father of orientalism was Sir William Jones (1746-1794), a judge of the Calcutta Supreme Court, who initiated a systematic study of Indian classical languages. Nathaniel halhed, Charles Wilkins, Henry T colebrooke had joined up with him with their skill in Indian languages. The platform of their intellectual activities was the Asiatic society, Calcutta, which Jones had founded in 1784. William Jones's discovery that Sanskrit had an evolutionary connection with the European group of languages astounded the classicist and romantic scholars of Europe, who, in response, had started a new inquiry embracing all the languages of mankind with the probing assumption that the languages of mankind were inter-linked. This was the origin of the modern science of linguistics and philology.

The inquiries of William Jones and his colleagues had at first inspired many of the east India companyservants to study Indian languages, literature and history. By the 1820s, the company had a band of civilian and military officers who were committed to the study of the Indian civilisation. Among them particular mention may be made of william carey, JH Harington, HH Wilson, WB Bayley, Hold Mackenzie, WH Maenaughten, George Swinton, Thomas Fortesque and HT Prinsep and James prinsep.

William Jones and his group conducted their research in the spirit of the 18th century European Enlightenment which disseminated the idea of inter-racial tolerance and cultural relativism. Like the Enlightenment *philosophes*, they also believed that the map of mankind was dotted with inter-relating cultures which deserve study and tolerance in the interest of human civilisation. It is imbued by this spirit of universality of human culture that led the 'orientalist' servants of the company to dig into the Indian past and discover its heritage. A series of textual, literary, archaeological, numismatic and paleographic discoveries made by them and their interpretations had deeply influenced the *philosophes* who now perceived the need for renewal of enlightenment for a vision of wholeness, a yearning for a oneness of mankind and a oneness with nature and for a reunification of religion, philosophy, and art that had been thought to be lost in the western world. The monistic and idealist philosophy of the *Vedanta* captured the mind of the European intellectuals until the Great sepoy revolt of 1857. The horror stories of the event had a shattering effect on the mind of the orientalists who had been hitherto stressing on the pacific and philosophical nature of the Indian people.

In the nineteenth century, a new class of orientalists emerged. The Christian missionaries in India and Europe were also studying Indian past and present, but with a different intent. The intention of
the missionary orientalists was to expose the weaknesses of the Indian civilisation in relation to the western. Charles grant, once a company servant and later chairman of the East India Company, was the leader of evangelical group of orientalists. The rationalist and romantic mind of the age of Enlightenment was gradually replaced by an imperial outlook which began to consider the oriental civilisations as imperfect and inferior to western civilisation. Keeping this ethnocentric assumption in view the neo-orientalists of the early 20th century began to re-interpret the interpretations of the Enlightenment orientalists. According to them, orientalism was 'a system of ideological fictions'. The purpose of 'imperial' orientalism was to reinforce and justify Western power over the Orient as a moral obligation.

Orientalism as an exercise in the West has now two realms- one political and the other philosophical and academic. Orientalists of the second realm, most of whom are the members of the academia, do argue that orientalism is not a mask for racialism, as the 'imperial' orientlists tend to believe, but an equal standard for understanding the whole mankind as a single unit of existence. However, it must be admitted that 'orientalism' of all brands is a western construct and its intensity and purpose varied from time to time.

Edward Said and Orientalism

Edward Said's evaluation and critique of the set of beliefs known as Orientalism forms an important background for postcolonial studies. His work highlights the inaccuracies of a wide variety of assumptions as it questions various paradigms of thought which are accepted on individual, academic, and political levels.

The Terms

The Orient signifies a system of representations framed by political forces that brought the Orient into Western learning, Western consciousness, and Western empire. The Orient exists for the West, and is constructed by and in relation to the West. It is a mirror image of what is inferior and alien ("Other") to the West.

Orientalism is "a manner of regularized (or orientalized) writing, vision, and study, dominated by imperatives, perspectives, and ideological biases ostensibly suited to the Orient." It is the image of the 'Orient' expressed as an entire system of thought and scholarship.

The Oriental is the person represented by such thinking. The man is depicted as feminine, weak, yet strangely dangerous because poses a threat to white, Western women. The woman is both eager to be dominated and strikingly exotic. The Oriental is a single image, a sweeping generalization, a stereotype that crosses countless cultural and national boundaries.

Latent Orientalism is the unconscious, untouchable certainty about what the Orient is. Its basic content is static and unanimous. The Orient is seen as separate, eccentric, backward, silently different, sensual, and passive. It has a tendency towards despotism and away from progress. It displays feminine penetrability and supine malleability. Its progress and value are judged in terms of, and in comparison to, the West, so it is always the other, the conquerable, and the inferior.
Manifest Orientalism is what is spoken and acted upon. It includes information and changes in knowledge about the Orient as well as policy decisions founded in Orientalist thinking. It is the expression in words and actions of Latent Orientalism.

Earlier Orientalism

The first 'Orientalists' were 19th century scholars who translated the writings of 'the Orient' into English, based on the assumption that a truly effective colonial conquest required knowledge of the conquered peoples. This idea of knowledge as power is present throughout Said's critique. By knowing the Orient, the West came to own it. The Orient became the studied, the seen, the observed, the object; Orientalist scholars were the students, the seers, the observers, and the subject. The Orient was passive; the West was active.

One of the most significant constructions of Orientalist scholars is that of the Orient itself. What is considered the Orient is a vast region, one that spreads across a myriad of cultures and countries. It includes most of Asia as well as the Middle East. The depiction of this single 'Orient' which can be studied as a cohesive whole is one of the most powerful accomplishments of Orientalist scholars. It essentializes an image of a prototypical Oriental—a biological inferior that is culturally backward, peculiar, and unchanging—to be depicted in dominating and sexual terms. The discourse and visual imagery of Orientalism is laced with notions of power and superiority, formulated initially to facilitate a colonizing mission on the part of the West and perpetuated through a wide variety of discourses and policies. The language is critical to the construction. The feminine and weak Orient awaits the dominance of the West; it is a defenseless and unintelligent whole that exists for, and in terms of, it’s Western counterpart. The importance of such a construction is that it creates a single subject matter where none existed, a compilation of previously unspoken notions of the other. Since the notion of the Orient is created by the Orientalist, it exists solely for him or her. Its identity is defined by the scholar who gives it life.

Contemporary Orientalism

Said argues that Orientalism can be found in current Western depictions of "Arab" cultures. The depictions of "the Arab" as irrational, menacing, untrustworthy, anti-Western, dishonest, and--perhaps most importantly--prototypical, are ideas into which Orientalist scholarship has evolved. These notions are trusted as foundations for both ideologies and policies developed by the Occident. Said writes: "The hold these instruments have on the mind is increased by the institutions built around them. For every Orientalist, quite literally, there is a support system of staggering power, considering the ephemerality of the myths that Orientalism propagates. The system now culminates into the very institutions of the state. To write about the Arab Oriental world, therefore, is to write with the authority of a nation, and not with the affirmation of a strident ideology but with the unquestioning certainty of absolute truth backed by absolute force." He continues, "One would find this kind of procedure less objectionable as political propaganda—which is what it is, of course—were it not accompanied by sermons on the objectivity, the fairness, the impartiality of a real historian, the implication always being that Muslims and Arabs cannot be objective but that Orientalists writing about Muslims are, by definition, by training, by the mere fact of their Westernness. This is the culmination of Orientalism as a dogma that not only degrades its subject matter but also blinds its practitioners."
Said's Project

Said calls into question the underlying assumptions that form the foundation of Orientalist thinking. A rejection of Orientalism entails a rejection of biological generalizations, cultural constructions, and racial and religious prejudices. It is a rejection of greed as a primary motivating factor in intellectual pursuit. It is an erasure of the line between 'the West' and 'the other.' Said argues for the use of "narrative" rather than "vision" in interpreting the geographical landscape known as the Orient, meaning that a historian and a scholar would turn not to a panoramic view of half of the globe, but rather to a focused and complex type of history that allows space for the dynamic variety of human experience. Rejection of Orientalist thinking does not entail a denial of the differences between 'the West' and 'the Orient,' but rather an evaluation of such differences in a more critical and objective fashion. 'The Orient' cannot be studied in a non-Orientalist manner; rather, the scholar is obliged to study more focused and smaller culturally consistent regions. The person who has until now been known as 'the Oriental' must be given a voice. Scholarship from afar and second-hand representation must take a back seat to narrative and self-representation on the part of the 'Oriental.'

What does historian do? Debate

History means many things to many people. Knowledge of the past is essential to the society. Without the knowledge of the past we would be without identity. In understanding our present, we cannot escape the past. But what does historians do to understand the past? What are the critical skills you need to begin to make sense of the past? History as a discipline is far too strong, far too well established as far too popular. History has never been more popular, whether in the press, television or movies. For the students of history, there must be a constant awareness of the methods and principles of the discipline, constant attention to how it is taught and how at different levels, it is communicated to a wider audience. However, several controversies and debates surround historical thinking in the present period.

Contributions of E. H. Carr

Edward Hallett Carr (28 June 1892 – 3 November 1982) was a liberal and later left-wing Marxist British historian, journalist and international relations theorist, and an opponent of empiricism within historiography. Carr was best known for his 14-volume history of the Soviet Union, in which he provided an account of Soviet history from 1917 to 1929, for his writings on international relations, and for his book What Is History?, in which he laid out historiographical principles rejecting traditional historical methods and practices.

Educated at the Merchant Taylors' School, London, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, Carr began his career as a diplomat in 1916. Becoming increasingly preoccupied with the study of international relations and of the Soviet Union, he resigned from the Foreign office in 1936 to begin an academic career. From 1941 to 1946, Carr worked as an assistant editor at ‘The Times’, where he was noted for his leaders (editorials) urging a socialist system and an Anglo-Soviet alliance as the basis of a post-war order. Afterwards, Carr worked on a massive 14-volume work on Soviet history entitled A History of Soviet Russia, a project that he was still engaged on at the time of his death in 1982. In 1961, he delivered the G. M. Trevelyan lectures at the University of Cambridge that became the basis of his book, what is History? Moving increasingly towards the left throughout his career, Carr saw his role as the theorist who would work out the basis of a new international order.
Early life

Carr was born in London to a middle-class family, and was educated at the Merchant Taylors' School in London, and Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was awarded a First Class Degree in Classics in 1916. Carr's family had orginated in northern England, and the first mention of his ancestors was a George Carr who served as the Sheriff of Newcastle in 1450. Carr's parents were Francis Parker and Jesse (née Hallet) Carr. They were initially Conservatives, but went over to supporting the Liberals in 1903 over the free trade issue. When Joseph Chamberlain proclaimed his opposition to free trade and announced in favour of Imperial preference, Carr's father, for whom all tariffs were abhorrent, changed his political loyalties. Carr described the atmosphere at the Merchant Taylors School as:"...95% of my school fellows came from orthodox Conservative homes, and regarded Lloyd George as an incarnation of the devil. We Liberals were a tiny despised minority." From his parents, Carr inherited a strong belief in progress as an unstoppable force in world affairs, and throughout his life a recurring theme in Carr's thinking was that the world was getting progressively a better place. With his belief in progress was a tendency on Carr's part to decry pessimism as mere whining from those who could not appreciate the benefits of progress. In 1911, Carr won the Craven Scholarship to attend Trinity College at Cambridge. As an undergraduate at Cambridge, Carr was much impressed by hearing one of his professors' lectures on how the Peloponnesian War influenced Herodotus in the writing of the Histories. Carr found this to be a great discovery—the subjectivity of the historian's craft. This discovery was later to influence his 1961 book what is History?

Diplomatic career

Like many of his generation, Carr found World War I to be a shattering experience as it destroyed the world he knew before 1914. Carr was later to write that the pre-1914 world was:"...solid and stable. Prices did not change. Incomes, if they changed, went up...It was a good place, and it was getting better. This country was leading it by the right direction. There were no doubt, abuses, but they were being, or would be, dealt with".

He joined the British Foreign Office in 1916, resigning in 1936. Carr was excused from military service for medical reasons. Carr was at first assigned to the Contraband Department of the Foreign Office, which sought to enforce the blockade on Germany, and then in 1917 was assigned to the Northern Department, which amongst other areas dealt with relations with Russia. In 1918, Carr was involved in the negotiations to have the British diplomats imprisoned in Petrograd by the Bolsheviks released in exchange for the British releasing the Soviet diplomats imprisoned in London in retaliation. As a diplomat, Carr was later praised by the Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax as someone who had "distinguished himself not only by sound learning and political understanding, but also in administrative ability".At first, Carr knew nothing about the Bolsheviks. Carr later recalled:

"I had some vague impression of the revolutionary views of Lenin and Trotsky, but knew nothing of Marxism; I'd probably never heard of Marx".

By 1919, Carr had become convinced that the Bolsheviks were destined to win the Russian Civil War, and approved of the Prime Minister David Lloyd George's opposition to the anti-Bolshevik ideas of the War Secretary Winston Churchill under the grounds of realpolitik. In Carr's opinion,
Churchill's support of the White Russian movement was folly as Russia was destined to be a great power once more under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, and it was foolish for Britain to support the losing side of the Russian Civil War. Carr was to later write that in the spring of 1919 he "was disappointed when he [Lloyd George] gave way (in part) on the Russian question in order to buy French consent to concessions to Germany on Upper Silesia, Danzig and reparations"

Carr participated in the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 as part of the British delegation. Carr later accused the "Big Three" at Versailles, namely Wilson (US President), Lloyd George (UK Prime Minister) and Clemenceau (French Prime Minister) of creating a "sterile" international order that led to all of the problems of the 1920s–30s.

In 1919, Carr was part of the British delegation at the Paris Peace Conference and was involved in the drafting of parts of the Treaty of Versailles relating to the League of Nations. During the peace conference, Carr was much offended at the Allied, especially French treatment of the Germans, writing that the German delegation at the peace conference were "cheated over the "Fourteen Points", and subjected to every petty humiliation" Beside working on the sections of the Versailles treaty relating to the League of Nations, Carr was also involved in working out the borders between Germany and the newly reborn state of Poland. Initially, Carr favoured Poland, urging in a memo in February 1919 that Britain recognize Poland at once, and that the German city of Danzig (modern Gdańsk, Poland) be ceded to Poland In March 1919, Carr fought against the idea of a Minorities Treaty for Poland, arguing that the rights of ethnic and religious minorities in Poland would be best guaranteed by not involving the international community in Polish internal affairs. By the spring of 1919, Carr's relations with the Polish delegation had declined to a state of mutual hostility. Carr's tendency to favour the claims of the Germans at the expense of the Poles led the British historian Adam Zamoyski to note that Carr "...held views of the most extraordinary racial arrogance on all of the nations of Eastern Europe". Carr's biographer, Jonathan Haslam wrote in a 2000 essay that Carr grew up in a Germanophile household, in which German culture was deeply appreciated, which in turn always coloured Carr's views towards Germany throughout his life. As a result of his Germanophile and anti-Polish views, Carr supported the territorial claims of the Reich against Poland. In a letter written in 1954 to his friend, Isaac Deutscher, Carr described his attitude to Poland at the time:"This was the period of Korfanty, Żeligowski and the disputes over Teschen and Eastern Galicia, not mention the campaign of 1920. The picture of Poland that was universal in Eastern Europe right down to 1925 was of a strong and potentially predatory power".

After the peace conference, Carr was stationed at the British Embassy in Paris until 1921, and in 1920 was awarded a CBE. At first, Carr had great faith in the League, which he believed would prevent both another world war, and ensures a better post-war world. Carr later recalled:"In those years, the League was rapidly becoming the focus of everything that mattered in international affairs; and each successive Assembly seemed to mark some progress in what has come to be known as the "organization of peace"

In the 1920s, Carr was assigned to the branch of the British Foreign Office that dealt with the League of Nations before being sent to the British Embassy in Riga, Latvia, where he served as Second Secretary between 1925–29. In 1925, Carr married Anne Ward Howe, by whom he had one son. During his time in Riga (which at that time possessed a substantial Russian émigré community), Carr became increasing fascinated with Russian literature and culture and wrote several works on various aspects of Russian life. Carr's interests in Russia and Russians were
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further increased by his boredom with life in Riga. Carr described Riga as "...an intellectual desert". Carr learnt Russian during his time in Riga in order to read Russian writers in the original. In 1927, Carr paid his first visit to Moscow. Carr was later to write that reading Alexander Herzen, Fyodor Dostoevsky and the work of other 19th century Russian intellectuals caused him to re-think his liberal views. Carr wrote under the impact of reading various Russian writers he found:"that the liberal moralistic ideology in which I was brought up was not, as I had always assumed, an Absolute taken for granted by the modern world, but was sharply and convincingly attacked by very intelligent people living outside the charmed circle, who looked at the world through very different eyes...This left me in a very confused state of mind: I reacted more and more sharply against the Western ideology, but still from a point within it".

Starting in 1929, Carr started to review books relating to all things Russian and Soviet and to international relations in several British literary journals such as the Fortnightly Review, The Spectator, the Times Literary Supplement and later towards the end of his life, the London Review of Books. In particular, Carr emerged as the Times Literary Supplement's Soviet expert in the early 1930s, a position he still held at the time of his death in 1982 Because of his status as a diplomat (until 1936), most of Carr's reviews in the period 1929–36 were published either anonymously or under the pseudonym "John Hallett". Between 1931 and 1937, Carr published many works on many historians and history, works that gave much fledgling discipline of international relations much vigour and discipline. In the summer of 1929, Carr began work on a biography of the Russian writer Fyodor Dostoevsky, during which the course of researching Dostoevsky's life, Carr befriended Prince D. S. Mirsky, a Russian émigré scholar living at that time in Britain. Beside studies on international relations, Carr's writings in the 1930s included biographies of Fyodor Dostoevsky (1931), Karl Marx (1934), and Mikhail Bakunin (1937). An early sign of Carr's increasing admiration of the Soviet Union was a 1929 review of Baron Pyotr Wrangel's memoirs where Carr wrote:"It is not longer possible for any sane man to regard the campaigns of Kolchak, Yudenich, Deninik and Wrangel otherwise than as tragic blunders of colossal dimensions. They were monuments of folly in conception and of incompetence in execution; they cost, directly and indirectly, hundreds of thousands of lives; and except in so far as they may have increased the bitterness of the Soviet rulers against the "White" Russians and the Allies who half-heartedly supported them, they did not deflect the course of history by a single hair's breadth".

In an article entitled "Age of Reason" published in the Spectator on April 26, 1930, Carr attacked what he regarded as the prevailing culture of pessimism within the West, which he blamed on the French writer Marcel Proust. Carr wrote:"It was about the turn of the century that the trouble began. It did not come from the rebels or radicals...It came rather with men like Kipling and Rostand, men loyal to the core to the old traditions, men of genius-and yet who somehow did not quite pull it off...The great days of the glory of man and his achievements were numbered. The vein was petering out; in some strange way it no longer came off. It was, men said, the end of the Victorian Age...It was once the vulgar ambition of mankind to make something out of nothing; Proust brought perfection to the more genteel pastime of resolving everything into nothingness".

In the early 1930s, Carr found the Great Depression to be almost profoundly shocking as the First World War. In an article entitled "England Adrift" published in September 1930, Carr wrote:"The prevailing state of mind in England to-day is one of defeatism or...skepticism, of disbelief in herself. England has ceased to have ideas, or if, she has them, to believe in the possibility of their fulfillment. Alone among the Great Powers she has ceased to have a mission...The government of
the day has so little faith in its capacity to tackle the major problems of our generation that it invites
the other parties to assist with their advice (imagine Mr Gladstone invoking the assistance of Lord
Beaconsfield!), and the principle opposition party, knowing full well there is no solution, declines
the invitation and keeps its hands free to wash them of the consequences...We have no convictions
beyond a vague sort of fatalism".

Further increasing Carr's interest in a replacement ideology for liberalism was his reaction to
hearing the debates in January 1931 at the General Assembly of the League of Nations in Geneva,
Switzerland, and especially the speeches on the merits of free trade between the Yugoslav Foreign
Minister Vojislav Marinkovich and the British Foreign Secretary Arthur Henderson. Carr wrote:"At
Geneva I followed some of the debates about the economic crisis, which seemed to spell the
bankruptcy of capitalism. In particular I was stuck by the fact that everyone professed to believe
that tariff barriers were a major cause of aggravation of the crisis, but that practically every country
was busy erecting them. I happened to hear a speech by some minor delegate (Yugoslav, I think)
which for the first time in my experience put the issue clearly and urgently. Free trade was the
doctrine of economically powerful states, which flourished without protection, but would be fatal to
weak states. This came as a revelation to me (like the revelation at Cambridge of the relativism of
historiography), and was doubly significant because of the part played by free trade in my
intellectual upbringing. If free trade went, the whole liberal outlook went with it."

It was at this time that Carr started to admire the Soviet Union. Carr wrote in a book review in
February 1931:"They [the Soviets] have discovered a new religion of the Kilowatt and the
Machine, which may well be the creed for which modern civilization is waiting...This new religion,
is growing up on the fringes of a Europe which has lost faith in herself.Contemporary Europe is
aimlessly drifting, refusing to face unpalatable facts, and looking for external remedies for her
difficulties. The important question for Europe at the present time is...whether the steel production
of the Soviet Union will overtake that of Great Britain and France...whether Europe can discover in
herself a driving force, an intensity of faith comparable to that now being generated in Russia"

In a 1932 book review of Lancelot Lawton's Economic History of Soviet Russia, Carr dismissed
Lawton's claim that the Soviet economy was a failure, and praised the British Marxist economist
Maurice Dobb's extremely favourable assessment of the Soviet economy. Carr concluded that "as
regards economic development, Professor Dobb is conclusive".Beside writing on Soviet affairs,
Carr also commented on other international events. In an essay published in February 1933 in the
Fortnightly Review, Carr blamed what he regarded as a putative Versailles treaty for the recent
accession to power of Adolf HitlerCarr wrote that in the 1920s, German leaders like Gustav
Stresemannwere unable to secure sufficient modifications of the Versailles treaty owing to the
intractable attitude of the Western powers, especially France, and now the West had reaped what it
had sowed in the form of the Nazi regime. However, despite some concerns about National
Socialism, Carr ended his essay by writing that:"The crucial point about Hitlerism is that its
disciples not only believe in themselves, but believe in Germany. For the first time since the war a
party appeared outside the narrow circles of the extreme Right which was not afraid to proclaim its
pride in being German. It will perhaps one day be recognized as the greatest service of Hitlerism
that, in a way quite unprecedented in German politics, it cut across all social distinctions,
embracing in its ranks working men, bourgeoisie, intelligentsia and aristocrats. "Germany Awake!"
became a living national faith".
Initially, Carr's political outlook was anti-Marxist and liberal. In his 1934 biography of Karl Marx, Carr presented his subject as highly intelligent man and a gifted writer, but one whose talents were devoted entirely for destruction. Carr argued that Marx's sole and only motivation was mindless class hatred. Carr labelled dialectical materialism gibberish, and the labour theory of value doctrinal and derivative. Carr wrote that:"The pseudo-Marxist is a pathetic figure. He knows that Marxism is moonshine, but he still nourishes the hope of finding in it a gleam to follow."

Speaking of the differences between the fascist regimes and the Soviet Union, Carr wrote:"the only difference between the so-called "dictatorship of the proletariat" and the dictatorships which prefer to hoist other flags is that the one proclaims its Marxist paternity whereas the others deny it."Despite his hostile appraisal of Marx, Carr ended his book by writing that recent developments in the Soviet Union meant that Marx had:"...a claim to be regarded as the most far-seeing genius of the nineteenth century and one of the most successful prophets in history"Carr went on to write:"There are now few thinking man who will dismiss with confidence the Marxian assumption that capitalism, developed to its highest point, inevitably encompasses its own destruction."

Likewise, Carr praised Marx for emphasizing the importance of the collective over the individual. Carr wrote that:"In a sense, Marx is the protagonist and forerunner of the whole twentieth century revolution of thought. The nineteenth century saw the end of the period of humanism which began with the Renaissance-the period which took as its ideal the highest development of the faculties and liberties of the individual...Marx understood that, in the new order, the individual would play a minor part. Individualism implies differentiation; everything that is undifferentiated does not count. The Industrial Revolution would place in power the undifferentiated mass. Not man, but mass-man, not the individual, but the class, not the political man, would be the unit of the coming dispensation. Not only industry, but the whole of civilization, would become a matter of mass-production."

In view of his later conversion to a sort of quasi-Marxism, Carr was to find the passages in ‘Karl Marx: A Study in Fanaticism’ criticizing Marx to be highly embarrassing, and refused to allow the book to be republished. Carr was to later call his Marx biography his worst book, and complained that he had only written it because his publisher had made a Marx biography the precondition of publishing the biography of Mikhail Bakunin that he was writing. In his books such as The Romantic Exiles and Dostoevsky, Carr was noted for his highly ironical treatment of his subjects, implying that their lives were of interest, but not of great importance. In the mid-1930s, Carr was especially preoccupied with the life and ideas of Bakunin. During this period, Carr started writing a novel about the visit of a Bakunin-type Russian radical to Victorian Britain who proceeded to expose all of Carr regarded as the pretensions and hypocrisies of British bourgeois society. The novel was never finished or published.

In 1938, Carr was a leading defender of the Munich Agreement from the left. In his 1939 book The Twenty Years’ Crisis, Carr argued that the Munich Agreement was just and moral attempt to undo the great wrong done to Germany by the Treaty of Versailles

As a diplomat in the 1930s, Carr took the view that great division of the world into rival trading blocs caused by the American Smoot Hawley Act of 1930 was the principal cause of German belligerence in foreign policy, as Germany was now unable to export finished goods or import raw materials cheaply. In Carr's opinion, if Germany could be given its own economic zone to dominate
in Eastern Europe comparable to the British Imperial preference economic zone, the U.S. dollar zone in the Americas, the French gold bloc zone and the Japanese economic zone, then the peace of the would could be assured. In a memo written on January 30, 1936, Carr wrote:"Since I think everyone is now agreed that it is dangerous to sit indefinitely on the safety-valve, and that Germany must expand somewhere, I feel that there is an overwhelming case for the view that the direction in which Germany can expand with a minimum of danger or inconvenience to British interests (whether political or economic) is in Central and South-Eastern Europe..."

Carr's views on appeasement caused much tension with his superior, the Permanent Undersecretary Sir Robert Vansittart, and played a role in Carr's resignation from the Foreign Office later in 1936. In a article entitled "An English Nationalist Abroad" published in May 1936 in the Spectator, Carr wrote "The methods of the Tudor sovereigns, when they were making the English nation, invite many comparisons with those of the Nazi regime in Germany" In this way, Carr argued that it was hypocritical for people in Britain to criticize the Nazi regime's human rights record. Because of Carr's strong antagonism to the Treaty of Versailles, which he viewed as unjust to Germany, Carr was very supportive of the Nazi regime's efforts to destroy Versailles through moves such as the Remilitarisation of the Rhineland. In 1936 Carr later wrote of his views in the 1930s that "No doubt, I was very blind".

**International relations scholar**

In 1936, Carr became the Woodrow Wilson Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, and is particularly known for his contribution on international relations theory. Carr's last words of advice as a diplomat was a memo urging that Britain accept the Balkans as an exclusive zone of influence for Germany. Additionally in articles published in the Christian Science Monitor on December 2, 1936 and in the January 1937 edition of Fortnightly Review, Carr argued that the Soviet Union and France were not working for collective security, but rather "...a division of the Great Powers into two armored camps", supported non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War, and asserted that King Leopold III of Belgium had made a major step towards peace with his declaration of neutrality of October 14, 1936. Two major intellectual influences on Carr in the mid-1930s were Karl Mannheim's 1936 book Ideology and Utopia, and the work of Reinhold Niebuhr on the need to combine morality with realism.

Carr's appointment as the Woodrow Wilson Professor of International Politics caused a stir when he started to use his position to criticize the League of Nations, a viewpoint which caused much tension with his benefactor, Lord Davies, who was a strong supporter of the League. Lord Davies had established the Wilson Chair in 1924 with the intention of increasing public support for his beloved League, which helps to explain his chagrin at Carr's anti-League lectures. In his first lecture on October 14, 1936 Carr stated the League was ineffective and that:"I do not believe the time is ripe...for the establishment of a super-national force to maintain order in the international community and I believe any scheme by which nations should bind themselves to go to war with other nations for the preservation of peace is not only impracticable, but retrograde". In the same lecture, Carr stated:"If European democracy binds its living body to the putrefying corpse of the 1919 settlement, it will merely be committing a particularly unpleasant form of suicide".

In the 1930s, Carr saw Hitler as a leader of a "have-not" nation struggling for economic justice, and misunderstood *lebensraum* to mean a zone of economic influence for Germany in Eastern Europe.
In 1937, Carr visited the Soviet Union for a second time, and was impressed by what he saw. During his visit to the Soviet Union, Carr may have inadvertently caused the death of his friend, Prince D. S. Mirsky. Carr stumbled into Prince Mirsky on the streets of Leningrad (modern Saint Petersburg, Russia), and despite Prince Mirsky's best efforts to pretend not to know him, Carr persuaded his old friend to have lunch with him. Since this was at the height of the Yezhovshchina, and any Soviet citizen who had any unauthorized contact with a foreigner was likely to be regarded as a spy, the NKVD arrested and executed Prince Mirsky as a British spy. As part of the same trip that took Carr to the Soviet Union in 1937 was a visit to Germany. In a speech given on October 12, 1937 at the Chatham Housesummarizing his impressions of those two countries, Carr reported that Germany was "...almost a free country". Unaware apparently of the fate of his friend, Carr spoke in his speech of the "strange behaviour" of his old friend, Prince Mirsky, who had at first gone to great lengths to try to pretend that he did not know Carr during their accidental meeting in Leningrad. Carr ended his speech by arguing that it was unfair for people in Britain to criticize either of the two dictatorships, whom Carr asserted were only reacting to the problems of the Great Depression. Carr stated: "But let us look a little at the historical perspective. Both the German and Russian regimes, today, represent a reaction against the individualistic ideology prevailing at any, in Western Europe, for the last hundred and fifty years...The whole system of individualist laissez-faire economy has we know, broken down. It has broken down because production and trade can only be carried out on a nationwide scale and with the aid of State machinery and State control. Now, State control has come in its most naked and undisguised form precisely where the individualist tradition was the weakest, in Germany and Russia".

In the 1930s, Carr was a leading supporter of appeasement. In the 1930s, Carr saw Germany as the victim of the Versailles treaty, and Hitler as a typical German leader, attempting like every other previous German leader since 1919 to overthrow that settlement. In his writings on international affairs in British newspapers, Carr criticized the Czechoslovak President Edvard Beneš for clinging to the alliance with France, rather than accepting that it was his country's destiny to be in the German sphere of influence. At the same time, Carr strongly praised the Polish Foreign Minister Colonel Józef Beck, who with his balancing act between France, Germany, and the Soviet Union as "a realist who grasped the fundamentals of the European situation" and argued that his polices were "from the Polish point of view...brilliantly successful". Starting in the late 1930s, Carr started to become even more sympathetic toward the Soviet Union, as Carr was much impressed by the apparent achievements of the Five-Year Plans, which stood in marked contrast to the seeming failures of capitalism in the Great Depression.

In the 1930s, Carr defended Chamberlain's appeasement policies, but was later to turn against him, accusing Chamberlain of forcing Stalin into signing the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact of 1939.

His famous work The Twenty Years' Crisis was published in July 1939, which dealt with the subject of international relations between 1919 and 1939. In that book, Carr defended appeasement under the grounds that it was the only realistic policy option. At the time the book was published in the summer of 1939, Neville Chamberlain had adopted his "containment" policy towards Germany, leading Carr to later ruefully comment that his book was dated even before it was published. In the spring and summer of 1939, Carr was very dubious about Chamberlain's "guarantee" of Polish independence issued on March 31, 1939, which he regarded as an act of folly and madness. In April
1939, Carr wrote in opposition to Chamberlain's "guarantee" of Poland that: "The use or threatened use of force to maintain the status quo may be morally more culpable than the use or threatened use of force to alter it".

In *The Twenty Year's Crisis*, Carr divided thinkers on international relations into two schools, which he labelled the realists and the utopians. Reflecting his own disillusionment with the League of Nations, Carr attacked as "utopians" those like Norman Angell who believed that a new and better international structure could be built around the League. In Carr's opinion, the entire international order constructed at Versailles was flawed, and the League was a hopeless dream that could never do anything practical.

Carr argued against the view that the problems of the world in 1939 were the work of a clique of evil men, and dismissed Arnold J. Toynbee's view that "we are living in an exceptionally wicked age". Carr asserted that the problems of the world in 1939 were due to structural political-economic problems that transcended the importance of individual national leaders, and argued that the focus on individuals as causal agents was equivalent to focusing on the trees rather the forest. Carr contended that the 19th century theory of a balance of interests amongst the powers was an erroneous belief, and instead contended that international relations was an incessant struggle between the economically advantaged "have" powers and the economically disadvantaged "have not" powers. In this economic understanding of international relations, "have" powers like the United States, Britain, and France were inclined to avoid war because of their contented status whereas "have not" powers like Germany, Italy and Japan were inclined towards war as they had nothing to lose, and everything to gain through war. In Carr's opinion, ideological differences between fascism and democracy were beside the point as he used as an example Japan, which Carr argued was not a fascist state, but still a "have not" power. Carr attacked Adam Smith for claiming there was a "harmony of interests" between the individual and his/her community, writing that "the doctrine of the harmony of interests was tenable only if you left out of account the interests of the weak who must be driven to the wall". Carr claimed after World War I, the American President Woodrow Wilson had unfortunately created an international order based on the doctrine of "harmony of interests" through the "utopian" instrument of the League of Nations with disastrous results. Carr argued that the only way to make the League (which Carr otherwise held in complete contempt by 1939) an effective force for peace was to persuade Germany, Italy and Japan to return to the League by promising them that their economic grievances could and would be worked out at the League. Carr called *The Twenty Year's Crisis*:"not exactly a Marxist work, but strongly impregnated with Marxist ways of thinking, applied to international affairs"

The distinction between "have" and "have not" nations perhaps reflected the influence of the theory first propagated by Enrico Corradini and later adopted by Benito Mussolini of the natural conflict between "proletarian" nations like Italy and "plutocratic" nations like Britain. In *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, Carr wrote:"When Herr Hitler refuses to believe that "God has permitted some nations first to acquire a world by force and then to defend this robbery with moralising theories", we have an authentic echo of the Marxist denial of a community of interest between "haves" and "have-nots", of the Marxist exposure of the interested character of "bourgeois" morality..."

In *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, Carr argued that the entire peace settlement of 1919 was flawed by the decisions of the British Prime Minister David Lloyd George, the French Premier Georges
Clemenceau and above all the American President Woodrow Wilson to impose a "sterile" international order in the post-war world. In particular, Carr claimed that what he saw as the basis of the post-1919 international order, namely the combination of 19th century style laissez-faire capitalism and the nationalism inspired by the principle of national self-determination, made for a highly defective peace settlement, and hence a very dangerous world. Carr later wrote that: "The Twenty Years' Crisis was written with the deliberate aim of counteracting the glaring and dangerous defect of nearly all thinking, both academic and popular, about international politics in the English-speaking countries from 1919 to 1939-the almost total neglect of the factor of power".

In Carr's opinion, the repeated demands made by Adolf Hitler for lebensraum (living space) was merely a reflection of the fact that Germany was a "have not" power (like many in interwar Britain, Carr misunderstood the term lebensraum as referring to a zone of exclusive economic influence for Germany in Eastern Europe). In Carr's view, the belligerence of the fascist powers was the "natural cynical reaction" to the empty moralizing of the "have" powers, who refused to make any concessions until the state of international relations had been allowed to seriously deteriorate. Carr argued that on moral and practical grounds the Treaty of Versailles had done a profound wrong to Germany, and that the present state of world tensions in 1939 was caused by the inability and/or unwillingness of the other powers to readress that wrong in a timely fashion. Carr defended the Munich Agreement as the overdue recognition of changes in the balance of power. In The Twenty Years' Crisis, Carr was highly critical of Winston Churchill, whom Carr described as a mere opportunist interested only in power for himself. Writing of Churchill's opposition to appeasement, Carr stated: "The realist will have no difficulty in recognizing the pragmatic, through no doubt unconscious adjustment of Mr. Churchill's judgments to his policy of the moment."

In the same book, Carr described the opposition of realism and utopianism in international relations as a dialectic progress. Carr described realism as the acceptance that what exists is right, and the belief that there is no reality or forces outside history such as God. Carr argued that in realism there is no moral dimension, and that what is successful is right, and what is unsuccessful is wrong. Carr argued that for realists there are no basis for moralizing about the past, present or the future and that "World history is the World Court". Carr rejected both utopianism and realism as the basis of a new international order, and instead called a synthesis of the two. Carr wrote that: "Having demolished the current utopia with weapons of realism we still need to build a new utopia of our own, which will fall to the same weapons".

Though Carr was highly sympathetic towards the realist case in international relations, and rejected utopianism as the basis of the international order, at the same time, Carr described realism as lacking: "a finite goal, an emotional appeal, a right of moral judgment, and a ground for action".

In his 1939 book The Twenty Years' Crisis, Carr attacked Norman Angell as a Utopian thinker on international relations.

Norman Angell, one of the "utopian" thinkers attacked by in The Twenty Years' Crisis called the book a "completely mischievous piece of sophisticated moral nihilism". In a review, Angell commented that Carr's claim that international law was only a device for allowing "have" nations to maintain their privileged position provided "aid and comfort in about equal degree to the followers of Marx and the followers of Hitler". Likewise, Angell maintained that Carr's claim that "resistance to aggression" was only an empty slogan on the part of the "have" nations meant only for keeping
down the "have not" nations was a "veritable gold mine for Dr. Goebbels". In response to *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, Angell wrote a book entitled *Why Freedom Matters* intended to rebut Carr. Another of the "utopian" thinkers attacked by Carr, Arnold J. Toynbee wrote that reading *The Twenty Years' Crisis* left one "in a moral vacuum and at a political dead point". Another "utopian", the British historian R.W. Seton-Watson wrote in response that it was "simply farcical" that Carr could write of morality in international politics without mentioning Christianity once in his book. In a 2004 speech, the American political scientist John Mearsheimer praised the *The Twenty Years' Crisis* and argued that Carr was correct when he claimed that international relations was a struggle of all against all with states always placing their own interests first. Mearsheimer maintained that Carr’s points were still as relevant for 2004 as for 1939, and went on to deplore what he claimed was the dominance of “idealist” thinking about international relations among British academic life.

Carr immediately followed up *The Twenty Year's Crisis* with *Britain: a Study of Foreign Policy from the Versailles Treaty to the Outbreak of War*, a study of British foreign policy in the inter-war period that featured a preface by the Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax. Carr ended his support for appeasement, which had so vociferously expressed in *The Twenty Year's Crisis* in the late summer of 1939 with a favourable review of a book containing a collection of Churchill's speeches from 1936–38, which Carr wrote were "justifiably" alarmist about Germany. After 1939, Carr largely abandoned writing about international relations in favour of contemporary events and Soviet history. Carr was to write only three more books about international relations after 1939, namely *The Future of Nations; Independence or Interdependence?* (1941), *German-Soviet Relations between the Two World Wars, 1919–1939* (1951) and *International Relations between the Two World Wars, 1919–1939* (1955). After the outbreak of World War II, Carr stated that he was somewhat mistaken in his views on Nazi Germany which he advanced before the war. In the 1946 revised edition of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, Carr was more hostile in his appraisal of German foreign policy then he had been in the first edition in 1939. Through *The Twenty Years' Crisis* was published just months before World War II began, the Japanese historian Saho Matusumoto wrote that in a sense, Carr's book began the debate on the origins of World War II.

Some of the major themes of Carr's writings were changes over time, and the relationship between ideational and material forces in society. Carr saw a major theme of history was the growth of reason as a social force. Carr argued that all major social changes had been caused by revolutions or wars, both of which Carr regarded as necessary, but unpleasant means of accomplishing social change. Carr saw his major task in all of writings of finding a better way of working out social transformations. Carr maintained that every revolution starting with the French Revolution had helped to move humanity in a progressive direction, but had failed to complete their purpose because of the lack of the essential instruments to finish the revolutionary project. Carr asserted that social changes had to be linked with a realistic understanding of the limitations of social changes in order to build lasting institutions capable of maintaining social change. Carr claimed that in modern industrial society that a dialogue between various social forces was the best way of achieving a social transformation "toward goals which can be defined only as we advance towards them and the validity of which can only be verified in a process of attaining them".

**World War II**

During World War II, Carr's political views took a sharp turn towards the left. Carr spent the Phony War working as a clerk with the propaganda department of the Foreign Office. As Carr did not
believe Britain could defeat Germany, the declaration of war on Germany on September 3, 1939 left him highly depressed. In March 1940, Carr resigned from the Foreign Office to serve as the writer of leaders (editorials) for The Times. In his second leader published on June 21, 1940 entitled "The German Dream", Carr wrote that Hitler was offering a "Europe united by conquest". Carr went on to write:"There must and will be a new order in Europe. But this cannot be achieved through the overweening ambition of one man or one country in defiance of the will of the majority of Europeans and of the whole world outside of Europe. To speculate on better ways of building the new order would at the present time be to divert energy from far more urgent tasks. But two conditions must at least be fulfilled. The new European order cannot be achieved through conquest but only through co-operation and it must unite Europe with the non-European world, not divide Europe from it."

In a leader of July 1, 1940 Carr wrote that the first conclusion to drawn from the present war was that "the conception of the small national unit, not strong enough for an active role in international politics, but enjoying all the prerogatives and responsibilities of a sovereignty, has been rendered obsolete by modern armaments and the scope of modern warfare". Carr ended by writing:"Europe can no longer afford a multiplicity of economic units, each maintaining its independent economic system behind a barbed wire of tariffs, quotas, exchange restrictions and barter agreements...Over the greater part of Western Europe the common values for which we stand are known and prized. We must indeed beware of these values in purely nineteenth-century terms. If we speak of democracy, we do not mean a democracy which maintains the right to vote but forgets the right to work and the right to live. If we speak of freedom, we do not mean a rugged individualism which excludes social organization and economic planning. If we speak of equality, we do not mean a political equality nullified by social and economic privilege. If we speak of economic reconstruction we think less of maximum production (through this too will be required) than of equitable distribution".

In a leader during the summer of 1940, Carr defended the Soviet annexation of the Baltic states under the grounds that this was "not merely pressure from Moscow, but sincere recognition that this was a better alternative than absorption into a new Nazi Europe". Carr served as the assistant editor of The Times from 1941 to 1946, during which time he was well known for his pro-Soviet attitudes which he expressed in his leaders (editorials) he wrote. After June 1941, Carr's already strong admiration for the Soviet Union was much increased by the Soviet Union's role in defeating Germany. In one of his first leaders Carr for the *Times*, he declared:"The PRIME MINISTER expressed the mood of the nation when he declared that our only present war aim is victory. Nevertheless the British will to victory is still bound up with the conviction that our war aims stand on a different plane from those of the enemy, and that victory for our aims will point the way to a new social and international order in Europe".

Carr called the war aim of "destroying Hitlerism" insufficient, and demanded that the British government express "a definite picture of what we are fighting for, both to hearten our own people at home and to counteract German propaganda abroad" In a leader of December 5, 1940 entitled "The Two Scourges", Carr wrote that only by removing the "scourge" of unemployment could one also remove the "scourge" of war. Such was the popularity of "The Two Scourges" that it was published as a pamphlet in December 1940, during which in its first print run of 10,000 it completely sold out. In a speech given in December 1940, Carr declared his views about the war that in his opinion:"This is not altogether a national war, it is to a certain extent a social war, a
revolutionary war; as a political revolution it is not simply confined to one country but is more or less world-wide”.

Carr's left-wing leaders caused some tension with the editor of the *Times*, Geoffrey Dawson, who felt that Carr was taking the *Times* in a too radical direction, which led Carr for a time being restricted only to writing on foreign policy. After Dawson's ouster in May 1941 and his replacement with Robert M'Gowan Barrington-Ward, Carr was given a free rein to write on whatever he wished. In turn, Barrington-Ward was to find many of Carr's leaders on foreign affairs to be too radical for his liking. Carr's leaders were noted for their advocacy of a socialist European economy under the control of an international planning board, and for his support for the idea of an Anglo-Soviet alliance as the basis of the post-war international order. In one of his leaders, Carr stated "The new order cannot be based on the preservation of privilege, whether the privilege be that of a country, of a class, or of an individual." Carr himself later described his attitude to the Soviets during his stint at the *Times*:"In the *Times* I very quickly began to plug the Russian alliance; and when this was vindicated by Russian endurance and Russian victory, it revived my faith in the Russian revolution as a great achievement and a historical turning point. It was obvious that the Russia of the Second World War was a very different place from the Russia of the First-terms of people as well of material resources. Looking back on the thirties, I came to feel that my preoccupation with the purges and brutalities of Stalinism had distorted my perspective. The black spots were real enough, but looking exclusively at them destroyed one's vision of what was really happening”.

Unlike many of his contemporaries in war-time Britain, Carr was against a Carthaginian peace with Germany, and argued for a post-war reconstruction of Germany along socialist lines. In Carr's opinion, National Socialism was not the natural result of *Deutschum* (Germanism), but rather of capitalism. Carr claimed that once capitalism was removed from German society, then the social forces which gave birth to fascism would wither away and die. On his leaders on foreign affairs, Carr was very consistent in arguing after 1941 that once the war ended, it was the fate of Eastern Europe to come into the Soviet sphere of influence, and claimed that any effort to the contrary was both vain and immoral. In a leader of August 1941 entitled "Peace and Power", Carr wrote that power in Eastern Europe:"...can fall only to Germany or to Russia. Neither Great Britain nor the United States can exercise, or will agree to exercise, any predominant role in these regions...There can be no doubt that British and Russian-normay it be added, American-interests alike demand that Russian influence in Eastern Europe should not be eclipsed by that of Germany."

In December 1941, Carr wrote "...in Europe, Great Britain and Soviet Russia must become the main bulwarks of a peace which can be preserved, and can be made real, only through their joint endeavour." In a memo sent to the British diplomat Frank Roberts (who had criticized Carr's views about the Baltic States) on January 16, 1942 Carr wrote:"After the collapse of Russia and Germany the Baltic States enjoyed an almost accidental independence during the twenty years interregnum from 1919 to 1939. Apart from this interval in history it was always true that they would have fallen within the orbit either of Russia or Germany, and it is now more certain than ever in an age which has exposed the illusions of neutrality in Europe. The winning of the war means that they will fall within the orbit of Russia”.

Between 1942 and 1945, Carr was the Chairman of a study group at the Royal Institute of International Affairs concerned with Anglo-Soviet relations. Carr's study group concluded that
Stalin had largely abandoned Communist ideology in favour of Russian nationalism that the Soviet economy would provide a higher standard of living in the Soviet Union after the war, and it was both possible and desirable for Britain to reach a friendly understanding with the Soviets once the war had ended. In 1942, Carr published Conditions of Peace followed by Nationalism and after in 1945, in which he outlined his ideas about the post-war world should look like. In his books, and his Times leaders, Carr urged for the post-war world, the creation of a socialist European federation anchored by an Anglo-German partnership that would be aligned with, but not subordinated to the Soviet Union against the country that Carr saw as the principal post-war danger to world peace, namely the United States.

In his 1942 book Conditions of Peace, Carr argued that it was a flawed economic system which had caused World War II, and that the only way of preventing another world war was for the Western powers to fundamentally change the economic basis of their societies by adopting socialism. Carr argued that the post-war world required a "European Planning Authority" and a "Bank of Europe" that would control the currencies, trade, and investment of all the European economies. One of the main sources for ideas in Conditions of Peace was the 1940 book Dynamics of War and Revolution by the American fascist Lawrence Dennis. In a review of Conditions of Peace, the British writer Rebecca West criticised Carr for using Dennis as a source, commenting "It is as odd for a serious English writer to quote Sir Oswald Mosley!"

In a speech on June 2, 1942 in the House of Lords, Viscount Elibank attacked Carr as an "active danger" for his views in Conditions of Peace about a magnanimous peace with Germany and for suggesting that Britain turn over all of her colonies to an international commission after the war.

In a leader of March 10, 1943 Carr wrote that:"There can be no security in Western Europe unless there is also security in Eastern Europe, and security in Eastern Europe is unattainable unless it is buttressed by the military power of Russia. A case so clear and cogent for close co-operation between Britain and Russia after the war cannot fail to carry conviction to any open and impartial mind."In the same leader Carr argued for:"ungrudging and unqualified agreement on the supposition that "If Britain's frontier is on the Rhine", it might just as pertinently be said—though it has not in fact been said—that Russia's frontier is on the Oder, and in the same sense."The leader of March 10, 1943 led to a protest from the Polish Ambassador, Count Edward Raczyński, who wrote in response that he "knew what Carr's idea of Eastern Europe was, but it is not the idea of the Poles, and they knew well what Russia would mean by friendly governments".

The next month, Carr's relations with the Polish government were further worsened by the storm caused by the discovery of the Katyn Forest massacre committed by the NKVD in 1940. In a leader entitled "Russia and Poland" on April 28, 1943, Carr blasted the Polish government for accusing the Soviets of committing the Katyn Forest massacre, and for asking the Red Cross to investigate Carr wrote that:"Every Polish statesmen and every Polish student of history knows his country imperatively needs the friendship of at least one of her greater neighbours, east and west. No Pole today can contemplate the deliberate co-operation of Germany...Yet the action of the Polish government ten days ago beyond a doubt played, in fact though not in intention, directly into German hands [Carr is referring here to the Polish request for the Red Cross to investigate the Katyn Forest massacre] ...Any Polish quarrel with Russia, whatever its origin, necessarily injures the cause of both Poland and of the United Nations."
In December 1944, when fighting broke out in Athens, Greece between the Greek Communist ELAS and the British Army, Carr in a *Times* leader sided with the Greek Communists, leading to Winston Churchill to condemn him in a speech to the House of Commons. Churchill called Carr's leader defending E.L.A.S "a melancholy document" that in his opinion reflected the decline of British journalism. Carr claimed that the Greek Communist front-organization EAM was the "largest organised party or group of parties in Greece" that "appeared to exercise almost unchallengeable authority" and called for Britain to recognize the EAM as the legal Greek government. The Anglo-American historian Robert Conquest accused Carr of hypocrisy in supporting the E.A.M/E.L.A.S., noting Carr was violating his own "Might is Right" precepts of international power politics, in which the stronger power was always in the right, regardless of the facts of the case. Since Britain was a much stronger power in the world than the Greek Communists, Conquest argued that Carr by his own standards should have been on the British side during the fighting in Athens in December 1944.

In contrast to his support for E.A.M/E.L.A.S, Carr was strongly critical of the legitimate Polish government in exile and its Armia Krajowa (Home Army) resistance organization. In his leaders of 1944 on Poland, Carr urged that Britain break diplomatic relations with the London government and recognizes the Soviet sponsored Lublin government as the lawful government of Poland. In a *Times* leader of February 10, 1945, Carr questioned whatever the Polish government in exile even had the right to speak on behalf of Poland Carr wrote that it was extremely doubtful about whatever the London government had "an exclusive title to speak for the people of Poland and a liberum veto on any move towards a settlement of Polish affairs" Carr went to argue that "The legal credentials of this Government are certainly not beyond challenge if it were relevant to examine them: the obscure and tenuous thread of continuity leads back at best to a constitution deriving from a quasi-Fascist coup d'état" Carr ended his leader with the claim that "What Marshal Stalin desires to see in Warsaw is not a puppet government acting under Russian orders, but a friendly government which fully conscious of the supreme impotence of Russo-Polish concord, will frame its independent policies in that context."

In a May 1945 leader, Carr blasted those who felt that an Anglo-American "special relationship' would be the principal bulwark of peace, writing that:"It would be the height of unwisdom to assume that an alliance of the English-speaking world, even it were to find favour with American opinion could form by itself the all-sufficient pillar of world security and render superfluous any other foundation for British policy in Europe."

As a result of Carr's leaders, the *Times* became popularly known during World War II as the three pence Daily Worker (the price of the *Daily Worker* was one penny). Commenting on Carr's pro-Soviet leaders, the British writer George Orwell wrote in 1942 that:"all the appeasers, e.g. Professor E. H. Carr, have switched their allegiance from Hitler to Stalin".

Reflecting his disgust with Carr's leaders in the *Times*, the British civil servant Sir Alexander Cadogan, the Permanent Undersecretary at the Foreign Office wrote in his diary: "I hope someone will tie Barrington-Ward and Ted Carr together and throw them into the Thames." Carr was to elaborate on these ideas he had first advocated in *Conditions of Peace* in his 1945 book *Nationalism and After*. In that book, Carr wrote "The driving force behind any future international order must be a belief...in the value of individual human beings irrespective of national affinities or allegiance." Carr argued that just as the military was under civilian control, that likewise so should
"the holders of economic power...be responsible to, and take their orders from, the community in exactly the same way". Carr claimed it was necessary to create "maximum social and economic opportunity" for all, and argued that this would be achieved via an international planning authority that would control the world economy, and provide for "increased consumption for social stability and equitable distribution for maximum production". Carr described his views at the time as: "Like a lot of other people, I took refuge in Utopian visions of a new world order after the war; after all, it was on the basis of such visions that a lot of real constructive work was done, and Churchill lost sympathy by being openly impatient of them. I began to be a bit ashamed of the harsh "realism" of The Twenty Years' Crisis and in 1940–41 wrote the highly Utopian Conditions of Peace [1942]-a sort of liberal Utopia, mixed with a little socialism but very little Marxism. It was my most popular book to date because it caught the current mood. But it was pretty feeble."

In a 1945 lecture, Carr stated that "The trend away from individualism and towards totalitarianism is everywhere unmistakable", that Marxism was the by far the most successful type of totalitarianisms proved by Soviet industrial growth, and that only the "blind and incurable" ignored these trends.

In 1945 during a lecture series entitled The Soviet Impact on the Western World, which were published as a book in 1946, Carr argued that "The trend away from individualism and towards totalitarianism is everywhere unmistakable", that Marxism was the by far the most successful type of totalitarianism as proved by Soviet industrial growth and the Red Army's role in defeating Germany and that only the "blind and incurable" ignored these trends. During the same lectures, Carr called democracy in the Western world a sham, which permitted a capitalist ruling class to exploit the majority, and praised the Soviet Union as offering real democracy. Carr claimed that Soviet social policies were far more progressive than Western social policies, and argued democracy was more about social equality than political rights. During the same series of lectures, Carr argued that: "It was Marshal Stalin who, consciously or unconsciously usurping Woodrow Wilson's role in the previous war, once more placed democracy in the forefront of Allied war aims."

Carr went on to argue that: "The degree of moral favour for the social purposes of Soviet policy which is, according to all observers, generated among the citizens of the Soviet Union is an answer to those critics who used to argue that Marxism could never be successful because it lacked moral appeal."

Finally, Carr claimed that: "The social and economic system of the Soviet Union, offering-as it does-almost unlimited possibilities of internal development, is hardly subject to those specific stimuli which dictated expansionist policies to capitalist Britain in the 19th century...there is nothing in Soviet policy so far to suggest that the east-west movement is likely to take the form of armed aggression or military conquest. The peaceful penetration of the Western world by ideas emanating from the Soviet Union has been, and seems likely to remain, a far important and conspicuous symptom of the new East-West movement. Ex Oriente Lux." One of Carr's leading associates, the British historian R.W Davies was later to write that Carr's view of the Soviet Union as expressed in The Soviet Impact on the Western World was a rather glossy, idealized picture that owed much to war-time propaganda about "our gallant Russian ally", and to Carr's very considerable faith in the Soviet Union as offering a superior social system to the West.
Cold War

During the Cold War, Carr sympathized with Communism as the world's best hope for a better future. In a 1978 article in the New Left Review, Carr wrote that "I think we have to consider seriously the hypothesis that the world revolution of which [the Bolshevik revolution] was the first stage, and which will complete the downfall of capitalism, will prove to be the revolt of the colonial peoples against capitalism in the guise of imperialism"

In 1946, Carr started living with Joyce Marion Stock Forde, who was to remain his common law wife until 1964. In 1947, Carr was forced to resign from his position at Aberystwyth. The Marxist historian Christopher Hill wrote that in the late 1940s "it was thought, or pretended to be thought that any irregularity in one's matrimonial position made it impossible for one to be a good scholar or teacher." In November 1946, Carr was involved with a radio debate with Arnold J. Toynbee on Britain's position in the world. Through Carr expressed support for Toynbee's idea of British neutrality in the emerging Cold War, Carr rejected Toynbee's idea that Britain "liquidate without too many qualms our political commitments and economic outposts in other continents". Carr declared that "The trouble about politics and economics is that if you run away from them they are apt to run after you-especially if you occupy as Britain does, a conspicuous and coveted and vulnerable position". In the late 1940s, Carr started to become increasingly influenced by Marxism. His name was on Orwell's list, a list of people which George Orwell prepared in March 1949 for the Information Research Department, a propaganda unit set up at the Foreign Office by the Labour government. Orwell considered these people to have pro-communist leanings and therefore to be inappropriate to write for the IRD.

In 1948, Carr condemned British acceptance of an American loan in 1946 as the marking the effective end of British independence. Carr wrote that:"The acceptance of the American loan with the conditions attached to it in 1946 was the turning point at which Britain ceased to control her own economic destinies. It is still arguable that the conditions should have been rejected and the consequences of rejection faced. The results of acceptance were perhaps psychological even more than practical. But the practical results should not be ignored. Through the conditions were never fully enforced, the fiasco of sterling convertibility in the summer of 1947 was extremely costly; and American objections to European economic union continued well into 1947-by which time the practical difficulties of its realization had enormously increased...The American loan opened the way to a silent infiltration of American influence into almost every walk of British public life. It is today almost impossible to imagine the appointment to any important public post (including posts in the Armed Forces and in the civil service as well as in industry) of anyone not persona grata in
corresponding American circles. To be pro-American pays handsome dividends: to be known as anti-American is a bar to promotion to a responsible position in any walk of life. Worst of all, British dependence on the United States is now taken for granted in quite broad sections of the population and had [sic] bred a widespread sense of hopelessness and incapacity to help ourselves, so that American help and American patronage which were intended to provide a stimulus to increased productivity in Britain are in danger of producing the opposite result.

Carr went to write that the best course for Britain was to seek neutrality in the Cold War and that "peace at any price must be the foundation of British policy". Carr ended by writing: "It may be that the question whether war breaks out between Russia and America affects us far more than the question whether we can increase the productivity of labour or improve the organization of industry or the distribution of consumer goods. But the point is that we can hardly do anything about the first question and a great deal about the second".

Carr took a great deal of hope from the Soviet-Yugoslav split of 1948. In an essay entitled "Spectre of Communism" published in the *Times* on July 2, 1948, Carr wrote: "It is this identification of Communist ideology with Soviet power, pointed by the looser, but none the less patent, defence of western democratic ideas and capitalist practices with the power of the United States, which makes the present international conjuncture so dark and menacing...That the two strongest Powers in the world today have become the centres of groups of nations formed on the basis not of old-fashioned alliances of power politics, but of contending views on the way in which society should be organized, enhances the dangers of conflict in a way which no contemporary observer can ignore. It would be a striking reversal of existing trends if Yugoslavia succeeded in vindicating for herself either a position of independent authority within the Soviet alliance or a right to stand along outside it"

Throughout the remainder of Carr's life after 1941, his outlook was basically sympathetic towards Communism. In the early 1950s, when Carr sat on the editorial board of the Chatham House, he attempted to block the publication of the manuscript that eventually became *The Origins of the Communist Autocracy* by Leonard Schapiro under the grounds that the subject of repression in the Soviet Union was not a serious topic for a historian. As interest in the subject in Communism grew, Carr largely abandoned international relations as a field of study. In part, Carr's turn away from international relations was due to his increasing scepticism about the subject. In 1959, Carr wrote to his friend and protégé Arno J. Mayer, shortly after he began teaching international relations at Harvard warning against attempts to turn international relations into a separate subject apart from history, which Carr viewed as a foolish attempt to sever a sub-discipline of history by turning it into a discipline of its own. In 1956, Carr refused to speak out about the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian Uprising while at the same time condemning the Suez War.

In his few books about international relations after 1938, despite a change in emphasis, Carr's pro-German views regarding inter-war international relations continued. For an example, in his 1955 book *International Relations Between the Two World Wars, 1919–1939*, Carr claimed that the German default on timber reparations in December 1922 that sparked the 1923 Ruhr crisis was only very small, and expressed the view that the French reaction in occupying the Ruhr was grossly disproportionate to the offence. As the American historian Sally Marks noted, that even in 1955 this was a long-discredited pro-German "myth", and that in fact the German default was enormous, and that Germany had been defaulting on a large scale and a frequent basis since 1921.
In 1966, Carr left Forde and married the historian Betty Behrens. That same year, Carr wrote in an essay that in India where "liberalism is professed and to some extent practiced, millions of people would die without American charity. In China, where liberalism is rejected, people somehow get fed. Which is the more cruel and oppressive regime?" One of Carr's critics, the British historian Robert Conquest, commented that Carr did not appear to be familiar with recent Chinese history as judging from that remark; Carr seemed to be ignorant of the millions of Chinese who starved to death during the Great Leap Forward. In 1961, Carr published an anonymous and very favourable review of his friend A. J. P. Taylor's contentious book *The Origins of the Second World War* that caused much controversy. In the late 1960s, Carr was one of the few British professors to be supportive of the New Left student protestors, whom he hoped might bring about a socialist revolution in Britain. In a 1969 introduction to the collection of essays, *Heretics and Renegades and Other Essays* by Carr's friend, Isaac Deutscher, Carr endorsed Deutscher's attack on George Orwell's novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* under the grounds that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* could not be an accurate picture of the Soviet Union as Orwell had never visited that state.

Carr exercised wide influence in the field of Soviet studies and international relations. The extent of Carr's influence could be seen in the 1974 festschrift in his honour entitled Essays in Honour of E.H. Carr ed. Chimen Abramsky and Beryl Williams. The contributors included Sir Isaiah Berlin, Arthur Lehning, G.A. Cohen, Monica Partridge, Beryl Williams, Eleonore Breuning, D.C. Watt, Mary Holdsworth, Roger Morgan, Alec Nove, John Erickson, Michael Kaser, R.W. Davies, Moshe Lewin, Maurice Dobb, and Lionel Kochan. The contributors examined such topics as the social views of Georges Sorel, Alexander Herzen, and Mikhail Bakunin; the impact of the Revolution of 1905 on Russian foreign policy, Count Ulrich von Brokdorff-Rantzau and German-Soviet relations; and developments in the Soviet military, education, economy and agriculture in the 1920s–1930s. Another admirer of Carr is the American Marxist historian Arno J. Mayer, who has stated that his work on international relations owes much to Carr.

During his last years, Carr continued to maintain his optimism in a better future in spite of what he regarded as grave setbacks. In a 1978 interview in *The New Left Review*, Carr called capitalism a "crazy" economic system that was doomed to die. In the same interview, Carr complained about what he called "obsessive hatred and fear of Russia", stating "an outburst of national hysteria on this scale is surely the symptom of a sick society". In a 1980 letter to his friend, Tamara Deutscher, Carr wrote that he felt that the government of Margaret Thatcher had forced "the forces of Socialism" in Britain into a "full retreat". In the same letter to Deutscher, Carr wrote that "Socialism cannot be obtained through reformism, i.e. through the machinery of bourgeois democracy". Carr went on to decry disunity on the Left, and wrote:

"What worries me is not only what is happening in this country today, but my preoccupation with what happened in the 30s. The hard-liners denied that Brüning was a lesser evil than Hitler, and refused to co-operate with the Social Democrats. I don't know that in the draft chapters [of *Twilight of the Comintern*] I have specifically attacked this view, but that is certainly the slant of the whole narrative. Trotsky denounced this line from the start, and in the last forty years I cannot think of any writer who has defended it. Have we all been wrong? And should we really deny that Callaghan is a lesser evil than Thatcher?"
Another thought. Lenin in the 1920s wanted the Communists 'to help the MacDonalds and the Snowden to defeat the Lloyd Georges and the Churchills'. Are Callaghan and Healey so much worse than M[acDonald] and S[nowden]?

Though Carr regarded the abandonment of Maoism in China in the late 1970s as a regressive development, he saw opportunities, and wrote to his stock broker in 1978: "a lot of people, as well as the Japanese, are going to benefit from the opening up of trade with China. Have you any ideas?" In one of his last letters to Tamara Deutscher, shortly before his death in 1982, Carr expressed a great deal of dismay at the state of the world, writing that "The left is foolish and the right vicious." Carr wrote to Deutscher that the sort of socialism envisioned by Marx could never be achieved via the means of democracy, but complained that the working class in Britain were not capable of staging the revolution needed to destroy British capitalism. Carr criticized what he regarded as an excessive preoccupation in the West with the human rights situation in the Soviet Union, blasted the European Left for naïveté, and Eurocommunism as a useless watered-down version of Communism. Carr wrote to Deutscher:"What can one think of "Eurocommunists" who have produced no programme of their own, but are prepared at the drop of a hat to rub shoulders with declared counter-revolutionaries (anti-Lenin, anti-Marx) and Cold Warriors? This must be meat and drink to the hardliners in the Kremlin. Back to the "united front from Trotsky to Chamberlain?" At least Trotsky never did that. Where are we going? There are too many warmongers around the world at present for comfort. Cannot the New Left go back to Nuclear Disarmament?"

Carr ended his letter by saying that he did not believe that the British proletariat, or any of the other Western proletariats had the willingness and/or the capacity to stage the sort of revolutions that Marx had predicated, and that because of his lack of faith in the revolutionary potential of the Western working classes, he could not be a Marxist. Beside the issue about the non-imminence of a workers' uprising in the West, Carr stated that he was in otherwise complete agreement with all of the main tenets of Marxism. In a letter to Deutscher, Carr wrote he had been convinced of the "bankruptcy of capitalism" since the 1930s, but that:"It would be fair to say that I have always been more interested in Marxism as a method of revealing hidden springs of thought and action, and debunking the logical and moralistic facade, erected around them, than in the Marxist analysis of the decline of capitalism. Capitalism was clearly on the way out, and the precise mechanism of its downfall did not seem to me all that interesting."

Carr added that he "could not see the Western proletariat, the progeny of Western bourgeois capitalism, as the bearer of the world revolution in its next stage". Shortly before his death, Carr wrote that he believed:"I cannot indeed foresee for western society in anything like its present form any prospect but decline and decay, perhaps but not necessarily ending in dramatic collapse. But I believe that new forces and movements, whose shape we cannot yet guess, are germinating beneath the surface, here or elsewhere. That is my unverifiable Utopia, and I suppose I should call it "socialist" and I am to this extent Marxist. But Marx did not define the content of socialism except in a few Utopian phrases; and nor can I."

A latter day controversy concerning Carr surrounds the question of whether he was an anti-Semite. Carr's critics point to the fact that he was champion in succession of two anti-Semitic dictators, namely Hitler and Stalin, his opposition to Israel, and to the fact that most of Carr's opponents such as Sir Geoffrey Elton, Leonard Schapiro, Sir Karl Popper, Bertram Wolfe, Richard Pipes, Adam
Ulam, Leopold Labedz, Sir Isaiah Berlin, and Walter Laqueur were Jewish. Carr's defenders such as Jonathan Haslam have argued against the charge of anti-Semitism, noting that Carr had many Jewish friends (including such erstwhile intellectual sparring partners such as Berlin and Namier), that his last wife Betty Behrens was Jewish and that his support for Nazi Germany in the 1930s and the Soviet Union in the 1940s–50s was in spite rather than because of anti-Semitism in those states.

**History of Soviet Russia**

After the war, Carr was a fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, and then Trinity College, where he published most of his popular works—*A History of Soviet Russia* and *What is History?* He remained at Trinity College until his death. He was a tutor in Politics at Balliol College, Oxford from 1953 to 1955 when he became a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In the 1950s, Carr was well known as an outspoken admirer of the Soviet Union. Carr's writings include his *History of Soviet Russia* (14 vol., 1950–78). During World War II, Carr was favourably impressed with what he regarded as the extraordinary heroic performance of the Soviet people, and towards the end of 1944 Carr decided to write a complete history of the Soviet Russia from 1917 comprising all aspects of social, political and economic history in order to explain how the Soviet Union withstood the challenge of the German invasion. The resulting work was his 14 volume *History of Soviet Russia*, which took the story up to 1929. Carr initially intended the series to begin in 1923 with a long chapter summarizing the state of the Soviet Union just before Lenin's death. Carr found that the idea of one chapter on the situation in the Soviet Union in the year 1923 "proved on examination almost ludicrously inadequate to the magnitude of Lenin's achievement and of its influence on the future".

Carr's friend and close associate, the British historian R.W. Davies, was to write that Carr belonged to the "anti-Cold-War" school of history, which regarded the Soviet Union as the major progressive force in the world, the United States as the world's principal obstacle to the advancement of humanity, and the Cold War as a case of American aggression against the Soviet Union. In 1950, Carr wrote in the defence of the Soviet Union that:"No sensible person will be tempted to measure the Russia of Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin by any yardstick borrowed from the Britain of MacDonald, Baldwin or Churchill, or the America of Wilson, Hoover or Franklin Roosevelt."

Using that cultural relativist argument, Carr criticized those Western historians whom he felt had unfairly judged the Soviet Union by the cultural norms of Britain and the United States. In 1960, Carr wrote that:"Much of what has been written in the English speaking countries during the last ten years about the Soviet Union...has been vitiated by this inability to achieve even the most elementary measure of imaginative understanding of what goes on in the mind of the other party..."Carr began his magnum opus by arguing that the 1917 October Revolution was a "proletarian revolution" forced on the Bolsheviks. Carr argued that:"It was the masses that drove their hesitating and temporising leaders down the path of revolution."

In Carr's opinion, since the Bolsheviks had driven to power against their will by the Russian people in 1917, they were then faced with the question of what to do with it. In Carr's view, Soviet history went through three periods in the inter-war era and was personified by the change of leadership from Vladimir Lenin to Joseph Stalin. After an initial period of chaos, Carr wrote that the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly in January 1918 was the last "tearing asunder of the veil of bourgeois constitutionalism", and that henceforward, the Bolsheviks would rule Russia their own
way. Carr argued that the emergence of Russia from what he regarded as a backward peasant economy to a leading industrial power was the most important event of the 20th century. The first part of a History of Soviet Russia comprised three volumes entitled The Bolshevik Revolution published in 1950, 1952, and 1953 which traced Soviet history from 1917 to 1922. During the writing of the first volumes of The History of Soviet Russia, Deutscher had much influence on Carr's understanding of the period. The second part was intended to comprise three volumes called The Struggle for Power, which was intended to cover the years 1922–28, but Carr instead decided to publish a single volume labelled The Interregnum which covered the events of 1923–24, and another four volumes entitled Socialism In One Country, which took the story up to 1926. The final volumes in the series were entitled The Foundations of the Planned Economy, which covered the years until 1929. Originally Carr had planned to take the series up to Operation Barbarossa in 1941 and the Soviet victory of 1945, but Carr's death in 1982 put an end to the project.

Carr argued that Soviet history went through three periods in the 1917–45 era. In the first phrase was the war communismera (1917–21), which saw much rationing, economic production focused into huge centres of manufacturing, critical services and supplies being sold at either set prices or for free, and to a large extent a return to a barter economy. Carr contended that the problems in the agrarian sector forced the abandonment of war communism in 1921, and its replacement by the New Economic Policy (NEP). During the same period saw what Carr called one of Lenin's "astonishing achievements", namely the gathering together of nearly all of the former territories of Imperial Russia (with the notable exceptions of Finland, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia) under the banner of the Soviet Union. In the NEP period (1921–28), Carr maintained that the Soviet economy became a mixed capitalist-socialist one with peasants after fulfilling quotas to the state being allowed to sell their surplus on the open market, and industrialists being permitted be allowed to produce and sell agricultural and light industrial goods. Carr contended that the post-Lenin succession struggle after 1924 was more about personal disputes than ideological quarrels. In Carr's opinion, "personalities rather than principles were at stake". Carr argued that the victory of Stalin over Leon Trotsky in the succession struggle was inevitable because Stalin was better suited to the new order emerging in the Soviet Union in the 1920s than Trotsky. Carr stated "Trotsky was a hero of the revolution. He fell when the heroic age was over." Carr argued that Stalin had stumbled into the doctrine of "Socialism in One Country" more by accident than by design in 1925, but argued that Stalin was swift to grasp how effective the doctrine was as a weapon to beat Trotsky with. Carr wrote"It was easy, on the basis of the new doctrine, to depict Stalin as the true expositor of Bolshevism and Leninism and his opponents as the heirs of those who had resisted Lenin and denied the Bolshevik creed in the past. Unwittingly Stalin had forged for himself an instrument of enormous power. Once forged, he was quick to discover its strength, and wielded it with masterful skill and ruthlessness."

Besides reviewing the politics and economics of the 1920s, Carr also devoted considerable space to the Soviet constitution of 1922, the relationship between the Soviet Socialist Republics and Moscow, efforts to "revitalize" the soviets (councils), the development of the Red Army and the OGPU. Writing of the OGPU, Carr noted that since the Bolsheviks had eliminated all of their enemies outside of the Party by the mid-1920s: "The repressive powers of the OGPU were henceforth directed primarily against opposition in the party, which was the only effective form of opposition in the state." Reflecting his background as a diplomat and scholar on international relations, Carr provided very detailed treatment of foreign affairs with a focus on both the Narkomindel and the Comintern. In particular, Carr examined the relationship between the Soviet
Communist Party and the other Communist parties around the world, the Comintern's structure, the Soviet reaction to the Locarno Treaties, and the efforts to promote a revolution in China.

The third phrase was the period of the Five Year Plans beginning with the First Five Year Plan in 1928, which saw the Soviet state promoting the growth of heavy industry, eliminating private enterprise, collectivising agriculture, and of quotes for industrial production being set in Moscow. In Carr's opinion, the changes wrought by the First Five Year were a positive development. Carr argued that the economic system that existed during the N.E.P. period was highly inefficient, and that any economic system based on planning by the state was superior to what Carr saw as the disorganized chaos of capitalism. Carr accepted the Soviet claim that the so-called "kulaks" existed as a distinct class, that they were a negative social force, and as such, the "dekulakisation" campaign that saw at least 2 million alleged "kulaks" deported to the Gulag 1930–32 was a necessary measure that improved the lives of the Soviet peasantry. R.W. Davies, Carr's associate and co-writer on the History of Soviet Russia expressed some doubts to Carr about whatever the "kulaks" actually existed, and thought the term was more an invention of Soviet propaganda than a reflection of the social conditions in the Soviet countryside.

Accompanying these social-economic changes were the changes in the leadership. Carr argued that Lenin saw himself as the leader of an elite band of revolutionaries who sought to give power to the people and wanted a world revolution. By contrast, Carr claimed that Stalin was a bureaucratic leader who concentrated power in his own hands, ruled in a ruthless fashion, carried a policy of "revolution from above", and by promoting a merger of Russian nationalism and Communism cared more for the interests of the Soviet Union than for the world Communist movement. However, Carr argued that Stalin's achievements in the making the Soviet Union a great industrial power by and large outweighed any of the actions for which he is commonly criticized for. Carr claimed that Stalin played both the roles of dictator and emancipator simultaneously, and argued that this reflected less than the man then the times and place in which he lived. Writing of Stalin, Carr claimed "Few great men have been so conspicuously as Stalin the product of the time and place in which they live." Carr claimed that if even Lenin had not died in 1924, history would still have worked out the same. In 1978, Carr claimed that if Lenin were still alive in 1928, he "would have faced exactly the same problems" as did Stalin, and had chosen the same solution, namely the "revolution from above". But Carr argued that Lenin would had been able to "minimize and mitigate the element of coercion" in the "revolution from above". As a result, Carr wrote that: "Stalin's personality, combined with the primitive and cruel traditions of the Russian bureaucracy, imparted to the revolution from above a particularly brutal quality."

A book that was not part of the History of Soviet Russia series, though closely related due to common research in the same archives was Carr's 1951 book German-Soviet Relations between the Two World Wars–1939. In that book, Carr blamed the British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain for the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact of 1939 Carr accused Chamberlain of deliberately snubbing Joseph Stalin's offers of an alliance, and as such, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, which partitioned much of Eastern Europe between Germany and the Soviet Union was under the circumstances the only policy the Soviets could have followed in the summer of 1939 Following the official interpretation of the reasons for the German-Soviet pact in the Soviet Union, Carr went to accuse Chamberlain of seeking to direct German aggression against the Soviet Union in 1939. Carr argued that Chamberlain was pursuing this alleged policy of seeking to provoke a German-Soviet war as a way of deflecting German attention from Western Europe and because of his supposed
anti-Communist phobias. Carr argued that the British "guarantee" of Poland given on March 31, 1939 was a foolhardy move which indicated Chamberlain's preference for an alliance with Poland as opposed to an alliance with the Soviet Union. In Carr's opinion, the sacking of Maxim Litvinov as Foreign Commissar on May 3, 1939 and his replacement with Vyacheslav Molotov indicated not a change in Soviet foreign policy from the collective security approach that Litvinov had championed as many historians argue, but was rather Stalin's way of engaging in hard bargaining with Britain and France. Carr argued that the Anglo-French delegation sent to travel on Moscow on the slow ship *City of Exeter* in August 1939 to negotiate the "peace front" as the proposed revived Triple Entente was called, were unimpressive diplomats and their unwillingness and inability to pressure the Poles to grant to transit rights to the Red Army reflected a fundamental lack of interest in reaching an alliance with the Soviet Union. By contrast, Carr argued that the willingness of the German Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop to come to Moscow anytime via aero-plane with full powers to negotiate whatever was necessary to secure a German-Soviet alliance reflected the deep German interest in reaching an understanding with the Soviets in 1939. Carr defended the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact under the grounds that: "In return for 'non-intervention' Stalin secured a breathing space of immunity from German attack." According to Carr, the "bastion" created by means of the Pact, "was and could only be, a line of defence against potential German attack." An important advantage (projected by Carr) was that "if Soviet Russia had eventually to fight Hitler, the Western Powers would already be involved." In an implicit broadside against the idea of West German membership in NATO (a controversial subject in the early 1950s) and Atlanticism, Carr concluded his book with the argument that ever since 1870 German foreign policy had always been successful when the Reich was aligned with Russia and unsuccessful when aligned against Russia, and expressed hope that the leaders of the then newly founded Federal Republic would understand the lessons of history.

In 1955, a major scandal that damaged Carr's reputation as a historian of the Soviet Union occurred when he wrote the introduction to *Notes for a Journal*, the supposed memoir of the former Soviet Foreign Commissar Maxim Litvinov that was shortly thereafter was exposed as a forgery. Notes for a Journal was a KGB forgery written in the early-1950s by a former Narkomindel official turned Chekist forger named Grigori Besedovsky specializing in forgeries designed to fool gullible Westerns. The American historian Barry Rubin argued it can be easily be established that *Notes for a Journal* was an anti-Semitic forgery in that in the *Notes* Litvinov was portrayed as a proud Jew whereas the real Litvinov did not see himself as Jewish at all, and more importantly the *Notes* showed Litvinov together with other Soviet officials of Jewish origin working behind the scenes for Jewish interests in the Soviet Union. Rubin also noted other improbabilities in *Notes for a Journal* such having Litvinov meeting regularly with rabbis in order to further Jewish interests, describing Aaron Soltz as the son of a rabbi whereas he was the son of a merchant and having those Soviet officials of Jewish origin be referred to by their patronyms. Rubin argued that this portrayal of Litvinov reflected Soviet anti-Semitism, and that Carr was amiss in not recognizing *Notes for a Journal* as the anti-Semitic forgery it was.

The first volume of *A History of Soviet Russia* published in 1950 was criticized by some historians, most notably the British Marxist historian Isaac Deutscher (who was a close friend of Carr's) as being too concerned with institutional development of the Soviet state, and for being impersonal and dry, capturing little of the tremendous emotions of the times. Likewise, Carr was criticized from both left and right for his downplaying of the importance of ideology for the Bolsheviks, and
his argument that the Bolsheviks thought in only in terms of Russia rather than the entire world. In a 1955 article, Deutscher argued that:

"Perhaps the main weakness of Mr Carr's conception is that he sees the Russian Revolution as virtually a national phenomenon only...he treats it as a historical process essentially national in character and self-sufficient within the national framework. He thinks in terms of statecraft and statecraft is national. His Lenin is a Russian super-Bismarck."

Despite his criticism, Deutscher ended his review by writing "It is Mr Carr's enduring and distinguished merit that he is the first genuine historian of the Soviet regime." Echoing Deutscher's criticism, the American historian Bertram Wolfe contended in 1955 that: "Mr Carr believes that the revolution was right for Russia. But he cannot quite make himself believe that in the matter of world revolution, this power-concentrated, dogmatic man [Lenin] was in deadly earnest."

It was often observed that Carr had little sympathy towards revolutionaries, presenting the pre-1917 Bolsheviks as somewhat comic and ridiculous figures. Walter Laqueurnoted that Carr had a strong preference for Lenin the politician attempting to build a new order in Russia after 1917 vs. Lenin the revolutionary working to destroy the old order before 1917. The scope and scale of History of Soviet Russia was illustrated in a letter Carr wrote to Tamara Deutscher, where in one volume Carr wished to examine Soviet relations with all of the Western nations between 1926–29, relations between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Western Communist parties; efforts to promote a "World Revolution"; the work and the "machinery" of the Comintern and the Profintern, Communist thinking on the "Negro Question" in the United States, and the history of Communist parties in China, Outer Mongolia, Turkey, Egypt, Afghanistan, and the Dutch East Indies.

A recurring theme of Carr's writings on Soviet history was his hostility towards those who argued that Soviet history could have taken different courses from what it did. In a 1974 book review of the American historian Stephen F. Cohen's biography of Nikolai Bukharin published in the Times Literary Supplement, Carr lashed out against Cohen for advocating the thesis that Bukharin represented a better alternative to Stalin. Carr dismissed Cohen's argument that the NEP was a viable alternative to the First Five Year Plan, and contemptuously labelled Bukharin a weak-willed and a rather pathetic figure who was both destined and deserved to lose to Stalin in the post-Lenin succession struggle. Carr ended his review by attacking Cohen as typical of the American left, who Carr claimed were a group of ineffective, woolly-headed idealists who, in a reference to the recent Watergate scandal, could not even bring down Richard Nixon, whom Carr charged had brought himself down while the American left did nothing useful to facilitate that event. Carr ended his review with the scornful remark that since the American left could produce nothing but "losers" like George McGovern, so it was natural that an American leftist like Cohen would sympathize with Bukharin, whom Carr likewise regarded as a great "loser" of history.

Carr's last book, 1982's The Twilight of the Comintern, though not officially a part of the History of Soviet Russia series, was regarded by Carr as the completion of the series. In this book, Carr examined the response of the Comintern to fascism in the years 1930–1935. Carr claimed that the failure of the Austrian-German customs union project of 1931 due to intense French pressure, besides discrediting the German Chancellor Heinrich Brüning, had left Germany open to Western economic domination due to the bank collapse of the Credianstalt followed by the rest of the Central European banking system, and thus led to the triumph of National Socialism in 1933. Carr
praised the 1932 article written by his friend Isaac Deutscher condemning the Third Period of the Comintern and calling for a united front of socialists and Communists against fascism as an excellent analysis, which had it been followed might have spared the world Nazi Germany. In this same way, Carr praised the examination of fascism offered by Trotsky as being very astute and penetrating. Carr argued that Trotsky was correct in condemning the Comintern's social fascism theory as doing more harm than good for the cause of the left, and contended that though the SPD was basically a "bourgeois" party, it was not a fascist party as the Comintern claimed. Carr maintained that the Comintern was divided into two fractions in the early 1930s. One fraction headed by the Hungarian Communist Béla Kun preferred the Third Period policy of treating the non-communist left as "disguised fascists", whereas another fraction headed by the Bulgarian Communist Georgi Dimitrov supported a policy of building popular fronts with socialists and liberals against fascism. Carr argued that the adoption of the Popular Front policy in 1935 had been forced on Stalin by pressure from Communist parties abroad, especially the French Communist Party. Carr contended that the 7th Congress of the Comintern in 1935 was essentially the end of the Comintern since it marked the abandonment of world revolution as a goal, and instead subordinated the cause of Communism and world revolution towards the goal of building popular fronts against fascism. Another related book that Carr was unable to complete before his death, and was published posthumously by Tamara Deutscher in 1984, was *The Comintern and the Spanish Civil War*.

The *History of Soviet Russia* volumes met with a mixed reception. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1970 described the *History of Soviet Russia* series as simply "magisterial". The British historian Chimen Abramsky praised Carr as the world's foremost historian of the Soviet Union who displayed an astonishing knowledge of the subject. In a 1960 review of *Socialism in One Country*, the Anglo-Austrian Marxist scholar Rudolf Schlesinger praised Carr for his comprehensive treatment of Soviet history, writing that no other historian had ever covered Soviet history in such detail. The Canadian historian John Keep called the series "A towering scholarly monument; in its shadow the rest of us are but pygmies." Deutscher called *A History of Soviet Russia* "...a truly outstanding achievement". The left-wing British historian A. J. P. Taylor called *A History of Soviet Russia* the most fair and best series of books ever written on Soviet history. Taylor was later to call Carr "an Olympian among historians, a Goethe in range and spirit". The American journalist Harrison Salisbury called Carr "one of the half dozen greatest specialists in Soviet affairs and in Soviet-German relations". The British academic Michael Cox praised the *History of Soviet Russia* series as "...an amazing construction: almost pyramid-like...in its architectural audacity". The British historian John Barber argued that *History of Soviet Russia* series through a scrupulous and detailed survey of the evidence "transformed" the study of Soviet history in the West. The British historian Hugh Seton-Watson called Carr "an object of admiration and gratitude" for his work in Soviet studies The South African born British Marxist historian Hillel Ticktin praised Carr as an honest historian of the Soviet Union and accused all of his critics such as Norman Stone, Richard Pipes, and Leopold Labedz of being "Cold War" historians who betoken to McCarthyism criticized Carr for being "...for being on the side of the people". Ticktin went to label Carr's critics "...an entirely unsavory collection, not unconnected with serving the needs of official British and American foreign policy" who were "...closely identified with a discredited right-wing politics...". Ticktin described historians such as Pipes and Labedz as being "...never intellectuals but bureaucrats of knowledge, if not worse". Ticktin went to call all historians who were critical of the Soviet Union either rabidly right-wing "Cold Warriors" such as Richard Pipes and Aleksandr Solzhenitsynor "CIA intellectuals", and called Carr an "icon of the Left" who sought to honestly portray Soviet history. In 1983, four American historians, namely Geoff Eley, W. Rosenberg, Moshe Lewin and
Ronald Suny in a joint article in the *London Review of Books* wrote of the "grandeur" of Carr's work and his "extraordinary pioneering quality". The four went on to write: "In the scope of his work Carr went where no one had gone before and where only a few have really gone since. He mapped the territory of Soviet history in the 1920s and delivered an agenda of questions which will be pursued for the rest of the 20th century... Carr's analysis is now an indispensable starting point for understanding the dynamics of Stalinism".

One of Carr's students, the British historian Jonathan Haslam, called Carr a victim of British "McCarthyism" who was unjustly punished for his willingness to defend and praise the Soviet Union. The British Marxist historian Eric Hobsbawm wrote that the "...History of Soviet Russia" constitutes, with Joseph Needham's *Science and Civilisation in China*, the most remarkable effort of single-handed historical scholarship undertaken in Britain within living memory". The American historian Peter Wiles called the *History of Soviet Russia" one of the great historiographical enterprises of our day" and wrote of Carr's "immensely impressive" work *The American Marxist historian Arno J. Mayer wrote that "...the History of Soviet Russia...established E.H. Carr not only as the towering giant among Western specialists of recent Russian history, but certainly also as the leading British historian of his generation". Most unusually for a book by a Western historian, *A History of Soviet Russia* met with warily favourable reviews by Soviet historians. Normally, any works by Western historians, no matter how favourable to Communism, met with hostile reviews in the Soviet Union, and there was even a brand of polemical literature by Soviet historians attacking so-called "bourgeois historians" under the xenophobic grounds that only Soviet historians were capable of understanding the Soviet past".

The *History of Soviet Russia* series were not translated into Russian and published in the Soviet Union until 1990. A Soviet journal commented in 1991 that Carr was "almost unknown to a broad Soviet readership", through all Soviet historians were aware of his work, and most of them had considerable respect for Carr, through they had been unable to say so until Perestroika. Those Soviet historians who specialized in rebutting the "bourgeois falsifiers" as Western historians were so labelled in the Soviet Union attacked Carr for writing that Soviet countryside was in chaos after 1917, but praised Carr as one of the "few bourgeois authors" who told the "truth" about Soviet economic achievements. Through right up until glasnost period, Carr was considered a "bourgeois falsifier" in the Soviet Union, Carr was praised as a British historian who taken "certain steps" towards Marxism, and whose *History of Soviet Russia* was described as "fairly objective" and "one of the most fundamental works in bourgeois Sovietology". In a preface to the Soviet edition of *The History of Soviet Russia* in 1990, the Soviet historian Albert Nenarokov wrote in his lifetime Carr had been 'automatically been ranked with the falsifiers", but in fact *The History of Soviet Russia* was a "scrupulous, professionally conscientious work".Nenarokov called Carr a "honest, objective scholar, espousing liberal principles and attempting on the basis of an enormous documentary base to create a satisfactory picture of the epoch he was considering and those involved in it, to assist a sober and realistic perception of the USSR and a better understanding of the great social processes of the twentieth century". However, Nenarokov expressed some concern about Carr's use of Stalinist language such as calling Bukharin part of the "right deviation" in the Party without the use of the quotation marks. Nenarokov took the view that Carr had too narrowly reduced Soviet history after 1924 down to a choice of either Stalin or Trotsky, arguing that Bukharin was a better, more humane alternative to both Stalin and Trotsky.
The pro-Soviet slant in Carr's *The History of Soviet Russia* attracted some controversy. The American writer Max Eastman in a 1950 review of the first volume of *A History of Soviet Russia* called Carr as "a mild-quiet-hearted bourgeois with a vicarious taste for revolutionary violence" In 1951, the Austrian journalist Franz Borkenau wrote in the *Der Monat* newspaper: "Human suffering he seems to say is not a historical factor; Carr belongs to those very cold people who always believe they think and act with the iciest calculation and therefore fail to understand why they are mistaken in their calculations time and time again".

In a 1955 review in *Commentary*, Bertram Wolfe accused Carr of systemically taking on Lenin's point of view in *History of Soviet Russia* volumes and of being unwilling to consider other perspectives on Russian history. In 1962 the British historian Hugh Trevor-Roper argued that Carr's identification with the "victors" of history meant that Carr saw Stalin as historically important, and that Carr had neither time nor sympathy for the millions of Stalin's victims. The Anglo-American historian Robert Conquest argued that Carr took the official reasons for the launching of the First Five Year Plan too seriously, and argued that the "crisis" of the late 1920s was more the result of Soviet misunderstanding of economics than an "objective" economic crisis forced on Stalin. Furthermore, Conquest maintained that Carr's opponents such as Leonard Schapiro, Adam Ulam, Bertram Wolfe, Robert C. Tucker and Richard Pipes had a far better understanding of Soviet history than did Carr. The Polish-born American historian Richard Pipes wrote that the essential questions of Soviet history were: "Who were the Bolsheviks, what did they want, why did some follow them and others resist? What was the intellectual and moral atmosphere in which all these events occurred?", and went on to note that Carr failed to pose these questions, let alone answer them. Pipes was later to compare Carr's single paragraph dismissal in the *History of Soviet Russia* of the 1921 famine as unimportant (because there were no sources for the death toll that Carr deemed trustworthy) with Holocaust denial.

The Anglo-Polish Soviet expert Leopold Labedz criticized Carr for taking the claims of the Soviet government too seriously. Labedz wrote that: "He [Carr] tended to confine himself to the penumbra of official formulations and of ideological formulas which always concealed, rather than revealed, real Soviet life". Labedz argued that what he regarded as Carr's worship of kratos (power) led him to engage in an apologia for Stalin by ignoring facts that placed Stalin in an unfavourable light and by highlighting those facts which placed Stalin in a positive light. Labedz noted it only after 17 years after the first volume of the *History of Soviet Russia* series was published did Carr criticize Stalin in volume 8 of the series, albeit only once and in a veiled form. Labedz went on to argue that Carr's decision to end the *History of Soviet Russia* series at 1929 reflected not the lack of documentary material as Carr claimed, but rather an inability and unwillingness to confront the horrors of Stalin's Soviet Union. Labedz drew an unflattering comparison between Carr and Edward Gibbon. Labedz argued that: "To compare Carr's approach with Gibbon's is to register the contrast between his moral indifference and Gibbon's human concern, his blinkered pedantry and Gibbon's sovereign achievement in the sifting and validation of evidence."

Labedz was very critical of Carr's handling of sources, arguing that Carr was too inclined to accept official Soviet documents at face value, and unwilling to admit to systematic falsification of the historical record under Stalin. Finally, Labedz took Carr to task over what Labedz regarded as his tendency to white-wash Soviet crimes "...behind an abstract formula which often combines "progressive" stereotypes with the lexicon of Soviet terminology". The British historian Norman Stone argued that Carr was guilty of writing in a bland style meant to hide his pro-Soviet
sympathies. Writing of a *History of Soviet Russia*, Stone commented that: "Much of the book concerns economics, a subject on which Carr was hardly an expert. The lack of definitive point in the book...makes it dull and unrevealing. Like Carr himself it peters out...Carr's *History* is not a history of the Soviet Union, but effectively of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Even then, much of it is the kind of unreconstructed Stalinist version that could not now see the light of day in Russia itself...I am nearly tempted to exclaim that no more useless set of volumes has ever masqueraded as a classic. Carr's real talent lay in mathematics...From the mathematical spirit he took a quality not so much of abstraction as of autism which was carried over into his historical work. The result is a trail of devastation."

The American historian Walter Laqueur argued that the *History of Soviet Russia* volumes were a dubious historical source that for the most part excluded mention of the more unpleasant aspects of Soviet life, reflecting Carr's pro-Soviet tendencies. Laqueur commented that Carr called Stalin a ruthless tyrant in his 1979 book *The Russian Revolution*, and noted that he almost totally refrained from expressing any criticism of Stalin in all 14 volumes of the *History of Soviet Russia* series. Likewise, Laqueur contended that Carr excelled at irony, and that writing panegyrics to the Soviet Union was not his forte. In Laqueur's opinion, if Carr is to be remembered by future generations, it will be for books like *Dostoyevsky*, *The Romantic Exiles* and *Bakunin*, and his *History of Soviet Russia* will besmirch the fine reputation created by those books. A major source of criticism of a *History of Soviet Russia* was Carr's decision to ignore the Russian Civil War under the grounds it was unimportant, and likewise to his devoting only a few lines to the Kronstadt mutiny of 1921 since Carr argued it only a minor event. Laqueur commented in his opinion that Carr's ignoring the Russian Civil War while paying an inordinate amount of attention to such subjects as the relations between the Swedish Communist Party and the Soviet Communist Party and Soviet diplomatic relations with Outer Mongolia in the 1920s left the *History of Soviet Russia* very unbalanced.

**What is History?**

Carr is also famous today for his work of historiography, what is History? (1961), a book based upon his series of G. M. Trevelyan lectures, delivered at the University of Cambridge between January–March 1961. In this work, Carr argued that he was presenting a middle-of-the-road position between the empirical view of history and R. G. Collingwood's idealism. Carr rejected the empirical view of the historian's work being an accretion of "facts" that he or she has at their disposal as nonsense. Carr claimed: "The belief in a hard core of historical facts existing objectively and independently of the interpretation of the historian is a preposterous fallacy, but one which it is very hard to eradicate".

Carr maintained that there is such a vast quantity of information, at least about post-Dark Ages times, that the historian always chooses the "facts" he or she decides to make use of. In Carr's famous example, he claimed that millions had crossed the Rubicon, but only Julius Caesar's crossing in 49 BC is declared noteworthy by historians. Carr divided facts into two categories, "facts of the past", that is historical information that historians deem unimportant, and "historical facts", information that the historians have decided is important. Carr contended that historians quite arbitrarily determine which of the "facts of the past" to turn into "historical facts" according to their own biases and agendas. Carr stated that:"Study the historian before you begin to study the facts. This is, after all, not very abstruse. It is what is already done by the intelligent undergraduate who, when recommended to read a work by that great scholar Jones of St. Jude's, goes round to a
friend at St. Jude's to ask what sort of chap Jones is, and what bees he has in his bonnet. When you read a work of history, always listen out for the buzzing. If you can detect none, either you are tone deaf or your historian is a dull dog. The facts are really not at all like fish on the fishmonger's slab. They are like fish swimming about in a vast and sometimes inaccessible ocean; and what the historian catches will depend partly on chance, but mainly on what part of the ocean he chooses to fish in and what tackle he chooses to use – these two factors being, of course, determined by the kind of fish he wants to catch. By and large, the historian will get the kind of facts he wants. History means interpretation. Indeed, if, standing Sir George Clark on his head, I were to call history "a hard core of interpretation surrounded by a pulp of disputable facts", my statement would, no doubt, be one-sided and misleading, but no more so, I venture to think, than the original dictum"

For this reason, Carr argued that Leopold von Ranke's famous dictum *wie es eigentlich gewesen* (show what actually happened) was wrong because it presumed that the "facts" influenced what the historian wrote, rather than the historian choosing what "facts of the past" he or she intended to turn into "historical facts". At the same time, Carr argued that the study of the facts may lead the historian to change his or her views. In this way, Carr argued that history was "an unending dialogue between the past and present".

Carr used as an example of how he believed that "facts of the past" were transformed into the "facts of history" an obscure riot that took place in Wales in 1850 that saw a gingerbread seller beaten to death. Carr argued that this incident had been totally ignored by historians until the 1950s when George Kitson Clark mentioned it in one of his books. Since Kitson Clark, Carr claimed that several other historians have cited the same riot for what it revealed about Victorian Britain, leading Carr to assert that the riot and the murder of the gingerbread seller was in the progress of going from a "fact of the past" to a "fact of history" that in the future will be regularly cited by historians. Another example Carr used of his theory was the publication in 1932 of the papers of the former German Foreign Minister Gustav Stresemann by his secretary Bernhard. Carr noted when Stresemann died in 1929, he left behind 300 boxes of papers relating to his time in office, and in 1932 Bernhard published three volumes of Stresemann's papers under the title *Stresemanns Vermächtnis*. Carr noted that because of Locarno Treaties, for which Stresemann was a co-winner of the Nobel peace prize, Bernhard devoted most of the papers in *Stresemanns Vermächtnis* to Stresemann's work with relations to Britain and France. Carr noted that the documents of the Auswärtiges Amt and Stresemann's own papers show that Stresemann was far more concerned with relations with the Soviet Union instead of the Western powers, and that Bernhard had edited the selection in *Stresemanns Vermächtnis* to focus more on Stresemann's Nobel Peace Prize-winning successes and to make him seem more like an apostle of peace than what he really was (one of Stresemann's major interests was in partitioning Poland between Germany and the Soviet Union). Moreover, Carr noted that when an English translation of *Stresemanns Vermächtnis* was published in 1935, the translator abbreviated one-third of the German original to focus more on those aspects of Stresemann's diplomacy that were of primary interest to British readers, which had the effect of making it seem that Stesemann was almost exclusively concerned with relations with the Western powers and had little time for relations with the Soviet Union. Carr commented that it were only the English translation of *Stresemanns Vermächtnis* that had survived World War II, then historians would have been seriously misled about what Stresemann had been up to as Foreign Minister. Finally Carr argued that in the conversations between Stresemann and the Soviet Foreign Commissar Georgy Chicherin, Stresemann does most of the talking and says all of the intelligent
and original things, leading Carr to suggest that Stresemann himself had edited the papers to place himself in the best possible light. Carr used Stresemanns Vermächtnis to argue for the subjective nature of the documents historians used, which he then used to support his attacks against the idea of the work of the historians being purely that of an totally objective observer who "lets the facts speak for themselves".

Likewise, Carr charged that historians are always influenced by the present when writing about the past. As an example, he used the changing viewpoints about the German past expressed by the German historian Friedrich Meinecke during the Imperial, Weimar, Nazi and post-war periods to support his contention. The British historian Hugh Trevor-Roper, one of Carr's leading critics, summarized Carr's argument as: "George Grote, the 19th-century historian of Greece, was an enlightened radical banker; therefore, his picture of Periclean Athens is merely an allegory of 19th century England as seen by an enlightened banker. Mommsen's History of Rome is similarly dismissed as a product and illustration of pre-Bismarckian Germany. Sir Lewis Namier's choice of subject and treatment of it simply show the predictable prejudices of a Polish conservative".

In general, Carr held to a deterministic outlook in history. In Carr's opinion, all that happens in the world had a cause, and events could not happened differently unless there was a different cause. In Carr's example, if one's friend Smith suddenly starts acting out of character one day, then it must be understood that there is a reason for the strange behaviour, and that if that reason did not exist, than Smith would be acting normally. Carr criticized counter-factual history as a "parlour game" played by the "losers" in history. Carr contended that those who engaged in counter-factual speculations about Russian history, such as if Count Pyotr Stolypin's land reforms were given enough time, would the Russian Revolution have been prevented, were those who were uncomfortable about the fact that the Bolsheviks were the "winners" of Russian history and their opponents were not. Likewise, Carr asserted those who stress the importance of "accidents" as a central causal agent in history were the "losers" of history, who wished to play, explain away their defeats as the workings of chance and fate. In the same way, Carr argued that historians must concern themselves with the "winners" of history. In Carr's example, it is those who score centuries in cricket matches who are recorded, not those who are dismissed for ducks, and in the same way, Carr maintained that a preoccupation with the "losers" would be the equivalent of someone only listing the losers of cricket games. Carr dismissed the free will arguments made by Sir Karl Popper and Sir Isaiah Berlin as Cold War propaganda meant to discredit communism. In a similar way, Carr took a hostile view of those historians who stress the workings of chance and contingency in the workings of history. In Carr's view, such historians did not understand their craft very well, or were in some way identified with the "losers" of history.

In the same way, Carr argued that no individual is truly free of the social environment in which they live, but contended that within those limitations, there was room, albeit very narrow room for people to make decisions that has an impact on history. Carr made a division between those who, like Vladimir Lenin and Oliver Cromwell, helped to shape the social forces which carried them to historical greatness and those who, like Otto von Bismarck and Napoleon, rode on the back of social forces over which they had little or no control. Though Carr was willing to grant individuals a role in history, he argued that those who focus exclusively on individuals in a Great man theory of history were doing a profound disservice to the past. As an example, Carr complained of those historians who explained the Russian Revolution solely as the result of the "stupidity" of the
Emperor Nicholas II (which Carr regarded as a factor, but only of lesser importance) rather than the working of a great social force.

Carr claimed that when examining causation in history, historians should seek to find "rational" causes of historical occurrences that is causes that can be generalized across time to explain other occurrences in other times and places. For Carr, historical "accidents" can not be generalized, and thus not worth the historian's time. Carr illustrated his theory by telling a story of a man named Robinson who went out to buy some cigarettes one night, and was killed by an automobile with defective brakes driven by a drunk driver named Jones on a sharp turn of the road. Carr argued one could contend that the "real" reasons for the accident that killed Robinson might be the defective brakes or the sharp turn of the road or the inebriated state of Jones, but that to argue that it was Robinson's wish to buy cigarettes was the cause of his death, that while a factor was not the "real" cause of his death. As such, Carr argued that those who were seeking to prevent a repeat of Robinson's death would do well to pass laws regulating drunk driving, straightening the sharp turn of the road and the quality of automobile brakes, but would be wasting their time passing a law forbidding people to take a walk to buy cigarettes. In a not too subtle dig at critics of determinism like Sir Karl Popper and Sir Isaiah Berlin, Carr spoke of the inquiry into Robinson's death being interrupted by two "distinguished gentlemen" who maintained quite vehemently that it was Robinson's wish to buy cigarettes that caused his death. In the same way, Carr argued that historians needed to find the "real" causes of historical events by finding the general trend which could inspire a better understanding of the present than by focusing on the role of the accidental and incidental.

As an example of his attack on the role of accidents in history, Carr mocked the hypothesis of "Cleopatra's nose" (Pascal's thought that, but for the magnetism exerted by the nose of Cleopatra on Mark Anthony there would have been no affair between the two, and hence the Second Triumvirate would not have broken up, and therefore the Roman Republic would have continued). Carr sarcastically commented that the male attraction to female beauty can hardly be considered an accident at all, and is rather one of the most common cases of cause and effect in the world. Other examples of "Cleopatra's Nose" type of history cited by Carr were the claim by Edward Gibbon if the Turkish sultan Bayezid I did not suffer from gout, he would have conquered Central Europe, Winston Churchill's statement if King Alexander had not died of a monkey bite, the Greco-Turkish War would have been avoided, and Leon Trotsky's remark that if he not contracted a cold while duck hunting, he would not have missed a crucial Politburo meeting in 1923. Rather than accidents, Carr asserted history was a series of causal chains interacting with each other. Carr contemptuously compared those like Winston Churchill who in his book *The World Crisis* claimed that the death of King Alexander from a monkey bite caused the Greek-Turkish war to those who would claim that the "real" cause of Robinson's death was due to his desire to buy cigarettes. Carr argued that the claim that history was a series of "accidents" was merely an expression of the pessimism, which Carr claimed was the dominant mood in Britain in 1961 due to the decline of the British Empire.

In Carr's opinion, historical works that serve to broaden society's understanding of the past via generalizations are more "right" and "socially acceptable" than works that do not. Citing Pieter Geyl, Carr argued that as the values of society changes, so do the values of historical works. Carr argued that as society continues to progress in the 20th century, historians must change the values that they apply in writing their works to reflect the work of progress. Carr argued during his lectures that Karl Marx had developed a schema for understanding past, present and the future that
reflected the proper and dual role of the historian both to analyse the past and provide a call for action for the present in order to create a better future for humanity.

Carr emphatically contended that history was a social science, not an art. Carr argued that history should be considered a social science because historians like scientists seek generalizations that helped to broaden the understanding of one's subject. Carr used the example of the word revolution, arguing that if the word did not have a specific meaning that it would make no sense for historians to write of revolutions, even though every revolution that occurred in history was in its own way unique. Moreover, Carr claimed that historical generalizations were often related to lessons to be learned from other historical occurrences. Since in Carr's view, lessons can be sought and learned in history, then history was more like a science than any art. Though Carr conceded that historians cannot predict exact events in the future, he argued that historical generalizations can supply information useful to understanding both the present and the future. Carr argued that since scientists are not purely neutral observers, but have a reciprocal relationship with the objects under their study just like historians, that this supported identifying history with the sciences rather than the arts. Likewise, Carr contended that history like science has no moral judgments, which in his opinion, supports the identification of history as a science.

Carr was well known for his assertions in *what is History?* in denying moral judgements in history. Carr argued that it was ahistorical for the historian to judge people in different times according to the moral values of his or her time. Carr argued that individuals should be judged only in terms of the values of their time and place, not by the values of the historian's time and/or place. In Carr's opinion, historians should not act as judges. Carr quoted Thomas Carlyle's remark on the British reaction to the French Revolution: "Exaggeration abounds, execration, wailing and on the whole darkness"...", and complained that exactly the same could be said about too much of Western commentary and writing on the Russian Revolution. Likewise, Carr quoted Carlyle on the Reign of Terror as a way of confronting Western complaints about Soviet terror:"Horrible in lands that had known equal justice-not so unnatural in lands that had never known it".

Thus, Carr argued that within the context of the Soviet Union, Stalin was a force for the good. In a 1979 essay, Carr argued about Stalin that"He revived and outdid the worst brutalities of the earlier Tsars; and his record excited revulsion in later generations of historians. Yet his achievement in borrowing from the West, in forcing on primitive Russia the material foundations of modern civilisation, and in giving Russia a place among the European powers, obliged them to concede, however reluctantly his title to greatness. Stalin was the most ruthless despot Russia had known since Peter, and also a great westerniser".

Though Carr made it clear that he preferred that historians refrain from expressing moral opinions, he did argue that if the historian should find it necessary then such views should be best be restricted to institutions rather than individuals. Carr argued that such an approach was better because the focus on individuals served to provide a collective alibi for societies. Carr used as examples those in United Kingdom who blamed appeasement solely upon Neville Chamberlain, those Germans who argued that Nazi-era crimes were the work of Adolf Hitler alone or those in the United States who blamed McCarthyism exclusively upon Senator Joseph McCarthy. In Carr's opinion, historians should reject concepts like good and Evil when making judgements about events and people. Instead, Carr preferred the terms *progressive* or *reactionary* as the terms for value judgements. In Carr's opinion, if a historical event such as the collectivisation of Soviet agriculture
in the early 1930s led to the growth of the Soviet heavy industry and the achievement of the goals of the First Five Year Plan, then the collectivisation must be considered a progressive development in history, and hence all of the sufferings and millions of deaths caused by collectivisation, the "dekulakisation" campaign and the Holodomor were justified by the growth of Soviet heavy industry. Likewise, Carr argued that the suffering of Chinese workers in the treaty ports and in the mines of South Africa in the late 19th-early 20th centuries was terrible, but must be considered a progressive development as it helped to push China towards the Communist revolution. Carr argued that China was much better off under the leadership of Mao Zedong then it was under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, and hence all of the developments that led to the fall of Chiang's regime in 1949 and the rise to power of Mao must considered progressive. Finally, Carr argued that historians can be "objective" if they are capable of moving beyond their narrow view of the situation both in the past and in the present, and can write historical works which helped to contribute to progress of society.

At the end of his lectures, Carr criticized a number of conservative/liberal historians and philosophers such as Hugh Trevor-Roper, Sir Karl Popper, Admiral Samuel Eliot Morison, Sir Lewis Bernstein Namier and Michael Oakeshott, and argued that "progress" in the world was against them. Carr ended his book with the prediction that "progress" would sweep away everything that Popper, Morison, Namier, Trevor-Roper and Oakeshott believed in the 20th century just the same way that "progress" swept away the Catholic Church's opposition to Galileo Galilei's astronomical theories in the 17th century. Elaborating on the theme of "progress" inevitably sweeping away the old order of things in the world, in a 1970 article entitled "Marxism and History", Carr argued that with the exception of the Mexican Revolution, every revolution in the last sixty-odd years had been led by Marxists. The other revolutions Carr counted were the revolutions in Cuba, China, Russia, and a half-revolution in Vietnam (presumably a reference to the then on-going Vietnam War). This together with what Carr saw as the miserable condition of the Third World, which comprised most of the world led Carr to argue that Marxism had the greatest appeal in the Third World, and was the most likely wave of the future. Carr expanded on this thesis of "progress" being an unstoppable force in September 1978 when he stated:"I think we have to consider seriously the hypothesis that the world revolution of which [the Bolshevik revolution] was the first stage, and which will complete the downfall of capitalism, will prove to be the revolt of the colonial peoples against capitalism in the guise of imperialism".

In his notes for a second edition of whatis History? Carr remarked on recent trends in historiography. Carr wrote about the rise of social history that:"Since the First World War the impact of the materialist conception of history on historical writings has been very strong. Indeed, one might say that all serious historical work done in this period has been moulded by its influence. The symptom of this change has been the replacement, in general esteem, of battles, diplomatic manoeuvres, constitutional arguments and political intrigues as the main topics of history-'political history' in the broad sense-by the study of economic factors, of social conditions, of statistics of population, of the rise and fall of classes. The increasing popularity of sociology has been another feature of the same development; the attempt has sometimes been made to treat history as a branch of sociology."

About the rise of social history as a subject at the expense of political history, Carr wrote:"Social history is the bedrock. To study the bedrock alone is not enough; and becomes tedious; perhaps this is what happened to Annales. But you can't dispense with it".Through Carr himself had insisted that
history was a social science, he regretted the decline of history as a discipline relative to the other social sciences, which he saw as a part of a conservative trend. Carr wrote: "History is preoccupied with fundamental processes of change. If you are allergic to these processes, you abandon history and take cover in the social sciences. Today anthropology, sociology, etc, flourish. History is sick. But then our society too is sick".

Carr deplored the rise of Structuralism. Carr wrote there was the structuralist approach, which Carr called a "horizontal" way of understanding history "which analyses a society in terms of the functional or structural inter-relation of its parts". Against it, there was what Carr called the "vertical" approach "which analyses it [society] in terms of where it has come from and where it is going". Through Carr was willing to allow that a structural approach had some advantages, he wrote: "But it makes a lot of difference which attracts [the historian's] main emphasis and concern. This depends partly, no doubt, on his temperament, but largely on the environment in which he works. We live in a society which thinks of change chiefly as change for the worse, dreads it and prefers the "horizontal" view which calls only for minor adjustments".

Repeating his attack on the empirical approach to history, Carr claimed that those historians who claimed to be strict empiricists like Captain Stephen Roskill who took a just-the-facts approach would resemble a character named Funes in a short story by Jorge Luis Borges who never forgot anything he had seen or heard, so his memory was a "garbage heap". Thus, Funes was "not very capable of thought" because "to think is forget differences, to generalize, to make abstractions". In his introduction to the second edition of What is History? written shortly before his death in 1982, which was all that Carr had finished of the second edition, Carr proclaimed his belief that the western world was in a state of despair, writing: "The Cold War has resumed with redoubled intensity, bringing with it the threat of nuclear extinction. The delayed economic crisis has set in with a vengeance, ravaging the industrial countries and spreading the cancer of unemployment throughout the Western world [Carr is referring to the recession of the early 1980s here.]. Scarcely a country is now free from the antagonism of violence and terrorism. The revolt of the oil-producing states of the Middle East has brought a significant shift in power to the disadvantage of the Western industrial nations [a reference on the part of Carr to the Arab oil shock of 1973-74 and to the Iranian oil shock of 1979]. The "third world" has been transformed from a passive into a positive and disturbing factor in world affairs. In these conditions any expression of optimism has come to seem absurd".

Carr went on to declare his belief that the world was in fact getting better and wrote that it was only the West in decline, not the world, writing that: "My conclusion is that the current wave of skepticism and despair, which looks ahead to nothing but destruction and decay, and dismisses as absurd any belief in progress or any prospect of a further advance by the human race, is a form of elitism-the product of elite social groups whose security and whose privileges have been most conspicuously eroded by the crisis, and of elite countries whose once undisputed domination over the rest of the world has been shattered".

The claims that Carr made about the nature of historical work in what is History? proved be very controversial, and inspired Sir Geoffrey Elton to write his 1967 book The Practice of History in response, defending traditional historical methods. Elton criticized Carr for his "whimsical" distinction between the "historical facts" and the "facts of the past", arguing that it reflected "...an extraordinarily arrogant attitude both to the past and to the place of the historian studying
Though Elton praised Carr for rejecting the role of "accidents" in history, he maintained that Carr's philosophy of history was merely an attempt to provide a secular version of the medieval view of history as the working of God's master plan with "Progress" playing the part of God. In response to Elton's book, Carr wrote a letter to him which began with a warning about suing him for libel. However, the libel threat was just a practical joke as Carr wrote "Nobody before has accused me of having been an undergraduate at Oxford, and my solicitors might, I fear take a low view of this". Carr was referring here to the sentence in *The Practice of History* where Elton had written that Carr's knowledge of ancient Greece were based on "the fifty-year memories of an Oxford undergraduate" (Carr had of course had attended Cambridge).

The British historian Hugh Trevor-Roper argued that Carr's dismissal of the "might-have-beens of history" reflected a fundamental lack of interest in examining historical causation. Trevor-Roper asserted that examining possible alternative outcomes of history was far from being a "parlour-game" was rather an essential part of the historians' work. Trevor-Roper argued that only by considering all possible outcomes of a given historical situation could a historian properly understand the period under study. In Trevor-Roper's opinion, only by looking at all possible outcomes and all sides could a historian properly understand history, and those historians who adopted Carr's perspective of only seeking to understand the "winners" of history, and treating the outcome of a particular set of events as the only possible outcome were "bad historians". In a review in 1963 in *Historische Zeitschrift*, Andreas Hillgruber wrote favourably of Carr's geistvoll-ironischer (ironically spirited) criticism of conservative, liberal and positivist historiansA more positive assessment of *What is History?* came from the British philosopher W.H. Walsh who in a 1963 review endorsed Carr's theory of "facts of history" and "facts of the past", writing that it is not a "fact of history" he had toast for breakfast today. Walsh went on to write that Carr was correct that historians did not stand above history, and were instead products of their own places and times, which in turn decided what "facts of the past" they determined into "facts of history".

The British historian Richard J. Evans credited *what Is History?* with causing a revolution in British historiography in the 1960s The Australian historian Keith Windschuttle, a critic of Carr noted regretfully that *What Is History?* has proved to be one of the most influential books ever written about historiography, and that there were very few historians working in the English language since the 1960s who had not read *What Is History?* Against Carr's theory of "facts of the past" and "facts of history", Windschuttle wrote:"Another contender for historical truth might be the proposition:'The United States defeated Japan in the Second World War.' Now this is something that we know not simply from the historical record. It is no mere interpretation derived from an examination of the documents of surrender signed aboard the USS Missouri in Tokyo Harbour in 1945. It is not an interpretation that future generations might overturn after they have scoured the nuances of the texts for so far undiscerned ideological meaning. The fact that the United States defeated Japan has shaped the very world that all of us have inhabited since 1945. The relations between states, the world economy, and the employment market of every industrial country are all consequences in various ways of this historical truth. The world itself confirms the proposition.

Of course, E.H. Carr might argue the defeat of Japan is a mere 'fact' and the really interesting discussions are the interpretations historians make and the conclusions they draw from facts of this kind. Well, one man's fact can be another man's conclusion. For someone writing a narrative history of the war in the Pacific, the defeat of Japan is a very big conclusion indeed. There is no event that is inherently confined to the status of a mere fact, that is, a building block of a much larger
conclusion. Every fact can itself be a conclusion and every conclusion can itself be a fact in someone else's explanation."The conservative British historian Andrew Robertswas to write in 2005 in defence of counter-factual history that: 'anything that has been condemned by Carr, Thompson and Hobsbawm must have something to recommend it"

**Conclusion to the theory of International relations**

Carr contributed to the foundation of what is now known as classical realism in International relations theory. Through study of history (work of Thucydides and Machiavelli) and reflection and deep epistemological disagreement with Idealism, the dominant International relations theory between the World Wars, he came up with realism. In his book *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, Carr defined three dichotomies of realism and utopianism (Idealism), derived from Machiavellian realism:

1. In the first place, history is a sequence of cause and effect, whose course can be analysed and understood by intellectual effort, but not (as the utopians believe) directed by “imagination”.
2. Secondly; theory does not (as the utopians assume) create practice, but practice theory. In Machiavelli's words, “good counsels, whence so ever they come, are born of the wisdom of the prince and not the wisdom of the prince from good counsels”. Thirdly, politics are not (as the utopians pretend) a function of ethics, but ethics of politics. Men “are kept honest by constraint”. Machiavelli recognized the importance of morality, but thought that there could be no effective morality where there was no effective authority. Morality is the product of power. [Carr, 1939]

**Carr's distinctions of Realism and Utopianism**

In the second part of the book *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, Carr defined six distinctions between Realism and Utopianism. The first being two schematic descriptions of idealism and realism (utopia and reality). The utopian believes in the possibility of transforming society by an act of will. The main problem of the utopian is his/her lack of information regarding the constraints that the reality poses upon us. Not regarding these constraints seriously, the utopian cannot assess his/her current position and thus is unable to move from the actual state of affairs to his/her desire. A Utopian may want a world in peace, but have no viable plan of action to bring peace on Earth, only the belief that it should be so and the conviction that such a belief will bring peace into being. On the other hand, the realists take the society we live in as a historical consequence. The social reality is the product of a long chain of causality, a predetermined result. Thus, it cannot be changed by an act of will. The realist, taking things as they are, deprives him/herself from the possibility of changing the world.

The second distinction is that between theory and practice. For the utopian, we derive the answer to "what should be done?" from theory. The all-important question is to be able to conceive of a utopia. Once the target is constructed in mind, all we have to do is to get there. Thus, utopian confuses what "is" and what "ought to be". When a utopian says "men are equal", he actually means "men ought to be equal". The difference is crucial and confusing in actual politics. For the realist, theory is derived from reality, the actual state of affairs. While the utopian tries to reproduce reality with reference to theory, the realist tries to produce theory from reality. Thus, for a realist, a theory based on the equality of men is simply wrong or wishful thinking. The realist theory is descriptive, and you cannot derive policy from that theory; it is not prescriptive. For Carr, one has to see the interdependence of the two. Most of our reality is the product of some ideas that took shape in the form of institutions or applied rules. Every theory carries in it a part of reality and vice versa.
The problems we face in reality force us to think and imagine new ways of reality. The theory (solution) we produce changes reality and becomes part of reality. When that reality creates new problems, we come up with further theory to solve them and it goes on like this. That is a circle of causality.

The third distinction is that between the intellectual who derives the truth from books and the bureaucrat who derives it from actual experience. The intellectual believes in the predominance of theory and thus thinks of himself as the true guide of the so-called man of action. The bureaucrat is bound up with the existing order. He has no formula or theory that guides him. He merely tries to make the existing order within which he exists, continue to exist. The fourth distinction is that between left and right. The left is progressive in the utopian sense while the right is conservative in the realist sense.

The fifth is between radical and conservative (left and right, though Carr notes, that not always radicals and conservatives represent those political orientation). Radicals are utopians, intellectuals, theoretician, while conservatives are realists, bureaucrats and people from practice. Finally, the same distinction appears between ethics and politics. The utopian believes in the predominance of ethics as a guide to policy. The realist believes that ethics is derived from the relations of power as they stand. Thus, politics pre-dominates. For Carr, the ability to see from both angles is the right way to go about.

Critique of Carr: Sir Geoffrey Elton

Sir Geoffrey Rudolph Elton (17 August 1921 – 3 December 1994) was a German-born British historian, who specialized in the Tudor period. Elton was born in Tübingen, Germany as Gottfried Rudolf Ehrenberg. His parents were the Jewish scholars Victor Ehrenberg and Eva Dorothea Sommer. In 1929, the Ehrenbergs moved to Prague, Czech Republic. In February 1939, the Ehrenbergs fled to Britain. Ehrenberg continued his education at Rydal School, a Methodist school in Wales, starting in 1939. After only two years, Ehrenberg was working as a teacher at Rydal and achieved the position of assistant master in Mathematics, History and German. While there, he took courses via correspondence at the University of London and graduated with a degree in Ancient History in 1943. Ehrenberg enlisted in the British Army in 1943. He spent his time in the Army in the Intelligence Corps and the East Surrey Regiment, serving with the Eighth Army in Italy from 1944 to 1946. During this period, Ehrenberg anglicised his name to Geoffrey Elton. After his discharge from the army, Elton studied early modern history at the University of London, graduating with a PhD in 1949. He took British citizenship in 1947.

The Tudor Revolution in Government

Elton focused primarily on the life of Henry VIII but made significant contributions to the study of Queen Elizabeth I. He was most famous for arguing in his 1953 book *The Tudor Revolution in Government* that Thomas Cromwell was the author of modern, bureaucratic government which replaced medieval, household government. This change took place in the 1530s and must be regarded as part of a planned revolution. In essence, Elton was arguing that before Cromwell the realm could be viewed as the King's private estate writ large and that most administration was done by the King's household servants rather than separate state offices. Cromwell, who was Henry VIII's chief minister from 1532 to 1540, introduced reforms into the administration that delineated the King's household from the state and created a modern bureaucratic government. He shone
Tudor light into the darker corners of the Realm and radically altered the role of Parliament and the competence of Statute.

By master-minding these reforms, Cromwell was said to have laid the foundations of England's future stability and success. Elton elaborated on these ideas in his 1955 work, the best-selling *England under the Tudors*, which went through three editions after its first appearance, and his Wiles Lectures, which he published in 1973 as *Reform and Renewal: Thomas Cromwell and the Common Weal*. His thesis has been widely challenged by Tudor historians and can no longer be regarded as orthodoxy, but Elton's contribution to the debate has profoundly influenced subsequent discussion of Tudor government, in particular concerning the role of Cromwell.

**His Historical Perspective**

Elton was a staunch admirer of Thatcher and Churchill. He was also a fierce critic of Marxist historians, who he argued were presenting seriously flawed interpretations of the past. In particular, Elton was opposed to the idea that the English Civil War was caused by socio-economic changes in the 16th and 17th centuries, arguing instead that it was due largely to the incompetence of the Stuart kings. Elton was also famous for his role in the Carr-Elton debate when he defended the nineteenth century interpretation of empirical, 'scientific' history most famously associated with Leopold von Ranke against E. H. Carr's views. Elton wrote his 1967 book *The Practice of History* largely in response to Carr's 1961 book *What is History?*

Elton was a strong defender of the traditional methods of history and was appalled by postmodernism, once intoning on the subject: '...we are fighting for the lives of innocent young people beset by devilish tempters who claim to offer higher forms of thought and deeper truths and insights - the intellectual equivalent of crack, in fact. Any acceptance of these theories - even the most gentle or modest bow in their direction - can prove fatal.' Although ex-pupils of his such as John Guy claim he did embody a "revisionist streak," Elton saw the duty of historians as empirically gathering evidence and objectively analyzing what the evidence has to say. As a traditionalist, he placed great emphasis on the role of individuals in history instead of abstract, impersonal forces. For instance, his 1963 book *Reformation Europe* is in large part concerned with the duel between Martin Luther and the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V. Elton objected to cross-disciplinary efforts such as efforts to combine history with anthropology or sociology. He saw political history as the best and most important kind of history. Elton had no use for those who seek history to make myths, to create laws to explain the past, or to produce theories such as Marxism.

**His career**

Elton taught at the University of Glasgow and from 1949 onwards at Clare College, Cambridge University and was the Regius Professor of Modern History there from 1983 to 1988. Pupils include John Guy and Diarmaid MacCulloch and he was knighted in 1986. Elton worked as publication secretary of the British Academy from 1981 to 1990 and served as the president of the Royal Historical Society from 1972 to 1976. He married a fellow historian, Sheila Lambert; in 1952.He was the brother of the education researcher Lewis Elton and therefore the uncle of Lewis's comedian and writer son, Ben Elton.

**Keith Jenkins**
Keith Jenkins is a British historiographer. Like Hayden White and "postmodern" historiographers; Jenkins believes that any historian's output should be seen as a story. A work of history is as much about the historian's own world view and ideological positions as it is about past events. This means that different historians will inevitably ascribe different meaning to the same historical events. Jenkins is professor in history at the University of Chichester and author of Re-thinking History (1991), On "What is History": From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White (1995) and edited The Postmodern History Reader (1997), the author of Why History? Ethics and Postmodernity (1999). With Alun Munslow he co-authored The Nature of History Reader (2004), in which key pieces of writing by leading historians are reproduced and evaluated, with an explanation and critique of their character and assumptions.

In, On "What is History?" Keith Jenkins expands on his highly successful Rethinking History and brings the "history question" up to date. The author argues that the older modernist texts, including those of Carr and Elton, are now only partial guides to contemporary debates. He lobbies for an embracing of the postmodernist approaches of such thinkers as Richard Rorty and Hayden White.

In the introduction, Jenkins contextualizes the places of Carr and Elton, and Rorty and White in the contemporary debate concerning the nature of history. He goes on to give radical critiques of Carr and Elton in the first two chapters. In the last sections, Jenkins introduces Rorty and White, postmodern thinkers who in his opinion represent a way forward in today's historiographical debates.

Jenkins' exploration of Hayden White's work is particularly significant. White has long been recognized as one of the most original history theorists currently writing, but his work is little read and little understood in many orthodox historical arenas. Jenkins argues that this neglect of White and a concurrent suspicion of "theory" among many historians are issues which need to be urgently addressed. On "What Is History?" enables readers to gain a clear understanding of the current debates in history and historiography, an understanding that necessarily moves beyond Carr and Elton.

Contemporary Trends

The last quarter of the 20th century has witnessed radical changes in the writing of history. Historians are forced to look for hitherto unearthed or unused sources and formulate new interpretations and theories. In the course of these new approaches, the subject matter, sources and interpretation are subject to re-examination also.

New Cultural History

The new cultural history is a way of understanding the past that emphasizes the ways that groups and individuals, in competition with one another, construct the meaning that guide their interpretation of the material world. It is difficult to give an exact definition for new cultural history as it is neither a school nor a movement. It is not a single approach and it has no specific methodology. The meaning of new cultural history is constructed in a plurality of ways for the same event. It emphasize that no cultural event has a monolithic meaning. It is an understanding of history.
that celebrated plurality within human societies and therefore embraces many different views of culture. It provides new topics for historical research. One of the great insights of the new cultural history is the everyday experience or the day today actions of the ordinary people are seen not only as historically constructed but as important to the understanding of power relations in human societies.

The new cultural history states that culture is an integral part of struggle and power. Following from the pioneering work of Michel Foucault, historians have begun to look for hidden clues to power relationships in the ways those categories of knowledge are constructed. Apart from this, the new cultural history has emerged out of the myriads of theories like Clifford Geertz, the linguistic theories of Derrida and of the Deconstructionists. Recently, the scope of the new cultural history has been widened by the interventions of the Annalists, Marxists, Gramscians etc. The disciplinary boundaries of social science are cut across and has shown how the use of anthropology, literary criticism, philosophy, sociology etc could enrich the discussions of various historical problems. It also represent a change of focus from looking for historical causation to explore the meaning of things and events. It examines several historical concepts like power, ideology, class, cultural identity, attitude, race etc. Cultural expressions of social movements such as nationalism, cultural evolutions like ideas, science, art, festivals etc also come under new cultural history. The new cultural history represents a step beyond an older Cultural history, in which culture was understood to include every thing that people did and thought.

**Gender History**

Gender history is a sub-field of History and Gender studies, which looks at the past from the perspective of gender. It is in many ways, an outgrowth of women's history. Despite its relatively short life, Gender History (and its forerunner Women's History) has had a rather significant effect on the general study of history. Since the 1960s, when the initially small field first achieved a measure of acceptance, it has gone through a number of different phases, each with its own challenges and outcomes, but always making an impact of some kind on the historical discipline. Although some of the changes to the study of history have been quite obvious, such as increased numbers of books on famous women or simply the admission of greater numbers of women into the historical profession, other influences are more subtle, even though they may be more politically groundbreaking in the end.

According to historian Joan Scott, conflict occurred between Women's History historians and other historians in a number of ways. In the American Historical Association, when feminists argued that female historians were treated unequally within the field and underrepresented in the association, they were essentially leveling charges of historical negligence by traditional historians. Notions of professionalism were not rejected outright, but they were accused of being biased. Scott says that the construction of Women's History as "supplementary" to the rest of history had a similar effect. At first glance, a supplement simply adds information which has been missing from the greater story, but as Scott points out, it also questions why the information was left out in the first place. Whenever it is noticed that a woman found to be missing from written history, Women's History first describes her role, second, examines which mechanisms allowed her role to be omitted, and third, asks to what other information these mechanisms were blind.

Finally, the advent of gender theory once again challenged commonly held ideas of the discipline,
including those scholars studying Women's History. Postmodern criticism of essentialising socially constructed groups is the gender groups or otherwise, pointed out the weaknesses in various sorts of history. In the past, historians have attempted to describe the shared experience of large numbers of people, as though these people and their experiences were homogeneous and uniform. Women have multiple identities, influenced by any number of factors including race and class, and any examination of history which conflates their experiences, fails to provide an accurate picture.

**History from Below or People's history**

A people's history or history from below is a type of historical narrative which attempts to account for historical events from the perspective of common people rather than political and other leaders. A people's history (otherwise known as social history) is the history of the world that is the story of mass movements and of the outsiders. Individuals not included in the past in other type of writing about history are part of history-from-below theory's primary focus, which includes the disenfranchised, the oppressed, the poor, the nonconformists, the subaltern and the otherwise forgotten people. This theory also usually focuses on events occurring in the fullness of time, or when an overwhelming wave of smaller events cause certain developments to occur.

This revisionist approach to writing history is in direct opposition to methods which tend to emphasize single great figures in history, referred to as the great man theory; it argues that the driving factor of history is the daily life of ordinary people, their social status and profession. These are the factors that "push and pull" on opinions and allow for trends to develop, as opposed to great people introducing ideas or initiating events. In his book ‘*A People's History of the United States*, Howard Zinn wrote: "The history of any country, presented as the history of a family, conceals fierce conflicts of interest (sometimes exploding, most often repressed) between conquerors and conquered, masters and slaves, capitalists and workers, dominators and dominated in race and sex. And in such a world of conflict, a world of victims and executioners, it is the job of thinking people, as Albert Camus suggested, not being on the side of the executioners."

**Micro History**

One of the most interesting and innovative approach to history, mostly cultural and social history, is micro history, which just recently has been introduced in a new website called *microhistory.org* in Iceland. Micro history came about, according to the German-US historian Georg G. Iggers in his excellent summary of the development of modern historical practice, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century*, not because the micro historians considered that the traditional methodology of the social sciences "is not possible or desirable but that social scientists have made generalizations that do not hold up when tested against the concrete reality of the small-scale life they claim to explain." In the light of this perception, monographs and journals began to appear focusing specifically on micro historical research, and these became a forum for criticism of the kind of social history produced under the influence of the social sciences. Perhaps foremost of the contributors to the debate was the Italian historian Carlo Ginzburg, who delivered incisive criticisms of the prevailing methods in numerous articles in the Italian journal, *Quaderni Storici*, the German journal, *Historische Anthropologie*, in English in *Critical Inquiry*, and elsewhere.
Ginzburg and many of his colleagues attacked large-scale quantitative studies on the grounds that they distorted reality on the individual level. The micro historians placed their emphasis on small units and how people conducted their lives within them. By reducing the scale of observation, micro historians argued that they are more likely to reveal the complicated function of individual relationships within each and every social setting and they stressed its difference from larger norms. Micro historians tend to focus on outliers rather than looking for the average individual as found by the application of quantitative research methods. Instead, they scrutinize those individuals who did not follow the paths of their average fellow countryman, thus making them their focal point. In micro history the term “normal exception” is used to penetrate the importance of this perspective, meaning that each and every one of us do not show our full hand of cards. Seeing what is usually kept hidden from the outside world, we realize that our focus has only been on the “normal exception”; those who in one segment of society are considered obscure, strange, and even dangerous. They might be, in other circles, at the center of attention and fully accepted in their daily affairs.

Nearly all cases which micro historians deal with have one thing in common; they all caught the attention of the authorities, thus establishing their archival existence. They illustrate the function of the formal institutions in power and how they handle people’s affairs. In other words, each has much wider application, going well beyond the specific case under examination by the micro historian. The Italian micro historian Giovanni Levi put it this way in an article on the methods of micro history: “Micro historians have concentrated on the contradictions of normative systems and therefore on the fragmentation, contradictions and plurality of viewpoints which make all systems fluid and open.” To be able to illustrate this point, micro historians have turned to the narrative as an analytical tool or a research method where they get the opportunity to present their findings, show the process by which the conclusions are reached, and demonstrate the holes in our understanding and the subjective nature of the discourse.

We believe that the methods of micro history are extremely well suited for the study of American history, especially issues related to minorities, ethnicity, race, and gender. The interesting thing is that it has not been applied to American history in a noticeable fashion; micro history is, indeed, a European phenomena. We do want to encourage American historians to think about the methods of micro history and contribute to its development as it is introduced on the new website: www.microhistory.org run by the Center for Microhistorical Research at the Reykjavik Academy in Iceland. Among the features introduced on the website is a new journal, Journal of Micro history, an informal online publication which hopefully will work as a forum for ideas and debates about its methods. Also, an extended bibliography on micro historical research is to be found on the website which will help future micro historians, especially those who want to apply it to new fields in American history.

Textual Analysis or Content analysis

Textual analysis or Content analysis is a methodology in the social sciences for studying the content of communication. Earl Babbie defines it as "the study of recorded human communications, such as books, websites, paintings and laws." According to Dr. Farooq Joubish, content analysis is considered a scholarly methodology in the humanities by which texts are studied as to authorship, authenticity, or meaning. This latter subject includes philology, hermeneutics, and semiotics. Harold Lasswell formulated the core questions of content analysis: "Who says what, to whom, why, to what
extent and with what effect?" Ole Holsti(1969) offers a broad definition of content analysis as "any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages." Kimberly A. Neuendorf (2002) offers a six-part definition of content analysis:"Content analysis is a summarising, quantitative analysis of messages that relies on the scientific method (including attention to objectivity, intersubjectivity, a priori design, reliability, validity, generalisability, replicability, and hypothesis testing) and is not limited as to the types of variables that may be measured or the context in which the messages are created or presented."

In 1931, Alfred R Lindesmith developed a methodology to refute existing hypotheses, which became known as a content analysis technique, and it gained popularity in the 1960s by Glaser and is referred to as “The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis” in an article published in 1964-65. Glaser and Strauss (1967) referred to their adaptation of it as “Grounded Theory." The method of content analysis enables the researcher to include large amounts of textual information and systematically identify its properties, e.g. the frequencies of most used keywords (KWIC meaning "Key Word in Context") by locating the more important structures of its communication content. Yet such amounts of textual information must be categorised analysis, providing at the end a meaningful reading of content under scrutiny. David Robertson(1976) for example created a coding framefor a comparison of modes of party competition between British and American parties. It was developed further in 1979 by the Manifesto Research Groupaiming at a comparativecontent-analytic approach on the policypositions of political parties.

Since the 1980s, content analysis has become an increasingly important tool in the measurement of success in public relations (notably media relations) programs and the assessment of media profiles. In these circumstances, content analysis is an element of media evaluation or media analysis. In analyses of this type, data from content analysis is usually combined with media data (circulation, readership, number of viewers and listeners, frequency of publication). It has also been used by futurists to identify trends. In 1982, John Naisbittpublished his popular Megatrends, based on content analysis in the US media.

The creation of coding frames is intrinsically related to a creative approach to variables that exert an influence over textual content. In political analysis, these variables could be political scandals, the impact of public opinion polls, sudden events in external politics, inflation etc. Mimetic Convergence, created by F. Lampreia Carvalho for the comparative analysis of electoral proclamations on free-to-air television is an example of creative articulation of variables in content analysis. The methodology describes the construction of party identities during long-term party competitions on TV, from a dynamic perspective, governed by the logic of the contingent. This method aims to capture the contingent logic observed in electoral campaigns by focusing on the repetition and innovation of themes sustained in party broadcasts. According to such post-structuralistperspective from which electoral competition is analysed, the party identities, 'the real'cannot speak without mediations because there is not a natural centre fixing the meaning of a party structure, it rather depends on ad-hoc articulations. There is no empirical reality outside articulations of meaning. Reality is an outcome of power struggles that unify ideas of social structure as a result of contingent interventions. In Brazil, these contingent interventions have proven to be mimetic and convergent rather than divergent and polarised, being integral to the repetition of dichotomised worldviews.
Mimetic Convergence thus aims to show the process of fixation of meaning through discursive articulations that repeat, alter and subvert political issues that come into play. For this reason, parties are not taken as the pure expression of conflicts for the representation of interests (of different classes, religions, ethnic groups (see: Lipset&Rokkan 1967, Lijphart1984) but attempts to recompose and re-articulate ideas of an absent totality around signifiers gaining positivity.

Every content analysis should depart from a hypothesis. The hypothesis of Mimetic Convergence supports the Downsian interpretation that in general, rational voters converge in the direction of uniform positions in most thematic dimensions. The hypothesis guiding the analysis of Mimetic Convergence between political parties' broadcasts is: 'public opinion polls on vote intention, published throughout campaigns on TV will contribute to successive revisions of candidates' discourses. Candidates re-orient their arguments and thematic selections in part by the signals sent by voters. One must also consider the interference of other kinds of input on electoral propaganda such as internal and external political crises and the arbitrary interference of private interests on the dispute. Moments of internal crisis in disputes between candidates might result from the exhaustion of a certain strategy. The moments of exhaustion might consequently precipitate an inversion in the thematic flux.

As an evaluation approach, content analysis is considered by some to be quasi-evaluation because content analysis judgments need not be based on value statements if the research objective is aimed at presenting subjective experiences. Thus, they can be based on knowledge of everyday lived experiences. Such content analyses are not evaluations. On the other hand, when content analysis judgments are based on values, such studies are evaluations (Frisbie, 1986). As demonstrated above, only a good scientific hypothesis can lead to the development of a methodology that will allow the empirical description, be it dynamic or static.

Content analysis is a closely related if not overlapping kind, often included under the general rubric of “qualitative analysis,” and used primarily in the social sciences. It is “a systematic, replicable technique for compressing many words of text into fewer content categories based on explicit rules of coding” (Stemler 2001). It often involves building and applying a “concept dictionary” or fixed vocabulary of terms on the basis of which words are extracted from the textual data for concording or statistical computation.

Uses of content analysis

Ole Holsti (1969) groups 15 uses of content analysis into three basic categories:

- make inferences about the antecedents of a communication
- describe and make inferences about characteristics of a communication
- make inferences about the effect of a communication.

He also places these uses into the context of the basic communication paradigm.

The following table shows fifteen uses of content analysis in terms of their general purpose, element of the communication paradigm to which they apply, and the general question they are intended to answer.

<p>| Uses of Content Analysis by Purpose, Communication Element, and Question |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make inferences about the antecedents of communications</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Who?</td>
<td>• Answer questions of disputed authorship (authorship analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encoding process</td>
<td>Why?</td>
<td>• Secure political &amp; military intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyse traits of individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Infer cultural aspects &amp; change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide legal &amp; evaluative evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe &amp; make inferences about the characteristics of communications</td>
<td>Channel</td>
<td>How?</td>
<td>• Analyse techniques of persuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyse style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Message</td>
<td>What?</td>
<td>• Describe trends in communication content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relate known characteristics of sources to messages they produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Compare communication content to standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>To whom?</td>
<td>• Relate known characteristics of audiences to messages produced for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Describe patterns of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make inferences about the consequences of communications</td>
<td>Decoding process</td>
<td>With what effect?</td>
<td>• Measure readability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyse the flow of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess responses to communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The process of a content analysis

According to Dr. Klaus Krippendorff (1980 and 2004), six questions must be addressed in every content analysis:

1. Which data are analysed?
2. How are they defined?
3. What is the population from which they are drawn?
4. What is the context relative to which the data are analysed?
5. What are the boundaries of the analysis?
6. What is the target of the inferences?

The assumption is that words and phrases mentioned most often are those reflecting important concerns in every communication. Therefore, quantitative content analysis starts with word frequencies, space measurements (column centimeters/inches in the case of newspapers), time counts (for radio and television time) and keyword frequencies. However, content analysis extends far beyond plain word counts, e.g. with Keyword In Context routines words can be analysed in their specific context to be disambiguated. Synonyms and homonyms can be isolated in accordance to linguistic properties of a language.

Qualitatively, content analysis can involve any kind of analysis where communication content (speech, written text, interviews, images ...) is categorised and classified. In its beginnings, using the first newspapers at the end of 19th century, analysis was done manually by measuring the number of lines and amount of space given a subject. With the rise of common computing facilities like PCs, computer-based methods of analysis are growing in popularity. Answers to open ended questions, newspaper articles, political party manifestoes, medical records or systematic observations in experiments can all be subject to systematic analysis of textual data. By having contents of communication available in form of machine readable texts, the input is analysed for frequencies and coded into categories for building up inferences. Robert Philip Weber(1990) notes: "To make valid inferences from the text, it is important that the classification procedure be reliable in the sense of being consistent: Different people should code the same text in the same way". The validity, inter-coder reliability and intra-coder reliability are subject to intense methodological research efforts over long years.

One more distinction is between the manifest contents (of communication) and its latent meaning. "Manifest" describes what (an author or speaker) definitely has written, while latent meaning describes what an author intended to say/write. Normally, content analysis can only be applied on manifest content; that is, the words, sentences, or texts themselves, rather than their meanings. Dermot McKeone(1995) has highlighted the difference between prescriptive analysis and open analysis. In prescriptive analysis, the context is a closely-defined set of communication parameters (e.g. specific messages, subject matter); open analysis identifies the dominant messages and subject matter within the text.

A further step in analysis is the distinction between dictionary-based (quantitative) approaches and qualitative approaches. Dictionary-based approaches set up a list of categories derived from the frequency list of words and control the distribution of words and their respective categories over the texts. While methods in quantitative content analysis in this way transform observations of found categories into quantitative statistical data, the qualitative content analysis focuses more on the intentionality and its implications.

Reliability in content analysis

Dr. Kimberly A. Neuendorf (2002) suggests that when human coders are used in content analysis, reliability translates to intercoder reliability or "the amount of agreement or correspondence among two or more coders."

UNIT-II

TOOLS OF WRITING HISTORY

Archaeology

Archaeology is the study of humansociety, primarily through the recovery and analysis of the material culture and environmental data that they have left behind, which includes artifacts, architecture, biofacts and cultural landscapes (the archaeological record). Because archaeology employs a wide range of different procedures, it can be considered to be both a science and a humanity, and in the United States it is thought of as a branch of anthropology, although in Europe it is viewed as a separate discipline.

Archaeology studies human history from the development of the first stone tools in eastern Africa 3.4 million years ago up until recent decades. It is of most importance for learning about prehistoric societies, when there are no written records for historians to study, making up over 99% of total
human history, from the Paleolithic until the advent of literacy in any given society. Archaeology has various different goals, which range from studying human evolution to cultural evolution and understanding culture history.

The discipline involves surveyance, excavation and eventually analysis of data collected to learn more about the past. In broad scope, archaeology relies on cross-disciplinary research. It draws upon anthropology, history, art history, classics, ethnology, geography, geology, linguistics, physics, information sciences, chemistry, statistics, paleoecology, paleontology, paleozoology, paleoethnobotany, and paleobotany.

Archaeology developed out of antiquarianism in Europe during the 19th century, and has since become a discipline practiced across the world. Since its early development, various specific sub-disciplines of archaeology have developed, including maritime archaeology, feminist archaeology and archaeoastronomy, and numerous different scientific techniques have been developed to aid archaeological investigation. Nonetheless, today, archaeologists face many problems, ranging from dealing with pseudoarchaeology to the looting of artifacts and opposition to the excavation of human remains.

The purpose of archaeology is to learn more about past societies and the development of the human race. Over 99% of the history of humanity has occurred within prehistoric cultures, who did not make use of writing, thereby not leaving written records about themselves that we can study today. Without such written sources, the only way to learn about prehistoric societies is to use archaeology. Many important developments in human history occurred during prehistory, including the evolution of humanity during the Palaeolithic period, when the hominins developed from the australopithecines through to the early homos in Africa and finally into modern Homo sapiens. Archaeology also sheds light on many of humanity's technological advances, for instance the ability to use fire, the development of stone tools, the discovery of metallurgy, the beginnings of religion and the creation of agriculture. Without archaeology, we would know nothing of these evolutionary and technological changes in humanity that pre-date writing.

However, it is not only prehistoric, pre-literate cultures that can be studied using archaeology but historic, literate cultures as well, through the sub-discipline of historical archaeology. For many literate cultures, such as Ancient Greece and Mesopotamia, their surviving records are often incomplete and biased to some extent. In many societies, literacy was restricted to the elite classes, such as the clergy or the bureaucracy of court or temple. The literacy even of aristocrats has sometimes been restricted to deeds and contracts. The interests and world-view of elites are often quite different from the lives and interests of the populace. Writings that were produced by people more representative of the general population were unlikely to find their way into libraries and be preserved there for posterity. Thus, written records tend to reflect the biases, assumptions, cultural values and possibly deceptions of a limited range of individuals, usually a small fraction of the larger population. Hence, written records cannot be trusted as a sole source. The material record may be closer to a fair representation of society, though it is subject to its own biases, such as sampling bias and differential preservation.

Archaeological Theory

There is no one singular approach to archaeological theory that has been adhered to by all archaeologists. When archaeology developed in the late 19th century, the first approach to
archaeological theory to be practiced was that of cultural-history archaeology, which held the goal of explaining why cultures changed and adapted rather than just highlighting the fact that they did, therefore emphasizing historical particularism. In the early 20th century, many archaeologists who studied past societies with direct continuing links to existing ones (such as those of Native Americans, Siberians, Mesoamericans etc.) followed the direct historical approach, compared the continuity between the past and contemporary ethnic and cultural groups. In the 1960s, an archaeological movement largely led by American archaeologists like Lewis Binford and Kent Flannery arose that rebelled against the established cultural-history archaeology. They proposed a "New Archaeology", which would be more "scientific" and "anthropological", with hypothesis testing and the scientific method very important parts of what became known as processual archaeology.

In the 1980s, a new postmodern movement arose led by the British archaeologists Michael Shanks, Christopher Tilley, Daniel Miller, and Ian Hodder, which has become known as post-processual archaeology. It questioned processualism's appeals to scientific positivism and impartiality, and emphasised the importance of a more self-critical theoretical reflexivity. However, this approach has been criticized by processualists as lacking scientific rigor, and the validity of both processualism and post-processualism is still under debate. Meanwhile, another theory, known as historical processualism has emerged seeking to incorporate a focus on process and post-processual archaeology's emphasis of reflexivity and history.

Archaeological theory now borrows from a wide range of influences, including neo-Darwinian evolutionary thought, phenomenology, postmodernism, agency theory, cognitive science, Functionalism, gender-based and Feminist archaeology, and Systems theory.

**Methods**

An archaeological investigation usually involves several distinct phases, each of which employs its own variety of methods. Before any practical work can begin however, a clear objective as to what the archaeologists are looking to achieve must be agreed upon. This done, a site is surveyed to find out as much as possible about it and the surrounding area. Second, an excavation may take place to uncover any archaeological features buried under the ground. And, third, the data collected from the excavation is studied and evaluated in an attempt to achieve the original research objectives of the archaeologists. It is then considered good practice for the information to be published so that it is available to other archaeologists and historians, although this is sometimes neglected.

**Survey**

A modern archaeological project often begins with a survey. Regional survey is the attempt to systematically locate previously unknown sites in a region. Site survey is the attempt to systematically locate features of interest, such as houses and middens, within a site. Each of these two goals may be accomplished with largely the same methods. Survey was not widely practiced in the early days of archaeology. Cultural historians and prior researchers were usually content with discovering the locations of monumental sites from the local populace, and excavating only the plainly visible features there. Gordon Willey pioneered the technique of regional settlement pattern survey in 1949 in the Viru Valley of coastal Peru, and survey of all levels became prominent with the rise of processual archaeology some years later.
Survey work has many benefits if performed as a preliminary exercise to, or even in place of, excavation. It requires relatively little time and expense, because it does not require processing large volumes of soil to search out artifacts. (Nevertheless, surveying a large region or site can be expensive, so archaeologists often employ sampling methods.) As with other forms of non-destructive archaeology, survey avoids ethical issues (of particular concern to descendant peoples) associated with destroying a site through excavation. It is the only way to gather some forms of information, such as settlement patterns and settlement structure. Survey data are commonly assembled into maps, which may show surface features and/or artifact distribution.

The simplest survey technique is surface survey. It involves combing an area, usually on foot but sometimes with the use of mechanized transport, to search for features or artifacts visible on the surface. Surface survey cannot detect sites or features that are completely buried under earth, or overgrown with vegetation. Surface survey may also include mini-excavation techniques such as augers, corers, and shovel test pits. If no materials are found, the area surveyed is deemed sterile.

Aerial survey is conducted using cameras attached to airplanes, balloons, or even Kites. A bird's-eye view is useful for quick mapping of large or complex sites. Aerial photographs are used to document the status of the archaeological dig. Aerial imaging can also detect many things not visible from the surface. Plants growing above a buried man made structure, such as a stone wall, will develop more slowly, while those above other types of features (such as middens) may develop more rapidly. Photographs of ripening grain, which changes colour rapidly at maturation, have revealed buried structures with great precision. Aerial photographs taken at different times of day will help show the outlines of structures by changes in shadows. Aerial survey also employs infrared, ground-penetrating radar wavelengths, LiDAR and thermography.

Geophysical survey can be the most effective way to see beneath the ground. Magnetometers detect minute deviations in the Earth's magnetic field caused by iron artifacts, kilns, some types of stone structures, and even ditches and middens. Devices that measure the electrical resistivity of the soil are also widely used. Archaeological features whose electrical resistivity contrasts with that of surrounding soils can be detected and mapped. Some archaeological features (such as those composed of stone or brick) have higher resistivity than typical soils, while others (such as organic deposits or unfired clay) tend to have lower resistivity.

Although some archaeologists consider the use of metal detectors to be tantamount to treasure hunting, others deem them an effective tool in archaeological surveying. Examples of formal archaeological use of metal detectors include musketball distribution analysis on English Civil War battlefields, metal distribution analysis prior to excavation of a 19th century ship wreck, and service cable location during evaluation. Metal detectorists have also contributed to archaeology where they have made detailed records of their results and refrained from raising artifacts from their archaeological context. In the UK, metal detectorists have been solicited for involvement in the Portable Antiquities Scheme. Regional survey in underwater archaeology uses geophysical or remote sensing devices such as marine magnetometer, side-scan sonar, or sub-bottom sonar.

Excavation

Archaeological excavation existed even when the field was still the domain of amateurs, and it remains the source of the majority of data recovered in most field projects. It can reveal several
types of information usually not accessible to survey, such as stratigraphy, three-dimensional structure, and verifiably primary context. Modern excavation techniques require that the precise locations of objects and features, known as their provenance or provenience, be recorded. This always involves determining their horizontal locations and sometimes vertical position as well. Likewise, their association, or relationship with nearby objects and features, needs to be recorded for later analysis. This allows the archaeologist to deduce which artifacts and features were likely used together and which may be from different phases of activity. For example, excavation of a site reveals its stratigraphy; if a site was occupied by a succession of distinct cultures, artifacts from more recent cultures will lie above those from more ancient cultures.

Excavation is the most expensive phase of archaeological research, in relative terms. Also, as a destructive process, it carries ethical concerns. As a result, very few sites are excavated in their entirety. Again the percentage of a site excavated depends greatly on the country and "method statement" issued. In places 90% excavation is common. Sampling is even more important in excavation than in survey. It is common for large mechanical equipment, such as backhoes (JCBs), to be used in excavation, especially to remove the topsoil (overburden), though this method is increasingly used with great caution. Following this rather dramatic step, the exposed area is usually hand-cleaned with trowels or hoes to ensure that all features are apparent.

The next task is to form a site plan and then use it to help decide the method of excavation. Features dug into the natural subsoil are normally excavated in portions to produce a visible archaeological section for recording. A feature, for example a pit or a ditch consists of two parts: the cut and the fill. The cut describes the edge of the feature, where the feature meets the natural soil. It is the feature's boundary. The fill is what the feature is filled with, and will often appear quite distinct from the natural soil. The cut and fill are given consecutive numbers for recording purposes. Scaled plans and sections of individual features are all drawn on site, black and white and colour photographs of them are taken, and recording sheets are filled in describing the context of each. All this information serves as a permanent record of the now-destroyed archaeology and is used in describing and interpreting the site.

Analysis/post excavation

Once artifacts and structures have been excavated, or collected from surface surveys, it is necessary to properly study them, to gain as much data as possible. This process is known as post-excavation analysis, and is usually the most time-consuming part of the archaeological investigation. It is not uncommon for the final excavation reports on major sites to take years to be published. At its most basic, the artifacts found are cleaned, cataloged and compared to published collections, to classify them typologically and to identify other sites with similar artifact assemblages. However, a much more comprehensive range of analytical techniques are available through archaeological science, meaning that artifacts can be dated and their compositions examined. The bones, plants and pollen collected from a site can all be analyzed (using the techniques of zooarchaeology, paleoethnobotany, and palynology), while any texts can usually be deciphered. These techniques frequently provide information that would not otherwise be known and therefore contribute greatly to the understanding of a site.

Virtual archaeology
Some time around 1995 archaeologists started using computer graphicsto build virtual 3D models of sites such as the throne room of an ancient Assyrian palace or ancient Rome. This is done by collecting normal photographs and using computer graphics to build the virtual 3D model. In more general terms, computers can be used to recreate the environment and conditions of the past, such as objects, buildings, landscapes and even ancient battles. Computer simulation can be used to simulate the living conditions of an ancient community and to see how it would have reacted to various scenarios (such as how much food to grow, how many animals to slaughter, etc.) Computer-built topographical models have been combined with astronomical calculations to verify whether or not certain structures (such as pillars) were aligned with astronomical events such as the sun's position at a solstice.

**Academic sub-disciplines**

As with most academic disciplines, there are a very large number of archaeological sub-disciplines characterised by a specific method or type of material (e.g., lithic analysis, music, archaeobotany), geographical or chronological focus (e.g. Near Eastern archaeology, Islamic archaeology, Medieval archaeology), other thematic concern (e.g. maritime archaeology, landscape archaeology, battlefield archaeology), or a specific archaeological culture or civilisation (e.g. Egyptology, Indology, Sinology).

**Historical archaeology**

Historical archaeology is the study of cultures with some form of writing. In England, archaeologists have uncovered the long-lost layouts of medieval villages abandoned after the crises of the 14th century and the equally lost layouts of 17th century parterre gardens swept away by a change in fashion. In downtown New York City archaeologists have exhumed the 18th century remains of the African burial ground.

**Ethnoarchaeology**

Ethnoarchaeology is the archaeological study of living people. The approach gained notoriety during the emphasis on middle range theory that was a feature of the processual movement of the 1960s. Early ethno archaeological research focused on hunting and gathering or foraging societies. Ethnoarchaeology continues to be a vibrant component of post-processual and other current archaeological approaches. Ethnoarchaeology is the use of ethnography to increase and improve analogs, which are then used as analogies to interpret the archaeological record. In short, ethnoarchaeology is the application of ethnography to archaeology.

**Experimental archaeology**

Experimental archaeology represents the application of the experimental method to develop more highly controlled observations of processes that create and impact the archaeological record. In the context of the logical positivism of processualism with its goals of improving the scientific rigor of archaeological epistemologies the experimental method gained importance. Experimental techniques remain a crucial component to improving the inferential frameworks for interpreting the archaeological record.

**Archaeometry**
Archaeometry is a field of study that aims to systematize archaeological measurement. It emphasizes the application of analytical techniques from physics, chemistry, and engineering. It is a lively field of research that frequently focuses on the definition of the chemical composition of archaeological remains for source analysis. Archaeometry also investigates different spatial characteristics of features, employing such methods as space syntax and geodesy, which can be analyzed using computer-based geographic information system technologies. A relatively nascent subfield is that of archaeological materials, designed to enhance understanding of prehistoric and non-industrial culture through scientific analysis of the structure and properties of materials associated with human activity.

**Cultural resources management**

While archaeology can be done as a pure science, it can also be an applied science, namely the study of archaeological sites that are threatened by development. In such cases, archaeology is a subsidiary activity within Cultural resources management (CRM), also called heritage management in the United Kingdom. Today, CRM accounts for most of the archaeological research done in the United States and much of that in Western Europe as well. In the US, CRM archaeology has been a growing concern since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, and most taxpayers, scholars, and politicians believe that CRM has helped preserve much of that nation's history and prehistory that would have otherwise been lost in the expansion of cities, dams, and highways. Along with other statutes, the NHPA mandates that projects on federal land or involving federal funds or permits consider the effects of the project on each archaeological site.

The application of CRM in the United Kingdom is not limited to government-funded projects. Since 1990 PPG 16 has required planners to consider archaeology as a material consideration in determining applications for new development. As a result, numerous archaeological organisations undertake mitigation work in advance of (or during) construction work in archaeologically sensitive areas, at the developer's expense.

In England, ultimate responsibility of care for the historic environment rests with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport in association with English Heritage. In Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, the same responsibilities lie with Historic Scotland, Cadw and the Northern Ireland Environment Agency respectively.

Among the goals of CRM are the identification, preservation, and maintenance of cultural sites on public and private lands, and the removal of culturally valuable materials from areas where they would otherwise be destroyed by human activity, such as proposed construction. This study involves at least a cursory examination to determine whether or not any significant archaeological sites are present in the area affected by the proposed construction. If these do exist, time and money must be allotted for their excavation. If initial survey and/or test excavation indicates the presence of an extraordinarily valuable site, the construction may be prohibited entirely. CRM is a thriving entity, especially in the United States and Europe where archaeologists from private companies and all levels of government engage in the practice of their discipline.

Cultural resources management has, however, been criticized. CRM is conducted by private companies that bid for projects by submitting proposals outlining the work to be done and an expected budget. It is not unheard-of for the agency responsible for the construction to simply
choose the proposal that asks for the least funding. CRM archaeologists face considerable time pressure, often being forced to complete their work in a fraction of the time that might be allotted for a purely scholarly endeavor. Compounding the time pressure is the vetting process of site reports that are required (in the US) to be submitted by CRM firms to the appropriate State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). From the SHPO's perspective there is to be no difference between a report submitted by a CRM firm operating under a deadline, and a multi-year academic project. The end result is that for a Cultural Resource Management archaeologist to be successful, they must be able to produce academic quality documents at a corporate world pace.

The annual ratio of open academic archaeology positions (inclusive of Post-Doc, temporary, and non tenure track appointments) to the annual number of archaeology MA/MSc and PhD students is grossly disproportionate. This dearth of academic positions causes a predictable excess of well educated individuals who join the ranks of the following year's crop of non-academically employed archaeologists. Cultural Resource Management once considered an intellectual backwater for individuals with "strong backs and weak minds" has reaped the benefit of this massive pool of well educated professionals. This results in CRM offices increasingly staffed by advance degreed individuals with a track record of producing scholarly articles but who have the notches on their trowels to show they have been in the trenches as a shovelbum.

History of archaeology

Flavio Biondo, an Italian Renaissance humanist historian, created a systematic and documented guide to the ruins and topography of ancient Rome in the early 15th century for which he has been called an early founder of archaeology. Ciriaco de' Pizzicollior Cyriacus of Ancona (31 July 1391 — 1453/55) was a restlessly itinerant Italian humanist who came from a prominent family of merchants in Ancona. Ciriaco traveled all around the Eastern Mediterranean, noting down his archaeological discoveries in his day-book, Commentaria, that eventually filled six volumes. He has been called father of archaeology.

After that, modern archaeology has its origins in the antiquarianism of Europe in the mid-19th century, where it developed soon after the scientific advancement of geology, which had shown that the Earth was billions rather than thousands of years old, as was then commonly believed. Soon after this, in 1859, Charles Darwin's On the Origin of Species was published, outlining his theory of evolution, eventually leading scientists to believe that humanity was in fact millions of years old, thereby providing a time limit within which the burgeoning archaeological movement could study. Meanwhile, in 1836 the Danish historian Christian Jürgensen Thomsen published A Ledetraad til Nordisk Oldkyndighed (Guideline to Scandinavian Antiquity) translated into English in 1848, in which he proposed the idea that collections of European artifacts from prehistory could be divided up into a three age system: the Stone Age, Bronze Age and Iron Age. Thomsen was not the first scholar to propose the three age system (that idea dated back to Greek and Roman thinkers), but he was the first to apply these categories to material culture, and with that innovation came significant advances in the concept of seriation, or stylistic changes through time.

It was these three concepts of human antiquity, evolution and the Three-Age system that are often thought of as the building blocks for modern archaeology.

Soon the early archaeologists began to investigate various areas around the world, with the study of ancient Aegean civilization being stimulated by the excavations of Heinrich Schliemann at Troy,
and of Arthur Evans at Crete, whilst John Lloyd Stephens was a pivotal figure in the rediscovery of Maya civilization throughout Central America. However, the methodologies employed by these archaeologists were highly flawed by today's standards, often having a eurocentric bias, and many early European archaeologists often relied on anthropological and ethnographic accounts provided by the likes of Edward Tylor and Lewis Henry Morgan, thereby comparing contemporary "savage" peoples like the Native Americans with the historical peoples of Europe who lived in similar societies. Soon the new discipline of archaeology spread to North America, where it was taken up by figures like Samuel Haven and William Henry Holmes, who excavated ancient Native American monuments.

Further advancements in archaeological field methodology arose in the late 19th century. One of the pioneering figures in this was Augustus Pitt Rivers, who meticulously excavated on Cranborne Chase in southern England, emphasising that it was not only items of beauty or value that should be recorded but mundane items as well; he therefore helped to differentiate archaeology from antiquarianism. Other important archaeologists who further refined the discipline in the late 19th and early 20th centuries were Flinders Petrie (who excavated in Egypt and Palestine), Sir Mortimer Wheeler (India), Dorothy Garrod (the Middle East), Max Uhle (Peru) and Alfred Kidder (Mexico). Further adaptation and innovation in archaeology continued throughout the 20th century, in particular in the 1960s, when maritime archaeology was popularised by George Bass, urban archaeology became more prevalent with redevelopment in many European cities, and rescue archaeology was developed as a result of increasing commercial development.

Popular views of archaeology

Early archaeology was largely an attempt to uncover spectacular artifacts and features, or to explore vast and mysterious abandoned cities. Such pursuits continue to fascinate the public. Books, films, and video games, such as The City of Brass, King Solomon's Mines, Indiana Jones, Tomb Raider, The Mummy and Relic Hunter all testify to the public's interest in the discovery aspect of archaeology. Much thorough and productive research has indeed been conducted in dramatic locales such as Copán and the Valley of the Kings, but the bulk of activities and finds of modern archaeology is not so sensational. Archaeological adventure stories tend to ignore the painstaking work involved in carrying out modern survey, excavation, and data processing. Some archaeologists refer to such off the mark portrayals as "pseudoarchaeology".

Archaeology has been portrayed in the mainstream media in sensational ways. This has its advantages and disadvantages. Many practitioners point to the childhood excitement of Indiana Jones films as the inspiration for them to enter the field. Archaeologists are also very much reliant on public support; the question of exactly who they are doing their work for is often discussed.

Current issues and controversy

Public archaeology

Motivated by a desire to halt looting, curb pseudoarchaeology, and to help preserve archaeological sites through education and fostering public appreciation for the importance of archaeological heritage, archaeologists are mounting public-outreach campaigns. They seek to stop looting by combating people who illegally take artifacts from protected sites, and by alerting people who live near archaeological sites of the threat of looting. Common methods of public outreach
include press releases, and the encouragement of school field trips to sites under excavation by professional archaeologists. Public appreciation of the significance of archaeology and archaeological sites often leads to improved protection from encroaching development or other threats.

One audience for archaeologists' work is the public. They increasingly realize that their work can benefit non-academic and non-archaeological audiences, and that they have a responsibility to educate and inform the public about archaeology. Local heritage awareness is aimed at increasing civic and individual pride through projects such as community excavation projects, and better public presentations of archaeological sites and knowledge. The U.S.Dept. of Agriculture, Forest Service (USFS) operates a volunteer archaeology and historic preservation program called the Passport in Time (PIT). Volunteers work with professional USFS archaeologists and historians on national forests throughout the U.S. Volunteers are involved in all aspects of professional archaeology under expert supervision.

In the UK, popular archaeology programs such as Time Team and Meet the Ancestors have resulted in a huge upsurge in public interest. Where possible, archaeologists now make more provisions for public involvement and outreach in larger projects than they once did, and many local archaeological organizations operate within the Community archaeology framework to expand public involvement in smaller-scale, more local projects. Archaeological excavation, however, is best undertaken by well-trained staff that can work quickly and accurately. Often this requires observing the necessary health and safety and indemnity insurance issues involved in working on a modern building site with tight deadlines. Certain charities and local government bodies sometimes offer places on research projects either as part of academic work or as a defined community project. There is also a flourishing industry selling places on commercial training excavations and archaeological holiday tours.

Archaeologists prize local knowledge and often liaise with local historical and archaeological societies, which is one reason why Community archaeology projects are starting to become more common. Often archaeologists are assisted by the public in the locating of archaeological sites, which professional archaeologists have neither the funding, nor the time to do.

**Pseudoarchaeology**

Pseudoarchaeology is an umbrella term for all activities that claim to be archaeological but in fact violate commonly accepted and scientific archaeological practices. It includes much fictional archaeological work (discussed above), as well as some actual activity. Many non-fiction authors have ignored the scientific methods of processual archaeology, or the specific critiques of it contained in post-processualism.

An example of this type is the writing of Erich von Däniken. His 1968 book, Chariots of the Gods?, together with many subsequent lesser-known works, expounds a theory of ancient contacts between human civilisation on Earth and more technologically advanced extraterrestrial civilisations. This theory, known as palaeocontact theory, or Ancient astronaut theory, is not exclusively Däniken's, nor did the idea originate with him. Works of this nature are usually marked by the renunciation of well-established theories on the basis of limited evidence and the interpretation of evidence with a preconceived theory in mind.
Looting

Looting of archaeological sites is an ancient problem. For instance, many of the tombs of the Egyptian pharaohs were looted during antiquity. Archaeology stimulates interest in ancient objects, and people in search of artifacts or treasure cause damage to archaeological sites. The commercial and academic demand for artifacts unfortunately contributes directly to the illicit antiquities trade. Smuggling of antiquities abroad to private collectors has caused great cultural and economic damage in many countries whose governments lack the resources and or the will to deter it. Looters damage and destroy archaeological sites, denying future generations’ information about their ethnic and cultural heritage. Indigenous peoples especially lose access to and control over their 'cultural resources', ultimately denying them the opportunity to know their past.

Popular consciousness often associates looting with poor Third World countries, but this is a false assumption. A lack of financial resources and political will are chronic worldwide problems inhibiting more effective protection of archaeological sites. Many Native American Indians today, such as Vine Deloria, Jr., consider any removal of cultural artifacts from a Native American Indian site to be theft, and much of professional archaeology as academic looting.

In 1937 W. F. Hodge the Director of the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles CA, released a statement that the museum would no longer purchase or accept collections from looted contexts. The first conviction of the transport of artifacts illegally removed from private property under the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA; Public Law 96-95; 93 Statute 721;16 U.S.C. was in 1992 in the State of Indiana.

Descendant people

In the United States, examples such as the case of Kennewick Man have illustrated the tensions between Native Americans and archaeologists, which can be summarized as a conflict between a need to remain respectful toward sacred burial sites and the academic benefit from studying them. For years, American archaeologists dug on Indian burial grounds and other places considered sacred, removing artifacts and human remains to storage facilities for further study. In some cases human remains were not even thoroughly studied but instead archived rather than reburied. Furthermore, Western archaeologists' views of the past often differ from those of tribal peoples. The West views time as linear; for many natives, it is cyclic. From a Western perspective, the past is long-gone; from a native perspective, disturbing the past can have dire consequences in the present.

As a consequence of this, American Indians attempted to prevent archaeological excavation of sites inhabited by their ancestors, while American archaeologists believed that the advancement of scientific knowledge was a valid reason to continue their studies. This contradictory situation was addressed by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA, 1990), which sought to reach a compromise by limiting the right of research institutions to possess human remains. Due in part to the spirit of postprocessualism, some archaeologists have begun actively to enlist the assistance of indigenous peoples likely to be descended from those under study.
Archaeologists have also been obliged to re-examine what constitutes an archaeological site in view of what native peoples believe to constitute sacred space. To many native peoples, natural features such as lakes, mountains or even individual trees have cultural significance. Australian archaeologists especially have explored this issue and attempted to survey these sites to give them some protection from being developed. Such work requires close links and trust between archaeologists and the people they are trying to help and at the same time study.

While this cooperation presents a new set of challenges and hurdles to fieldwork, it has benefits for all parties involved. Tribal elders cooperating with archaeologists can prevent the excavation of areas of sites that they consider sacred, while the archaeologists gain the elders' aid in interpreting their finds. There have also been active efforts to recruit aboriginal peoples directly into the archaeological profession.

**Repatriation**

A new trend in the heated controversy between First Nations groups and scientists is the repatriation of native artifacts to the original descendants. An example of this occurred June 21, 2005, when community members and elders from a number of the 10 Algonquian nations in the Ottawa area convened on the Kitigan Zibi reservation near Maniwaki, Quebec, to inter ancestral human remains and burial goods — some dating back 6,000 years. It was not determined, however, if the remains were directly related to the Algonquin people who now inhabit the region. The remains may be of Iroquoian ancestry, since Iroquoian people inhabited the area before the Algonquin. Moreover, the oldest of these remains might have no relation at all to the Algonquin or Iroquois, and belong to an earlier culture who previously inhabited the area.

The remains and artifacts, including jewelry, tools and weapons, were originally excavated from various sites in the Ottawa Valley, including Morrison and the Allumette Islands. They had been part of the Canadian Museum of Civilization's research collection for decades, some since the late 19th century. Elders from various Algonquin communities conferred on an appropriate reburial, eventually deciding on traditional redcedar and birchbark boxes lined with redcedar chips, muskrat and beaver pelts.

Now, an inconspicuous rock mound marks the reburial site where close to 80 boxes of various sizes are buried, no further scientific study is possible. Although negotiations were at times tense between the Kitigan Zibi community and museum, they were able to reach agreement.

**Importance of Archaeology**

Archaeology is all about putting bits and pieces of the material remains together to reconstruct the past and embark upon a journey to the magnificent civilizations standing tall in the history. Let's have a look at the importance of archaeology.

Archaeology is the study of human culture in historic as well as prehistoric times, by examining the material remains of early human settlements. These material remains may range from human or plant fossils to excavated artifacts or ruins of an old building. A broad study of human culture, archaeology is often regarded as a subset of anthropology. Archaeology is an elaborated process, which starts with a detailed study and surveying of a particular area to ascertain sites, with possible human settlements in the past. The site is then excavated to recover material remains. After
classification, this unearthed matter is analyzed and interpreted to reconstruct historical events. The archaeologist has to be very careful with the handling aspect of the 'unearthed matter'. Its documentation is of great importance, as the amount of information derived from it can be beneficial in terms of quality as well as quantity.

**Why is Archaeology Important**

Archaeology helps us to travel back into time to get valuable information about the human settlements which existed centuries ago. It throws light on the cultural history of various countries and answers various questions about the lifestyles of people who lived in that part of the world. It has also helped to ascertain the chronology of the prehistoric times. In the Indian sub-continent, archaeological excavations unearthed the Indus Valley Civilization which flourished between 2600 - 1900 BC. The excavations, which started in 1920, opened the door to a human settlement which was far more evolved and scientifically advanced; characterized with well-planned cities and well-developed network of trade routes.

Archaeological investigations also prove to be useful in understanding some mysterious subjects; such as Egyptian religion, and the cultural life of some communities which were invisible at a point of time. Most importantly it can answer the questions and fill the loopholes in history. It can give a brief idea about the changes which occurred over a period of time as well as the factors which were responsible for them.

The importance of archaeology has led to its categorization into various sub-divisions. While historical archaeology includes the study of cultures, the underwater archaeology is a study of the remains of any human activity, found in the bed of a water body. The latter has also helped in collecting information of the cities which were submerged under water. The recent development of 'salvage archaeology' and 'urban archaeology' has increased the quantity of data that can be possibly obtained from excavation sites.

Archaeology is dependent on other sciences and social sciences, like chemistry, geology, zoology etc in terms of data collection. When an object is recovered from excavation site an archaeologist can use chemistry to determine its age, while botany or zoology can provide information about the surroundings where it was found. It's an important aid in reconstructing the prehistoric era, about which not much is known due to absence of written records. The material remains of this era included carvings on the walls of caves, artifacts like pottery, weapons used to hunt animals for food etc. Even after writing was developed, written records which were maintained were highly biased and largely based on assumptions. In such cases, archaeology helps to prove the authenticity of written records.

Archaeology can also contribute to rewriting history. When researchers found thousands of pieces of red slip pottery in the ancient city of Pompeii, the role of this civilization in trade and commerce of Mediterranean region was altered. Earlier, it was assumed that the people from Pompeii imported pottery from other settlements but this find proved that the people of Pompeii used local pottery too.

Public archaeology, a new dimension given to archaeology to foster its public appreciation, has also helped a great deal. It has played a significant role in spreading awareness about the possible ill-
effects that archaeology faces from hazards such as encroaching development, archaeological thefts etc.

**Epigraphy**

Epigraphy (from the Greek: *epi-graphē*, literally "on-writing", "inscription") is the study of inscriptions or epigraphs as writing; that is, the science of identifying the graphemes and of classifying their use as to cultural context and date, elucidating their meaning and assessing what conclusions can be deduced concerning the writing and the writers. Specifically excluded from epigraphy is the historical significance of an epigraph as a document or the artistic value of a literary composition.

A person utilizing the methods of epigraphy is called an *epigrapher* or *epigraphist*. For example, the Behistun inscription is an official document of the Achaemenid Empire engraved on native rock at a location in Iran. Epigraphists are responsible for reconstructing, translating and dating the trilingual inscription and finding any relevant circumstances. It is the work of historians, however, to determine and interpret the events recorded by the inscription as document. Often epigraphy and history are competences practiced by the same person.

An epigraph is any sort of text, from a single grapheme (such as marks on a pot that abbreviate the name of the merchant who shipped commodities in the pot) to a lengthy document (such as a treaty, a work of literature, or a hagiographic prescription). Epigraphy overlaps other competences such as numismatics or palaeography. Most inscriptions are short compared to books. The media and the forms of the graphemes can be any whatever: engravings in stone or metal, scratches on rock, impressions in wax, embossing on cast metal, cameo or intaglio on precious stones, painting on ceramic or in fresco. Typically the material is durable, but the durability might be an accident of circumstance, such as the baking of a clay tablet in a conflagration.

**Scope**

Epigraphy is a primary tool of archaeology when dealing with literate cultures. The US Library of Congress classifies epigraphy as one of the auxiliary sciences of history. Epigraphy also helps identify a forgery: epigraphic evidence formed part of the discussion concerning the James Ossuary. The study of ancient handwriting, usually in ink, is a separate field, palaeography.

The character of the writing, the subject of epigraphy, is a matter quite separate from the nature of the text, which is studied in it. Texts inscribed in stone are usually for public view and so they are essentially different from the written texts of each culture. Not all inscribed texts are public, however: in Mycenaean Greece the deciphered texts of "Linear B" were revealed to be largely used for economic and administrative record keeping. Informal inscribed texts are "graffiti" in its original sense.

**History**

The science of epigraphy has been developing steadily since the 16th century. Principles of epigraphy vary culture by culture, and the infant science in European hands concentrated on Latin inscriptions at first. Individual contributions have been made by epigraphers such as Georg...
Fabricius (1516–1571); August Wilhelm Zumpt (1815–1877); Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903); Emil Hübner (1834–1901); Franz Cumont (1868–1947); Louis Robert (1904–1985).

The Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, begun by Mommsen and other scholars, has been published in Berlin since 1863, with wartime interruptions. It is the largest and most extensive collection of Latin inscriptions. New fascicles are still produced as the recovery of inscriptions continues. The Corpus is arranged geographically: all inscriptions from Rome are contained in volume 6. This volume has the greatest number of inscriptions; volume 6, part 8, fascicle 3 was just recently published (2000). Specialists depend on such on-going series of volumes in which newly discovered inscriptions are published, often in Latin, not unlike the biologists' Zoological Record—the raw material of history.

Greek epigraphy has unfolded in the hands of a different team, with different corpora. There are two. The first is Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum of which four volumes came out, again at Berlin, 1825-1877. This marked a first attempt at a comprehensive publication of Greek inscriptions copied from all over the Greek-speaking world. Only advanced students still consult it, for better editions of the texts have superseded it. The second, modern corpus is Inscriptiones Graecaearaarranged geographically under categories: decrees, catalogues, honorary titles, funeral inscriptions, various, all presented in Latin, to preserve the international neutrality of the field of classics.

Other such series include the Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum(Etruscan inscriptions), Corpus Inscriptionum Crucisignatorum Terrae Sanctae (Crusaders' inscriptions), Corpus Inscriptionum Insularum Celticarum, (Celtic inscriptions), Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum (Iranian inscriptions) and so forth.

Egyptian hieroglyphs were solved using the Rosetta stone, which was a multilingual stele in Classical Greek, Demotic Egyptian and Classical Egyptian hieroglyphs. The work was done by the French scholar, Jean-François Champollion, and the British scientist Thomas Young. The interpretation of Maya hieroglyphs was lost as a result of the Spanish Conquest of Central America. However, recent work by Maya epigraphers and linguists has yielded a considerable amount of information on this complex writing system.

NUMISMATICS

Numismatics is the study or collection of currency, including coins, tokens, paper money, and related objects. While numismatists are often characterized as students or collectors of coins, the discipline also includes the broader study of money and other payment media used to resolve debts and the exchange of goods. Lacking a structured monetary system, people in the past lived in a barter society and used locally found items of inherent or implied value. A few people today still use bartering in absence of a monetary system. Early money used by people is referred to as "Odd and curious", but the use of other goods in barter exchange is excluded, even where used as a circulating currency (e.g., cigarettes in prison). The Kyrgyz people used horses as the principal currency unit and gave small change in lambskins. The lambskins may be suitable for numismatic study, but the horse is not. Many objects have been used for centuries, such as cowry shells, precious metals and gems.
Today, most transactions take place by a form of payment with either inherent, standardized or credit value. Numismatic value may be used to refer to the value in excess of the monetary value conferred by law. This is also known as the "collector value." For example, a collector may be willing to pay more than $2.00 for a United States two-dollar bill, given their low circulation.

Economic and historical studies of money's use and development are an integral part of the numismatists' study of money's physical embodiment.

Etymology

First attested in English 1829, the word numismatics comes from the adjective numismatic, meaning "of coins", borrowed 1792 from French numismatique, which derives from Late Latin numismatis, genitive of numisma, a variant of nomisma meaning "coin", itself the latinisation of the Greek νόμισμα (nomisma), "current coin, custom", which derives from νομίζω (nomizō), "to hold or own as a custom or usage, to use customarily", in turn from νόμος (nomos), "usage, custom", ultimately from νέμω (nemō), "I dispense, divide, assign, keep, hold".

History of numismatics

Coin collecting may have existed in ancient times. Caesar Augustus gave "coins of every device, including old pieces of the kings and foreign money" as Saturnalia gifts. Petrarch, who wrote in a letter that he was often approached by vinediggers with old coins asking him to buy or to identify the ruler, is credited as the first Renaissance collector. Petrarch presented a collection of Roman coins to Emperor Charles IV in 1355. The first book on coins was De Asse et Partibus (1514) by Guillaume Budé. During the early Renaissance ancient coins were collected by European royalty and nobility. Collectors of coins were Pope Boniface VIII, Emperor Maximilian of the Holy Roman Empire, Louis XIV of France, Ferdinand I, Elector Joachim II of Brandenburg who started the Berlin coin cabinet and Henry IV of France to name a few. Numismatics is called the "Hobby of Kings", due to its most esteemed founders.

Professional societies organized in the 19th century. The Royal Numismatic Society was founded in 1836 and immediately began publishing the journal that became the Numismatic Chronicle. The American Numismatic Society was founded in 1858 and began publishing the American Journal of Numismatics in 1866. In 1931 the British Academy launched the Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum publishing collections of Ancient Greek coinage. The first volume of Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles was published in 1958. In the 20th century as well the coins was seen more as archaeological objects. After the second World War in Germany a project, Fundmünzen der Antike (Coin finds of the Classical Period) was launched, to register every coin found within Germany. This idea found successors in many countries.

In the United States, the US mint established a coin Cabinet in 1838 when chief coiner Adam Eckfeldt donated his personal collection. William E. Du Bois’ Pledges of History... (1846) describes the cabinet. C. Wyllys Betts’ American colonial history illustrated by contemporary medals (1894) set the groundwork for the study of American historical medals.

Modern numismatics
Modern numismatics is the study of the coins of the mid 17th to the 21st century, the period of machine struck coins. Their study serves more the need of collectors than historians and it is more often successfully pursued by amateur aficionados than by professional scholars. The focus of modern numismatics lies frequently in the research of production and use of money in historical contexts using mint or other records in order to determine the relative rarity of the coins they study. Varieties, mint-made errors, the results of progressive die wear, mintage figures and even the socio-political context of coin mintings are also matters of interest.

Subfields

Exonumia is the study of coin-like objects such as token coins and medals, and other items used in place of legal currency or for commemoration. This includes elongated coins, encased coins, souvenir medallions, tags, badges, counterstamped coins, wooden nickels, credit cards, and other similar items. It is related to numismatics proper (concerned with coins which have been legal tender), and many coin collectors are also exonumists. Notaphily is the study of paper money or banknotes. It is believed that people have been collecting paper money for as long as it has been in use. However, people only started collecting paper money systematically in Germany in the 1920s, particularly the Serienscheine (Series notes) Notgeld. The turning point occurred in the 1970s, when notaphily was established as a separate area by collectors. At the same time, some developed countries such as the USA, Germany and France began publishing their respective national catalogues of paper money, which represented major points of reference literature.

Scripophily is the study and collection of stocks and Bonds. It is an interesting area of collecting due to both the inherent beauty of some historical documents as well as the interesting historical context of each document. Some stock certificates are excellent examples of engraving. Occasionally, an old stock document will be found that still has value as a stock in a successor company.

Numismatists

The term numismatist applies to collectors and coin dealers as well as scholars using coins as source or studying coins. The first group chiefly derives pleasure from the simple ownership of monetary devices and studying these coins as private amateur scholars. In the classical field amateur collector studies have achieved quite remarkable progress in the field. Examples are Walter Breen, a well-known example of a noted numismatist who was not an avid collector, and King Farouk I of Egypt was an avid collector who had very little interest in numismatics. Harry Bass by comparison was a noted collector who was also a numismatist. The second group is the coin dealers. Often called professional numismatists, they authenticate or grade coins for commercial purposes. The buying and selling of coin collections by numismatists who are professional dealers advances the study of money, and expert numismatists are consulted by historians, museum curators, and archaeologists.

The third category is scholar numismatists working in public collections, universities or as independent scholars acquiring knowledge about monetary devices, their systems, their economy and their historical context. An example would be Kenneth Jenkins. Coins are especially relevant as source in the pre-modern period.
An archive is a collection of historical records, or the physical place they are located. Archives contain primary source documents that have accumulated over the course of an individual or organization's lifetime, and are kept to show the function of an organization. In general, archives consist of records that have been selected for permanent or long-term preservation on grounds of their enduring cultural, historical, or evidentiary value. Archival records are normally unpublished and almost always unique, unlike books or magazines for which many identical copies exist. This means that archives (the places) are quite distinct from libraries with regard to their functions and organization, although archival collections can often be found within library buildings.

A person who works in archives is called an **archivist**. The study and practice of organizing, preserving, and providing access to information and materials in archives is called **science**. When referring to historical records or the places they are kept, the plural form **archives** are chiefly used. Archivists tend to prefer the term "archives" (with an S) as the correct terminology to serve as both the singular and plural, since "archive," as a noun or a verb, has acquired meanings related to computer science.

**Etymology**

First attested in English in early 17th century, the word **archive** is derived from the French archives (plural), in turn from Latin archīum or archīvum, which is the romanized form of the Greek, arkhēion, "public records, town-hall, residence or office of chief magistrates", itself from,arkhē, amongst others "magistracy, office, government" (compare an-archy, mon-archy), which comes from the verb arkhō, "to begin, rule, govern". The word originally developed from the Greek arkhēion which refers to the home or dwelling of the Archon, in which important official state documents were filed and interpreted under the authority of the Archon. The adjective formed from **archive** is **archival**.

**History**

Archives were well developed by the ancient Chinese, the ancient Greeks, and ancient Romans. Modern archival thinking has many roots in the French Revolution. The French National Archives, who possess perhaps the largest archival collection in the world, with records going as far back as A.D. 625, were created in 1790 during the French Revolution from various government, religious, and private archives seized by the revolutionaries.

**Users and institutions**

Historians, genealogists, lawyers, demographers, filmmakers, and others conduct research at archives. The research process at each archive is unique, and depends upon the institution in which the archive is housed. While there are many different kinds of archives, the most recent census of archivists in the United States identified five major types: academic, business (for profit), government, non-profit, and other. There are also four main areas of inquiry involved with archives: material technologies, organizing principles, geographic locations, and tangled embodiments of humans and non-humans. These areas help to further categorize what kind of archive is being created.
Academic

Archives in colleges, universities, and other educational facilities are typically housed within a library, and duties may be carried out by an archivist or a librarian. Occasionally, history professors may also run a smaller archive. Academic archives exist to preserve and celebrate the history of their school and academic community. An academic archive may contain items such as papers of former professors and presidents, memorabilia related to school organizations and activities, and items the academic library wishes to remain in a closed-stack setting, such as rare books or thesiscopies. Access to some of these archives is by appointment only; others have posted hours. Users of academic archives can be undergraduates, graduate students, faculty and staff, scholarly researchers, and the general public. Many academic archives work closely with alumnirelations departments or other campus institutions to help raise funds for their library or school. Because of their library setting, a degree certified by the American Library Association is preferred for employment in an academic archive in the United States.

Business (for profit)

Archives located in for-profit institutions are usually those owned by a private business. Examples of prominent business archives in the United States include Coca-Cola (which also owns the separate museum World of Coca-Cola), Procter and Gamble, Motorola Heritage Services and Archives, and Levi Strauss & Co. These corporate archives maintain historic documents and items related to the history and administration of their companies. Business archives serve the purpose of helping their corporations maintain control over their brand by retaining memories of the company's past. Especially in business archives, records management is separate from the historic aspect of archives. Workers in these types of archives may have any combination of training and degrees, from either a history or library background. These archives are typically not open to the public and only used by workers of the owner company, although some will allow approved visitors by appointment. Business archives are concerned with maintaining the integrity of their company, and are therefore selective of how their materials may be used.

Government

Government archives include those maintained by local and state government as well as those maintained by the national (or federal) government. Anyone may use a government archive, and frequent users include reporters, genealogists, writers, historians, students, and people seeking information on the history of their home or region. Many government archives are open to the public and no appointment is required to visit.

In the United States, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) maintains central archival facilities in the District of Columbia and College Park, Maryland, with regional facilities distributed throughout the United States. Some city or local governments may have repositories, but their organization and accessibility varies widely. State or province archives typically require at least a bachelor's degree in history for employment, although some ask for certification by test (government or association) as well.

In the UK the National Archives, formerly known as the Public Record Office, is the government archive for England and Wales. The National Monuments Record is the public archive of English
Heritage. The National Archives of Scotland, located in Edinburgh, serve that country while the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland in Belfast is the government archive for Northern Ireland.

A network of local authority-run record offices and archives exists throughout England, Wales and Scotland and holds many important collections, including local government, landed estates, church and business records. Many archives have contributed catalogues to the national Access 2 Archives programme and online searching across collections is possible.

In France, the French Archives Administration (Service interministériel des Archives de France) in the Ministry of Culture manages the National Archives (Archives nationales) which possess 406 km. (252 miles) of archives as of 2010 (the total length of occupied shelves put next to each other), with original records going as far back as A.D. 625, as well as the departmental archives (archives départementales), located in the préfectures of each of the 100 départements of France, which possess 2,297 km. (1,427 miles) of archives (as of 2010), and also the local city archives, about 600 in total, which possess 456 km. (283,4 miles) of archives (as of 2010). Put together, the total volume of archives under the supervision of the French Archives Administration is the largest in the world.

In India the National Archives are located in New Delhi. In Taiwan the National Archives Administration are located in Taipei. Most intergovernmental organisations keep their own historical archives. However, a number of European organisations, including the European Commission, choose to deposit their archives with the European University Institute in Florence.

Church

A prominent Church Archives is the Vatican Secret Archive. Archdioceses, dioceses and parishes also have archives in the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches. The records in these archives include manuscripts, papal records, local Church records, photographs, oral histories, audiovisual materials, and architectural drawings. Most Protestant denominations have archives as well, including the Presbyterian U.S.A Historical Society, The Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives, the United Methodist Archives and History Center of the United Methodist Church and the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).

Non-profit

Non-profit archives include those in historical societies, not-for-profit businesses such as hospitals, and the repositories within foundations. Non-profit archives are typically set up with private funds from donors to preserve the papers and history of specific persons or places. Often these institutions rely on grantfunding from the government as well as the private funds. Depending on the funds available, non-profit archives may be as small as the historical society in a rural town to as big as a state historical society that rivals a government archives. Users of this type of archive may vary as much as the institutions that hold them. Employees of non-profit archives may be professional archivists, para-professionals, or volunteers, as the education required for a position at a non-profit archive varies with the demands of the collection's user base.

Web archiving
The process of collecting data from the World Wide Web and preserving it in an archive, such as an archive site, for the web user to see. See Website Archiving. Examples of web archives:

- Side bars
- Blogs
- Calendar
- Tag cloud
- News websites

### Other

Some archives defy categorization. There are tribal archives within the Native American nations in North America, and there are archives that exist within the papers of private individuals. Many museums keep archives in order to prove the provenance of their pieces. Any institution or persons wishing to keep their significant papers in an organized fashion that employs the most basic principles of archival science may have an archive. In the 2004 census of archivists taken in the United States, 2.7% of archivists were employed in institutions that defied categorization. This was a separate figure from the 1.3% that identified themselves as self-employed.

Another type of archive is public secrets. This is an interactive testimonial in which women incarcerated in the California State Prison System reveal their stories about what happened to them. The function of the archive is to unfold the stories of the women who want to express themselves and want their stories to be heard. This collection of stories includes the women's direct speeches and also a recording of the women saying their speech.

The archives of an individual may include letters, papers, photographs, computer files, scrapbooks, financial records or diaries created or collected by the individual — regardless of media or format. The archives of an organization (such as a corporation or government) tend to contain other types of records, such as administrative files, business records, memos, official correspondence and meeting minutes.

### Standardization

The International Council on Archives (ICA) has developed a number of standards on archival description including the General International Standard Archival Description ISAD (G). ISAD (G) is meant to be used in conjunction with national standards or as a basis for nations to build their own standards. In the United States, ISAD (G) is implemented through Describing Archives: A Content Standard, popularly known as "DACS". In Canada, ISAD (G) is implemented through Rules for Archival Description, also known as "RAD".

### Literary Texts

A text, within literary theory, is a coherent set of symbols that transmits some kind of informative message. This set of symbols is considered in terms of the informative message's content, rather than in terms of its physical form or the medium in which it is represented. In the most basic terms established by structuralist criticism, therefore, a "text" is any object that can be "read," whether this object is a work of literature, a street sign, an arrangement of buildings on a city block, or styles of clothing.
Within the field of literary criticism, "text" also refers to the original information content of a particular piece of writing; that is, the "text" of a work is that primal symbolic arrangement of letters as originally composed, apart from later alterations, deterioration, commentary, translations, paratext, etc. Therefore, when literary criticism is concerned with the determination of a "text," it is concerned with the distinguishing of the original information content from whatever has been added to or subtracted from that content as it appears in a given textual document (that is, a physical representation of text).

Since the history of writing predates the concept of the "text", most texts were not written with this concept in mind. Most written works fall within a narrow range of the types described by text theory. The concept of "text" becomes relevant if/when a "coherent written message is completed and needs to be referred to independently of the circumstances in which it was created."

**COLLECTION AND CLASSIFICATION OF EVIDENCES**

The study of history is a search for truth, but whether such a thing as historical truth can exist has been a much debated problem. Ultimate history is what actually happened, even though we shall never be able to rediscover it. However, the search has to be continued and the search is the inquiry into the past. This enquiry rests on evidence.

Evidence is not ready – made historical knowledge. But it is the most important aspect of historical reconstruction. Everything is evidence, which the historian can use as evidence. The whole perceptible world is potentially and in principle, evidence to historian. Anything is evidence which is used as evidence until he uses it. Evidence is evidence only when someone contemplates it historically, otherwise it is merely a perceived fact, historically dumb. If history means scientific history, for ‘source’ we must read evidence. Any fact that becomes actual evidence in so far as the historian can use it, and he cannot use it unless the scholar comes to it with right kind of historical knowledge. The more historical knowledge we have, the more we can learn from any given piece of evidence.

What really happened is only what evidence obliges us to believe. History is rational or bases the answer which it gives to its questions on grounds, namely, appeal to evidence. Enlargement of historical knowledge comes about mainly through finding how to use an evidence this or that kind of perceived fact which historians have hitherto thought useless to them. Prof. T.K. Gangadharan is of the view that the very discovery of evidence depends upon a selection of facts based on the principle of choice. However, the historian should convince himself and others the way with the sources enables him to establish or at least come nearer to establishing the truth. Generally evidences could be grouped into ‘potential evidence’ and ‘actual evidence’. Potential evidence about a subject is all the extent statements about it. Everything in the world is potential evidence. The ‘actual evidence’ is that part of the statement which the historian decides to accept.

Once the evidence is collected they have to be classified as Primary, Secondary and Tertiary evidences. The Primary sources are the bedrock of historical knowledge, infact the basic raw materials for the reconstruction of history. They are the original evidences which are the first witnesses of a fact. It is the one which the historian has himself created with his own efforts and is made available to the community for the first time. The primary evidence include ‘consciously transmitted information’ in the form of oral or written testimony or the records written and kept by
actual participants or witnesses of an event like constitution, charters, treaties, official decisions court decisions, minutes, records, autobiographies, letters, diaries, genealogies, contracts, bills, newspapers, pictures, paintings etc. and ‘unconscious testimony’ in the form of remains or relics, fossils, tools, weapons, household articles and clothes, arts and institutions of various types etc. In both the conscious and unconscious testimony of this type only the observer of the event comes between original event and the user of the information about it.

The Primary evidences may be of material evidences like buildings, artifacts, tools, botanical remains etc. and of written evidences like inscriptions, documents, letters and texts. The first hand accounts of experimentation and investigation, original works, reports etc. could be treated as primary sources.

Secondary sources are the sources of information transmitted by one who was neither a participant nor an eyewitness of the original event. They are second hand information from one who merely reports what an actual participant or witness said or wrote. It could also be the summaries of information gathered from primary sources. Secondary sources may sometimes prove very useful in providing information about primary sources. Translations, summaries, reviews, abstracts, books and other publications, commentaries, encyclopedia etc. Text books are usually considered as tertiary sources of information since they are generally prepared from secondary sources. Tertiary sources of information can be useful, providing a broad summary of the problem. They may even be acceptable as references.

The reliability of sources of information is generally a function of the number of hands through which the information has passed. In certain problems the original source material may be lost or inaccessible and so the scholar may be forced to rely heavily on secondary and tertiary sources. However, there is no substitute for primary sources, when they are available. But it does not mean that the other evidence is less important. ‘The secondary source data is the coherent work of history, articles, books, in which both the intelligent, layman and historian who is venturing upon a new topic, or keeping in touch with the new discoveries in his chosen field, or seeking to widen his general historical knowledge will look forward for what they want’.

Whether a particular type of evidence is primary or secondary will also depend on the purpose of the research. It also depends on the authority which compiled the data. Nehru’s autobiography can be primary with reference to his own philosophy, but at the same time will be secondary with regard to contemporary events in India. A primary source data can contain secondary data as we like that of a communiqué conveying some information is primary source but the details about that fall in the category of secondary source, because the account can be subjective and might have been prepared on the basis of information collected from some other source, because the account can be subjective and might have been prepared on the basis of information collected from some other source. Newspapers contain news which the readers get for the first time, and to that extent these are primary sources of information, but the details provided by the news writers are not always based on first hand sources of information and thus fall under the category of secondary source. But whether it is primary or secondary source of information it is of considerable importance for historian, provided that is used with utmost care and caution.

**Forms of identification of a Historical problem/Choosing of Subject**
Actually it is very difficult for a researcher to choose a subject of his research. If a researcher fails to select his subject properly, he will not be able to do justice with his work and his purpose of undertaking a research work would be completely marred. He would feel disappointed and dejected if he made a wrong choice of the subject. Before making a final selection of his subject of research, a researcher is required to consult some scholars and historians in order to find out exact guidelines. He must not consider the advice of these knowledgeable persons a binding on him. He should also use his own wisdom and interest in the final selection of the tonic of his research, as he is well aware of his own ability and capability. He must also keep his taste in mind before choosing the subject of research. The following points should especially be taken into consideration during the course of choosing subject.

**Interest of Researcher:** A researcher must select very carefully keeping in view his interest because he has to work on the selected topic for years using energy and resources. A researcher can put his best in his work because of his interest in the subject till the completion of his work. He must make a careful choice as to which branch of history viz. Ancient, medieval or modern, he has great interest. A researcher should also keep in mind whether the topic belongs to social, economic, political, religious aspect and whether it concerns to national regional, local or international level. In fact the subject must be of the choice of scholar. In this connection Prof.Hocket also mentions, “Every topic requires its own kind of preliminary training; if it is in economic history the writer must be acquainted with the principles of economics; if in diplomatic theory he should know the elements of international law and probably French, German, Spanish or some other foreign language or languages.”

**Availability of Source Material:** At the time of choosing the subject a researcher must be sure of the availability of sufficient source material. He should also keep in mind the time period during which the research project could be completed. If a researcher does not pay enough attention to the resources, he will not be able to round up his work successfully. Actually the success of a researcher completely depends on his skill and how carefully he utilizes the resources. Selection of vague topic may lead to failure. To avoid such mishappening a researcher must be very alert while choosing a subject.

**Reliable Research Materials:** A researcher is expected to produce a good and excellent piece of work. Therefore, before choosing a subject finally, he must keep in mind that the reliable research material will be made available to him easily. He is also required to consider the fact whether the material will be available at one place or it is scattered at different places. He should also account his resources how he would be able to procure that material from different places. If he is not in a position to collect the scattered material, he must give up his idea of selecting that particular subject. He should also keep in mind whether selecting that particular subject. He should also keep in mind whether the persons, institutions or organizations which possess the reliable matter, will permit him to utilize those sources. Generally people and institutions do not agree to show their records.

**The Scale of Study:** Before the final selection of the research topic a researcher is required to know as to whether the topic would be manageable. The word manageable has different meaning from man to man. It is not necessary that a topic which is suitable for one researcher may be equally good for the other. Hence every researcher is required to weigh his limitations and
resources before the final selection of the topic so that the research work once undertaken, could be completed in nice way without any hindrance.

Language of the Material Available: An efficient and hard working researcher should also keep in mind the language of material available in mind before the final selection of the topic. The availability of material will prove to be meaningless if the available material is in the language which the researcher does not known. He should also think that in case a material is available in other than his own language, how he would manage to utilize it. If there is none to assist, then he must give up the idea of selecting that topic and switch to some other topic for which the matter is available in the language known to him.

Selection of Useful Subject: A researcher is also required to select a topic which suits to his taste and resources. He should also consider that the topic of research would prove to be useful for the society and people. If you fail to do justice with research work because of the vastness of the topic, there is no need in the selection of such topic. It will be sheer waste of time and energy, if the subject selection is neither acceptable nor does it has any utility.

Stress on Originality: The research should keep in mind whether he would be able to produce any fresh and original idea at the end of his research work. If his research work adds something new to the present and existing knowledge of the subject only then he should choose the subject otherwise the research work will prove to be failure and he will be subjected to condemnation and criticism. It should also be actually the aim of researcher that he must add some new dimensions to the existing knowledge of the subject.

Clear View about Objectives. In fact a researcher should be quite clear in his views about objectives of the thesis before the selection of the subject. Sometimes an enthusiastic scholars does not know how to limit a subject properly, whereas it is essentially needed that the scholar must be satisfied that he will be able to finish his work in the reasonable length of time. Moreover he must have an idea of the nature and scope of his work. He should also be aware whether he is going to establish a new idea or refuting an idea already established by the other scholars. In fact a scholar ought to know correctly what he is going to prove in his research work. The aim of his research work must be quite clear in his mind. He is merely an organized presentation of the fact available in the source material while a thesis is a piece of historical literature. Really if a researcher is not aware of the chief aim his work; he will not be able to do any thing solid and substantial.

To Avoid Research Work On Comparative History: A new researcher during the course of his study should not select a topic of comparative history. A topic of comparative history involves vast knowledge of the subject and a store of many and resources. Since all should avoid to select such topic. Assessment of two historic personalities or organizations need extensive survey of the resources, hence it should also be discouraged. The time span of research also becomes quite long if a comparative topic is selected for research. It is also not easy for new researcher to establish a harmony between the two different countries or personalities in terms of the current prevailing norms, hence no topic of comparative study should be chosen as a subject of study by new researchers. Prof. L. Gottschalk also mentions. “Such problems should be avoided by the beginning investigators or broken down into their component parts with the intention of starting moderately with one alone of the three components”.
Lastly a researcher can also have some help in the selection of his subject from **a survey of the reviews of new books and bibliographical articles** which are published in different historical periodicals from time to time. Generally in the reviews and bibliographical articles, references are given of certain problems which need further research work, so a researcher gets an opportunity to make up his mind and choose some topic of his choice, according to his interest.

Though selection of topic is difficult task however a good researcher can make up his mind weighing all the pros and cons before the final selection of his time and ultimately succeeds in making right choice, by which he makes the difficult task an easy one.

**FORMS OF GENERALIZATION AND SYNTHESIS**

Any research work will be complete only with valid generalizations and synthesis. Generalization is the broad conclusion of a work which will naturally indicate the essence of the study. Generalization is also known as ‘framing a formula’ or deducing a general law. It is the result of the study; it sums up the entire work as estimation. In fact, it is the spirit or the essence of the work. Generalizations need a clear understanding of the important phases of history writing. The evidences collected, classified and interpreted will yield to certain generalizations. It is the elaboration of the raw materials used to explain the events and the relationship exists among the facts already mentioned in the work.

Generalization is the higher form of analysis dealing with broad principles in general terms. However, the formation of generalizations must be lucid and clear. It should not be too long or too short. The researcher should possess a penetrating capacity based on logical argument for making generalizations. He should be aware of the elements of explanation which should be brought in generalization. In fact, generalization is the instinctive process of simplification. The scholar has to extend certain common characteristics to all the objects which resemble each other.

Framing a formula is a form of generalization. It is done by reducing a number of facts to a few generalities and thus obtaining uniformity. A series of questions are asked and the answers received are but under comparison. The answers thus received and compared are combined together into a precise structure. The scholars should know the elements to be included in the formula before it is formed. A distinction has to be made between the general facts and unique facts. General facts are common and unique facts are particular. The similarities among the unique facts are joined together with the general facts and are fitted into the common formula.

Great care should be taken before making generalization, as it resets on a vague idea that all facts which resemble each other are similar in all respects. So it is better to fix the precise limits of the field of generalization, as too large a field is not advisable for generalization. It should be made each other in the real sense of the term. After fixing the character and extent of a descriptive formula, an overall picture of the entire phenomenon could be prepared. Descriptive formula gives the particular character of each small group of facts. It is better to avoid isolated details or secondary characteristics, as they would not resemble each other in a whole set of characteristics.

Sometimes the very use of language commits the historian to generalization. The Peloponnesian war and the Second World War were very different and both were unique. But the historians call
them both wars. They do the same when they write of the English, French, Russian and Chinese revolutions. ‘The historian is not really interested in the unique, but in what is general in the unique’ The historian uses generalization to test his evidence. If the evidence is not clear, his judgments will be influenced by this generalization.

History is concerned with the relation between the unique and the general. The point of generalization is to learn from history to apply the lesson drawn from one set of events to another act of events. Those who reject generalization by insisting that history is exclusively concerned with unique, deny the fact that anything could be learned from history. ‘What distinguishes historian from the collector of historical facts is generalization.

Synthesis in historical writing is the process of reducing facts into new form of composition and put numerous individual parts together in systematic way. It is the joining arranging explaining and interpretation of facts in such a way that the rendering material becomes both meaningful and interesting. Though the method and system of presentation may differ from historian to historian, the objective in synthesis remains the same – presentation of facts in most interesting, and clearly understandable way. It is the means of arranging isolated events into a new form of composition and putting different things together in order to construct something new for readers.

Synthesis is process by which several elements are combined in the right proportion to come out with something altogether new. But it is not an easy task to combine meaningfully all data and facts intelligently to produce a connected whole. Normally there are three important elements in historical synthesis – Contingency, Necessity and Logic.

Contingency has played a significant role in history. It is not a calculated effort, but an element of chance in historical event. Several historical events of significance took place just because of contingency. No such incidents could be foreseen or planned. Chance and individuality play a vital role in contingency. It is a fact that even in contingency there is stability. Necessity has relationship with cause and effect and is very much responsible for making progress in history. Wheels of progress will come to a stop as soon as necessities of people will come to an end or get confined to what he has got. Necessity of leaders and nations were behind colonization and revolutions. Necessity compels people to associate and to fight for common cause.

Logic order used in historical synthesis to denote that behind every action of every individual there is some logic or order, without which he would not take any action. It is the principal approach to every historical problem and it under estimate the role of chance in historical events. Logic is the outcome of the well established tendencies and habits. These result in ideologies which change the very course of events. Thus historical synthesis means chance, necessity and events combined together. It is their combination in a systematic way and in a presentable form of matter that the real importance of historical synthesis lies.

EMERGING TOOLS

Radical changes are being experienced in the historical studies in the present days. Historians are trying to look at hitherto unearthed and unused source materials as well as their treatment. In the course of this new approach, the subject matter, sources and interpretation are subjected to re-
examination. Gender studies, environmental studies, studies on the history of the marginalized sections etc need new tools of analysis.

**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. 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. 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 encyclopedic 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. Within the current National Curriculum, pupils at level 4 are expected to "show their knowledge and understanding of local, national and international history".

**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.

Russia and the USSR

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

Artistic uses of local history as a genre

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.

ORAL HISTORY

Oral History is history that is told verbally – not written down. It’s THE most traditional way of retelling and learning history. The first oral historians were people who sat around an evening fire and told of their experiences and that of their ancestors as far back as they could remember. It was the only way to pass down and preserve the culture and the traditions of a group. Many civilizations gave high status to the best of their oral historians. In Celtic society, for example, this person was called a Bard and was given the task of creating epic sagas of the tribe’s daring deeds – cattle raids, battles, and other heroic doings that would then be recited at feasts and gatherings. In this way history was passed on and, in many instances, legends began. All of this occurred before there was such a thing as writing. Many of the earliest histories – the Bible, "La Morte d’Arthur", "The Book of Kells" are written collections of these earlier oral histories. But even today – when we have books, newspapers, photographs, and other printed records of our civilization – oral history remains an important way to collect history.

We need to remember what history is. History is not only to be found in documents, letters or textbooks, but also in the memory of people who witnessed or lived through events. It’s not just a collection process – it’s also a theory of history which maintains that the common folk and the dispossessed have a history as well as those who are famous enough to get their names written down. It’s been said that the history that makes it into history books is the story of the "conquerors" – the people in power. They tend to suppress the stories of those they consider powerless. Thus, until about the 1970s or 1980s there were few accounts about the lives of slaves or women in most
textbooks. There still is very little. How much is in your textbook about women’s suffrage? Probably only a page or two. Yet it took American women 75 years to get the right to vote. Oral histories – people’s life stories – offer us a glimpse into their lives, work, families, and communities. Through them we get not just the outlines of history but the colors.

Listen to this story about making a wagon wheel. You'll hear rich details in the storyteller's lively style of speaking and the colorful words that he has chosen. If we collect enough stories we can begin to see trends -- common themes that pop up in many stories and we can see what is important to people. That’s where students like you come in. You are the perfect oral historians for your community. You grew up here. You know – and are probably related to – many of the people who have these stories. And, because of these community connections, these older people will be happy to tell their stories to you.

Why use oral history?
Making History Come Alive

"Oral History is not only a tool or method for recovering history; it is also a theory of history which maintains that the common folk and the dispossessed have a history and that this history must be written."

Gary Okihiro - "Oral History and the Writing of Ethnic History"

Oral history offers a unique view of the past. What makes oral history distinct is that a story is being told. The way in which the story is told - what is left in and what is considered unimportant - can tell much about a person. It is history that begins and ends with personal experience. Collecting oral histories can teach many skills: researching, interviewing, active listening, and organizing material - just to name a few.

Re-valuing Appalachian lifestyles

The act of collecting the material also serves two important functions. One, it provides the interviewer with a valuable experience, but it is important also to the person who is being interviewed, the interviewee. These are often older people and the fact that someone would want to interview them may give them a sense that their lives have some value; some interest to someone else. It frequently means more to the interviewee than you might realize.

Oral History In Ohio (OHIO): This group was composed of people - many of them educators or historians, who used oral histories in their work. One of the most interesting projects presented was one done by a middle school in Cleveland. The teachers had their students go to a nearby nursing home and interview the residents there. Each student conducted an interview with a person. In return for the interview the student had to come up with a "gift" of some sort to give something back to the older person. One teenager, during the interview, discovered that the man who he was talking with had worked in downtown Cleveland throughout his whole life and spoke vividly of the streets and buildings there. He was now wheelchair-bound and never left the nursing home. As his gift the young man went downtown and took photos of the streets the interviewee had talked about. Then the student gave them to the elderly gentleman.

Once collected, the oral histories can be used in a variety of ways. You could simply start an
archive of historical material on a topic or community. Some classes have compiled magazines or books of stories based on oral histories. They could also serve as the raw material for a children's book, a play, an exhibit, or a radio or TV feature. There's another reason to conduct oral histories for those of us who live in Appalachian Ohio. Many of the towns in Appalachia that existed in the earlier part of the century are dying out. Little is left to show that these were once bustling, vibrant communities. For many of these towns there are no written records – they didn’t have a newspaper . . . or a mayor . . . or a town hall - the history is in people's memories.

Once the older people who live in these communities are gone, there will be no memory of what the towns were like. That bit of history will be lost forever. Now is the time to preserve local stories. Because of the coming millennia, people are thinking about what has happened in the last 100 to 1000 years. And this is the first century that we have been able to record oral history, so it’s very appropriate that we use the technology we have to do so.

UNIT-III
ELEMENTS OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH AND STUDY

FORMS OF REASONING AND LOGICAL ARGUMENT

Reasoning is an element of historical method, attempted to fill the gaps which a historian finds in his collected materials for the reconstruction of history. Such gaps or blanks are bound to exist as materials are collected from different sources, spread over a vast area and covering a wide span of time. Prof.T.K.Gangadharan opined that it is not possible to get all necessary answers from the collected materials, so naturally there will be gaps in between. In some cases, evidences are not at all available for the historian to fill the gaps, while in some other cases the collected materials would not be sufficient to answer some of the vital questions relating to the gaps. These types of problems become more complex when the problems with which the historian deal relates to remote past. There occur several instances in which satisfactory and logical answers are not available from the collected sources, especially when the historians with ancient period.

In the study of historical problems and events, it is impossible for any historian to collect each and every detail and so some aspects still remain shrouded in mystery. Even when a historian attempts to write the history of a recent event the problem still remains. It will become more complicated when it is related with remote past. In physical science if such a problem exists, the researcher can repeat the experiment. But in history it is not possible and historical facts are quite
different from those of physical science. It is because of this, that the historian is forced to undertake the method of constructive reasoning to fill the blank spaces.

Constructive reasoning is a process through which a historian tries to know what is not known to him, on the basis of available materials. Hence the historian has to take up deductive method to know the unknown with the help of the information already received from the available records. Deductive method, if used quite logically and unbiased, could be helpful to illuminate the dark aspects of historical reconstruction. However, the historian is expected to use this method only when he has no other reliable sources available. He may be able to derive valid conclusions through the deductive logical method.

But constructive reasoning also has its problems. It is very difficult to correctly employ it because of too many possibilities of finding a valid reason. It is highly subjective method because no basis for finding out the validity of reasoning has so far been detected. When there are too many possibilities of finding valid reasons, the possibilities of committing error also increases. However, the historian has to formulate a conclusion in favour of a particular reason, but this is done not by any objective factual experience, but on his own subjective reasoning and personal experience. So it should be taken for granted that constructive reasoning may be adopted only in the absence of other methods, to get the required results. If the reasoning the historian uses is correct, the result will also be correct and the method he uses will be legitimate.

It is generally suggested that constructive reasoning should be avoided as far as possible. The main reason for this is that it is the most difficult method to employ correctly. If, however, its use becomes unavoidable for that it is essential, it should be employed with utmost caution. When it is actually employed, it should be done only after satisfying ourselves that all the precautions are fully observed.

**Precautions**

When constructive reasoning is employed the historian should see that reasoning and analysis of a document are completely separated from each other. Both should not be confused. The basis of analysis is the interpretation of data in such a logical manner which could throw light upon the problem. The aim of analysis is to explain and comment on the given material, and not to call for any additional material. It is merely the ability to comment, criticize, examine and explain and pass judgments on given proposition without attempting to draw any new information. This is done on the known facts. But in reasoning, new material is required to fill the gaps in the existing material. It is also open to borrow information from any outside source for finding out the validity of reasoning.

Another precaution to be taken in this regard is that no attempt should be made to transform dogmas into certainty. The historian should not incorporate any factor on the basis of certain presumption and assumptions. In other words, the historian should not try to overcome any difficulties through guess work, as guess work may cause serious problems. In order to avoid guess work and assumptions, one has to widen the range of source materials. As reasoning is highly subjective; too such narrative based on constructive reasoning would not enhance the value of a historical document. Recourse to reasoning should be taken with full consciousness and the general principles of reasoning, if any, should be followed. As mentioned earlier the historian should go for reasoning when the available materials are insufficient to answer the questions already raised by
the historian.

Constructive reasoning is to fill up the gaps in the historical writing. The available materials have to be studied honestly. The historian has no freedom to introduce something new to the text with which he is dealing. He has no right to twist the text to suit his needs or to overcome some difficulties. He should not make any conclusion, if reasoning leaves any doubt. There should be an element of certainty in reasoning. Facts obtained by direct examination of the document available must not be confused with the results obtained by reasoning. The fact obtained by reasoning must be justified by disclosing the method through which it has been adduced. In any case, unconscious reasoning must not be allowed, as there are chances for errors in it. The historian should not try to invent something new which does not exist. With the help of these precautions, it can be hoped that reasoning can prove somewhat useful and help filling some gaps in the material needed for writing history. There are two types of reasoning, namely, positive and negative.

**Positive Reasoning**

Positive reasoning is of great use to historians, but its process is more complex. It begins with a fact already established by available documents and infers some other fact which the document does not mention. Here the historian begins with the presumption that all historical facts are interconnected in a systematic and permanent order. It can be taken as a general rule that a given fact is always accompanied by another fact, either because the first is the cause of the second or because the second is the cause of the first, or because both are the effects of a common cause.

The statement of Thucydides that historical facts are connected with each other in a systematic and permanent order itself shows the relevance of positive reasoning even in the earlier period of history writing. For example, when a historian gets all relevant details like political stability, economic prosperity, cultural integration and all conceivable aspects of people’s life regarding a particular society at a particular period, but evidences are not available on the religious life of the society under discussion, then the historian can use the method of constructive reasoning to state that the said society was progressive and peaceful with the assumption of religious toleration. This conclusion is based upon the inference drawn from the known facts supplemented with positive reasoning.

The basic principle of positive reasoning is the analogy between the past and present humanity. As a matter of fact, the historian examines interconnections of present and assumes that facts were similar in the past as well. This is used for filling up those gaps which it is otherwise not possible to be filled with the help of facts available in the documents. However, positive reasoning can give the desired results only if certain precautions are taken. The scholar should clearly understands that the inferences rests on the general experiences of human affairs as well as it has been drawn from authentic materials there should be an interconnection between the general and particular propositions. The historian has to be sure that the general proposition is very true and then only he can infer particular proposition. If the general proposition is weak and defective, then the inference on particular may lead to serious problems. If the particular proposition is related with a local revolt by the workers, it must be based upon the general proposition that ‘oppression
leads to revolt’.

The second precaution to be taken regarding the use of positive reasoning is that the historian must have a detailed knowledge of the particular fact as available in the records, before going for the general proposition. Thus for positive reasoning, an accurate general proposition on the one hand, and detailed knowledge of particular proposition on the other is very essential. It is not correct to state that all wars are the product of human ambition, because some of the wars might have been waged for self defence. The historian should resist himself from spontaneous impulses to draw inferences from isolated facts. No argument should be based on isolated facts.

**Negative Reasoning**

The negative reasoning is otherwise known as ‘argument from silence’. It is based upon the understanding that no definite indication on a point is available in the collected evidence and the fact is nowhere mentioned and so it is believed that because of the non-mentioning of fact anywhere, it could be presumed that the event did not happen at all. It is assumed that if such an event had happened in the past, it would have been mentioned somewhere in the contemporary records or in some other sources, in the succeeding period. For example, if there is a propaganda that fire had broken out in a particular place on a specific date, it is quite natural that the person present in that street at that particular time would certainly have noticed it. From this it could be inferred that the news of the fire is a malicious propaganda.

Negative reasoning rests upon the principle that if the fact had existed, it would have been mentioned somewhere in the contemporary records and so even if the fact had existed for historian. Two conditions should be fulfilled for the use of negative reasoning: The first one is that the historian should be fully satisfied that the fact which he wants to establish had been observed, recorded, because such an important fact would never have missed from records. Then the historian has to satisfy himself that, had the fact been observed and recorded, it was of such a nature that it would have been preserved and that conditions and circumstances were favorable for its preservation. The problem arises because the possibility can be that due to historical reasons, the material relating to fact might have been destroyed, or the observer at that time might not have properly observed due to lack of interest or for any other reason.

The second condition in the case of negative reasoning is that the historian should be sure that the fact under consideration must have been of such a nature that the fact under consideration must have been of such a nature that it must have been observed and recorded. So the nature of the fact is very important to negative reasoning. The historian should fully satisfy himself that if the event had really taken place, one would never have missed it. If the records speak of a flood in a particular part of the country almost every year and if there is no mention about the flood for a particular year, it could be reasonably assumed that the flood has not affected that part of the country that particular year. However, negative reasoning should not be applied to cases where concealment of facts is possible, like cases dealing with corruption at political level, particularly about living personalities both of national or international importance or facts about international relations or foreign affairs and national security.
Therefore, the historian, while using negative reasoning should be sure that the document to which he is referring for recording his views has been authored by a person who was fully familiar with the facts and his writings were quite systematic. He should ensure that the fact was such that it could not have escaped the attention of such a systematic author. If even then it is not mentioned in records, it can reasonably presume that the event had not taken place at all.

**Arguments and Inference**

**The Discipline of Logic**

Human life is full of decisions, including significant choices about what to believe. Although everyone prefers to believe what is true, we often disagree with each other about what that is in particular instances. It may be that some of our most fundamental convictions in life are acquired by haphazard means rather than by the use of reason, but we all recognize that our beliefs about ourselves and the world often hang together in important ways.

If we believe that whales are mammals and that all mammals are fish, then it would also make sense for me to believe that whales are fish. Even someone who (rightly!) disagreed with my understanding of biological taxonomy could appreciate the consistent, reasonable way in which we used my mistaken beliefs as the foundation upon which to establish a new one. On the other hand, if we decide to believe that Hamlet was Danish because we believe that Hamlet was a character in a play by Shaw and that some Danes are Shavian characters, then even someone who shares my belief in the result could point out that we haven't actually provided good reasons for accepting its truth.

In general, we can respect the directness of a path even when we don't accept the points at which it begins and ends. Thus, it is possible to distinguish correct reasoning from incorrect reasoning independently of our agreement on substantive matters. Logic is the discipline that studies this distinction—both by determining the conditions under which the truth of certain beliefs leads naturally to the truth of some other belief, and by drawing attention to the ways in which we may be led to believe something without respect for its truth. This provides no guarantee that we will always arrive at the truth, since the beliefs with which we begin are sometimes in error. But following the principles of correct reasoning does ensure that no additional mistakes creep in during the course of our progress.

In this review of elementary logic, we'll undertake a broad survey of the major varieties of reasoning that have been examined by logicians of the Western philosophical tradition. We'll see how certain patterns of thinking do invariably lead from truth to truth while other patterns do not, and we'll develop the skills of using the former while avoiding the latter. It will be helpful to begin by defining some of the technical terms that describe human reasoning in general.

**The Structure of Argument**

Our fundamental unit of what may be asserted or denied is the proposition (or statement) that is typically expressed by a declarative sentence. Logicians of earlier centuries often identified
propositions with the mental acts of affirming them, often called judgments, but we can evade some interesting but thorny philosophical issues by avoiding this location.

Propositions are distinct from the sentences that convey them. "Smith loves Jones" expresses exactly the same proposition as "Jones is loved by Smith," while the sentence "Today is my birthday" can be used to convey many different propositions, depending upon who happens to utter it, and on what day. But each proposition is either true or false. Sometimes, of course, we don't know which of these truth-values a particular proposition has ("There is life on the third moon of Jupiter" is presently an example), but we can be sure that it has one or the other.

The chief concern of logic is how the truth of some propositions is connected with the truth of another. Thus, we will usually consider a group of related propositions. An argument is a set of two or more propositions related to each other in such a way that all but one of them (the premises) is supposed to provide support for the remaining one (the conclusion). The transition or movement from premises to conclusion, the logical connection between them, is the inference upon which the argument relies.

Notice that "premise" and "conclusion" are here defined only as they occur in relation to each other within a particular argument. One and the same proposition can (and often does) appear as the conclusion of one line of reasoning but also as one of the premises of another. A number of words and phrases are commonly used in ordinary language to indicate the premises and conclusion of an argument, although their use is never strictly required, since the context can make clear the direction of movement. What distinguishes an argument from a mere collection of propositions is the inference that is supposed to hold between them.

Thus, for example, "The moon is made of green cheese, and strawberries are red. My dog has fleas." is just a collection of unrelated propositions; the truth or falsity of each has no bearing on that of the others. But "Helen is a physician. So Helen went to medical school, since all physicians have gone to medical school." is an argument; the truth of its conclusion, "Helen went to medical school," is inferentially derived from its premises, "Helen is a physician." and "All physicians have gone to medical school."

Recognizing Arguments

It's important to be able to identify which proposition is the conclusion of each argument, since that's a necessary step in our evaluation of the inference that is supposed to lead to it. We might even employ a simple diagram to represent the structure of an argument, numbering each of the propositions it comprises and drawing an arrow to indicate the inference that leads from its premise(s) to its conclusion. Don't worry if this procedure seems rather tentative and uncertain at first. We'll be studying the structural features of logical arguments in much greater detail as we proceed, and you'll soon find it easy to spot instances of the particular patterns we encounter most often. For now, it is enough to tell the difference between an argument and a mere collection of propositions and to identify the intended conclusion of each argument.

Even that isn't always easy, since arguments embedded in ordinary language can take on a bewildering variety of forms. Again, don't worry too much about this; as we acquire more
sophisticated techniques for representing logical arguments, we will deliberately limit ourselves to a very restricted number of distinct patterns and develop standard methods for expressing their structure. Just remember the basic definition of an argument: it includes more than one proposition, and it infers a conclusion from one or more premises. So "If John has already left, then either Jane has arrived or Gail is on the way." can't be an argument, since it is just one big (compound) proposition. But "John has already left, since Jane has arrived." is an argument that proposes an inference from the fact of Jane's arrival to the conclusion, "John has already left." If you find it helpful to draw a diagram, please make good use of that method to your advantage.

Our primary concern is to evaluate the reliability of inferences, the patterns of reasoning that lead from premises to conclusion in a logical argument. We'll devote a lot of attention to what works and what does not. It is vital from the outset to distinguish two kinds of inference, each of which has its own distinctive structure and standard of correctness.

**Deductive Inferences**

When an argument claims that the truth of its premises guarantees the truth of its conclusion, it is said to involve a deductive inference. Deductive reasoning holds to a very high standard of correctness. A deductive inference succeeds only if its premises provide such absolute and complete support for its conclusion that it would be utterly inconsistent to suppose that the premises are true but the conclusion false.

Notice that each argument either meets this standard or else it does not; there is no middle ground. Some deductive arguments are perfect, and if their premises are in fact true, then it follows that their conclusions must also be true, no matter what else may happen to be the case. All other deductive arguments are no good at all—their conclusions may be false even if their premises are true, and no amount of additional information can help them in the least.

**Inductive Inferences**

When an argument claims merely that the truth of its premises make it likely or probable that its conclusion is also true, it is said to involve an inductive inference. The standard of correctness for inductive reasoning is much more flexible than that for deduction. An inductive argument succeeds whenever its premises provide some legitimate evidence or support for the truth of its conclusion. Although it is therefore reasonable to accept the truth of that conclusion on these grounds, it would not be completely inconsistent to withhold judgment or even to deny it outright.

Inductive arguments, then, may meet their standard to a greater or to a lesser degree, depending upon the amount of support they supply. No inductive argument is either absolutely perfect or entirely useless, although one may be said to be relatively better or worse than another in the sense that it recommends its conclusion with a higher or lower degree of probability. In such cases, relevant additional information often affects the reliability of an inductive argument by providing other evidence that changes our estimation of the likelihood of the conclusion.

It should be possible to differentiate arguments of these two sorts with some accuracy already. Remember that deductive arguments claim to guarantee their conclusions, while inductive
arguments merely recommend theirs. Or ask yourself whether the introduction of any additional information—short of changing or denying any of the premises—could make the conclusion seem more or less likely; if so, the pattern of reasoning is inductive.

**Truth and Validity**

Since deductive reasoning requires such a strong relationship between premises and conclusion, we will spend the majority of this survey studying various patterns of deductive inference. It is therefore worthwhile to consider the standard of correctness for deductive arguments in some detail.

A deductive argument is said to be valid when the inference from premises to conclusion is perfect. Here are two equivalent ways of stating that standard:

- If the premises of a valid argument are true, then its conclusion must also be true.
- It is impossible for the conclusion of a valid argument to be false while its premises are true.

(Considering the premises as a set of propositions, we will say that the premises are true only on those occasions when each and every one of those propositions is true.) Any deductive argument that is not valid is invalid: it is possible for its conclusion to be false while its premises are true, so even if the premises are true, the conclusion may turn out to be either true or false. Notice that the validity of the inference of a deductive argument is independent of the truth of its premises; both conditions must be met in order to be sure of the truth of the conclusion. Of the eight distinct possible combinations of truth and validity, only one is ruled out completely:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premises</th>
<th>Inference</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only thing that cannot happen is for a deductive argument to have true premises and a valid inference but a false conclusion.

Some logicians designate the combination of true premises and a valid inference as a sound argument; it is a piece of reasoning whose conclusion must be true. The trouble with every other case is that it gets us nowhere, since either at least one of the premises is false, or the inference is invalid, or both. The conclusions of such arguments may be either true or false, so they are entirely
useless in any effort to gain new information.

**Fallacies**

In order to understand what a fallacy is, one must understand what an argument is. Very briefly, an argument consists of one or more premises and one conclusion. A premise is a statement (a sentence that is either true or false) that is offered in support of the claim being made, which is the conclusion (which is also a sentence that is either true or false).

There are two main types of arguments: deductive and inductive. A deductive argument is an argument such that the premises provide (or appear to provide) complete support for the conclusion. An inductive argument is an argument such that the premises provide (or appear to provide) some degree of support (but less than complete support) for the conclusion. If the premises actually provide the required degree of support for the conclusion, then the argument is a good one. A good deductive argument is known as a valid argument and is such that if all its premises are true, then its conclusion must be true. If all the argument is valid and actually has all true premises, then it is known as a sound argument. If it is invalid or has one or more false premises, it will be unsound. A good inductive argument is known as a strong (or "cogent") inductive argument. It is such that if the premises are true, the conclusion is likely to be true.

A fallacy is, very generally, an error in reasoning. This differs from a factual error, which is simply being wrong about the facts. To be more specific, a fallacy is an "argument" in which the premises given for the conclusion do not provide the needed degree of support. A deductive fallacy is a deductive argument that is invalid (it is such that it could have all true premises and still have a false conclusion). An inductive fallacy is less formal than a deductive fallacy. They are simply "arguments" which appear to be inductive arguments, but the premises do not provide enough support for the conclusion. In such cases, even if the premises were true, the conclusion would not be more likely to be true.

**Examples of Fallacies**

1. **Inductive Argument**
   
   Premise 1: Most American cats are domestic house cats.
   Premise 2: Bill is an American cat.
   Conclusion: Bill is domestic house cat.

2. **Factual Error**

   Columbus is the capital of the United States.

3. **Deductive Fallacy**

   Premise 1: If Portland is the capital of Maine, then it is in Maine.
   Premise 2: Portland is in Maine.
   Conclusion: Portland is the capital of Maine.
(Portland is in Maine, but Augusta is the capital. Portland is the largest city in Maine, though.)

4. **Inductive Fallacy**

Premise 1: Having just arrived in Ohio, I saw a white squirrel.
Conclusion: All Ohio Squirrels are white.

(While there are many, many squirrels in Ohio, the white ones are very rare).

**Some other Common Fallacies**

**Generalization**

- Among the common fallacies is that of generalization. This occurs when a writer makes a statement like, "all fish are bass". Obviously that is not true, although many fish definitely are bass. In a more historical writing context, such a statement could be easily proven incorrect. Writers need to carefully review their texts and get rid of such unsubstantiated generalizations.

**Reductive Fallacy**

- Another trap to beware of is reductive fallacy. That occurs when a writer uses a phrase which effectively limits diversity to one thing, through phrases like "nothing but". History teaches that all events are complex, and stating that the Civil War was caused by slavery reduces a complex event to a much undeserved simplicity.

**Tautology**

- Tautology is a common fallacy in student writing. This occurs when the writer has different wordings of the same thing acting on each other as though they were separate. An example would be, "English aggressiveness spurred the nation to stimulate commerce on the seas and win the supremacy of trade routes." So, English aggressiveness works on England, and England works on English commerce. Obviously, the three are the same, but the writer treats them as being different.

**Misplaced Literalism**

- Another fallacy is that of misplaced literalism. That occurs when a writer takes someone's words out of context. If you merely quote a short passage from a book, you may not get an accurate idea of what the author's opinion is. Quotes are all right, but the sentences around them must be perused to determine if there are contradictions to the quoted passage.

**Plagiarism**

Simply put, plagiarism is using someone else's words and ideas in a paper and acting as though they were your own. This definition includes copying someone else's ideas, graphs, pictures, or anything that you borrow without giving credit to the originator of the words and ideas. It
definitely includes anything you download from an Internet site or copy out of a book, a newspaper, or a magazine. It also includes stealing the ideas of another person without giving her or him proper credit.

Some obvious examples of plagiarism include,

- Copying someone else's paper.
- Taking short or long quotations from a source without identifying the source.
- Turning in a paper you bought over the Internet.

Some less-obvious examples include

- Changing a few words around from a book or article and pretending those words are your own.
- Rearranging the order of ideas in a list and making the reader think you produced the list.
- Borrowing ideas from a source and not giving proper credit to the source.
- Turning in a paper from another class. Whether this is plagiarism or not depends on your instructor—asks first!
- Using information from an interview or an online chat or email, etc., without properly citing the source of the information.
- Using words that were quoted in one source and acting and citing the original source as though you read it yourself.

The ironic thing about committing plagiarism is that most professors prefer that you use quoted material and properly cite it. They want you to come up with your own ideas in a paper, but will usually give you a good deal of credit for the quality and quantity of outside sources you use as well. Learning how to give credit where credit is due is what this tutorial is all about, so it's time to get started.

**Report**

Report is a self-explanatory statement of facts relating to a specific subject and serves the purpose of providing information for decision making and follow up actions. It is a systematic presentation of ascertained facts about a specific event / subject. Report is a summary of findings and recommendations about a particular matter / problem. Report is for the guidance of higher authorities including company executives and directors. Reports facilitate timely decisions and follow up measures. According to Oxford Dictionary, report means "a record of ascertained facts."

**What are Features or Characteristics of Report?**

**Complete and Compact Document:** Report is a complete and compact written document giving updated information about a specific problem.

**Systematic Presentation of Facts:** Report is a systematic presentation of facts, figures, conclusions
and recommendations. Report writers closely study the problem under investigation and prepare a report after analyzing all relevant information regarding the problem. Report is supported by facts and evidence. There is no scope for imagination in a report which is basically a factual document.

Prepared in Writing: Reports are usually in writing. Writing reports are useful for reference purpose. It serves as complete, compact and self-explanatory document over a long period. Oral reporting is possible in the case of secret and confidential matters.

Provides Information and Guidance: Report is a valuable document which gives information and guidance to the management while framing future policies. It facilitates planning and decision making. Reports are also useful for solving problems faced by a business enterprise.

Self-explanatory Document: Report is a comprehensive document and covers all aspects of the subject matter of study. It is a self-explanatory and complete document by itself.

Acts as a Tool of Internal Communication: Report is an effective tool of communication between top executives and subordinate staff working in an organization. It provides feedback to employees and to executives for decision making. Reports are generally submitted to higher authorities. It is an example of upward communication. Similarly, reports are also sent by company executives to the lower levels of management. This is treated as downward communication. In addition, reports are also sent to shareholders and others connected with the company. It may be pointed out that report writing / preparation acts as a backbone of any system of communication.

Acts as Permanent Record: A report serves as a permanent record relating to certain business matter. It is useful for future reference and guidance.

Time Consuming and Costly Activity: Report writing is a time consuming, lengthy and costly activity as it involves collection of facts, drawing conclusion and making recommendations.

Seminar

Seminar is, generally, a form of academic instruction, either at an academic institution or offered by a commercial or professional organization. It has the function of bringing together small groups for recurring meetings, focusing each time on some particular subject, in which everyone present is requested to actively participate. This is often accomplished through an ongoing Socratic dialogue with a seminar leader or instructor, or through a more formal presentation of research. Normally, participants must not be beginners in the field under discussion (at US and Canadian universities, seminar classes are generally reserved for upper-class students, although at UK and Australian universities seminars are often used for all years). The idea behind the seminar system is to familiarize students more extensively with the methodology of their chosen subject and also to allow them to interact with examples of the practical problems that always occur during research work. It is essentially a place where assigned readings are discussed, questions can be raised and debates can be conducted. It is relatively informal, at least compared to the lecturesystem of academic instruction.

In some European universities, a seminar may be a large lecture course, especially when conducted
by a renowned thinker (regardless of the size of the audience or the scope of student participation in discussion). Some non-English speaking countries in Europe use the word *seminar* (e.g., German *Seminar*, Slovenian *seminar*, Polish *seminarium*, etc.) to refer to a university class that includes a term paper or project, as opposed to a lecture class (i.e., German *Vorlesung*, Slovenian *predavanje*, Polish *wykład*, etc.). This does not correspond to English use of the term. In some academic institutions, the term "preceptorial" is used interchangeably with seminar, although this is typically utilized in the scientific fields.

Increasingly, the term "seminar" is used to describe a commercial event (though sometimes free to attend) where delegates are given information and instruction in a subject such as property investing, other types of investing, Internet marketing, self-improvement or a wide range of topics, by experts in that field.

Seminar presentations are also intended for the improvement of technical knowledge of people. The presentations may also be uploaded in the internet for further reference by people.

**Universities**

In American universities, the term seminar refers to a course of intense study relating to the student's major. Seminars typically have significantly fewer students per professor than normal courses, and are generally more specific in topic of study. Seminars can revolve around term papers, exams, presentations, and several other assignments. Seminars are almost always required for university graduation.

**Origins of the word**

The word *seminar* is derived from the Latin word *seminarium*, meaning "seed plot". *(for more details see the following)*

**Seminar (Sharing the results of your scholarship with your colleagues)**

One of the most satisfying aspects of scholarship is the opportunity to share your findings with others - to make your experiences available to the insights and understandings of others who share your interest. This often leads to an increase in your own insight and may well extend the discovery; it will certainly lead to the refinement of the ideas and their presentation.

Preparing and presenting a seminar to departmental colleagues

Delivering a paper at a conference

Writing for publication

Making application for resources to improve student learning
Preparing and presenting a seminar to departmental colleagues

Presenting your ideas to a seminar of your teaching colleagues is a good way to start the process of communicating your scholarship of teaching more widely. While not as formal or large an undertaking as presenting at a conference or writing for publication it will require you to go through many of the same steps. The Oxford dictionary tells us that a seminar is "a small class at a university, etc for discussion and research; a class meeting for systematic study under the direction of a specified person". And that describes exactly the purpose of this section. You are the specified person, someone who prepares the topic, arranges a program that will encourage and enable all who come to participate and to contribute to each other's learning. Many people will recognize this as the definition of a workshop and feel that a seminar is a time where a presenter presents and allows a short time for questions. We prefer the activity described by Oxford as we believe that it is through collaboration and communication that we learn best.

As seminar leader you will take responsibility for

- identifying the topic
- planning the event
- providing a scholarly framework
- devising the learning stimulus
- helping participants to learn
- encouraging learning reflection for others as well as for yourself.

These activities can be organized into three stages

- Preparation
- Implementation
- Review and Evaluation

Preparation

Write a few lines in answer to these questions

Designing the seminar

- What is it that you want to share with people?
- What is your purpose in conducting this seminar?
- What is it that you want people to learn?
- How can you help them to know that?
Planning the program

Develop one or two clear objectives, point three above should provide some basis for their development. These objectives are for your guidance they should clearly identify:

- purpose for presenting a seminar, what is your justification for taking up the time of your colleagues, being very clear about this. How will the department benefit? How will the individual benefit? What is the relevance of the seminar to the department's goals, objectives and strategy?
- learning outcome, what is your topic, what will people learn as a result of this presentation and discussion, how does it relate to the department's goals objectives and strategy?
- prepare a series of questions that will help participants make links between their own experiences and what is being presented and use these to guide the development of your program.

How will you use the time allocated to the seminar, how will it be proportioned between?

- input
- activity or exercise.

The answers you wrote in relation to 'Designing the seminar', will help you develop your seminar plan. In particular, 'What is it that you want people to learn?' and 'How can you help them to know that?'

Developing interest in the seminar

- Why would people be interested in attending?
- Who would be interested in attending?
- What will you tell them about the event?
- How can you let them know about the event?

Answers to these questions will enable you to prepare a statement about your seminar. You want people to come so make it brief but interesting, remember to include date time and venue.

E-mail is a good way to get in touch with people, you may wish to post a notice on your staff electronic bulletin board or drop a note in colleague's pigeon holes. Remember to follow up key people personally, the best publicity is word of mouth, get people talking about it so there is a sense of anticipation and people are looking forward to the event. Invite your Head of Department personally.

Implementation: Running the seminar
Introduction

This is where you set the tone for the seminar. It is important to strike a balance between seeming well organized but not determined to control the program too tightly. An overhead that announces the topic and the session plan can be displayed as you welcome people and outline your objectives for the session.

Learning Stimulus

It is good practice to start with a simple activity that will enable all to participate from the beginning, contributes to a sense of camaraderie and increases the energy level of the group. The activity needs to be relevant to the topic and provide an opportunity for people to draw on their own relevant prior knowledge. With a few words to conclude the activity affirming peoples contribution and connecting it to what is to follow.

Learning

What is it that you want to share with people? What is it that you want people to learn? How can you help them to know that?

Your answers to these questions form the basis for this part of the program. This will probably involve you in some telling but keep this to a minimum; remember that the definition of a seminar is 'for discussion and research, a meeting for systematic study'. You’re telling needs to be the catalyst to allow people to explore the topic for themselves. As the director of this learning experience guide the conversation with a series of questions that ask people to make connections between the topic and their own teaching or research, this will enable learning integration. Your task is to outline the issue. Provide sufficient context to people to understand your findings or conclusions then ask for their contribution.

Learning reflection

Use some further questions or an activity to bring the discussion to a close. These questions or activities should be reflective, focusing on what has been learnt during the session. It may take a form that will be helpful to you in your own review and evaluation of the session. Conclude with a short remark indicating how the discussion has enlarged your own view and thanking the participants for their contribution to your own learning.

Review/Evaluation

An important part of scholarly practice is reflection and evaluation

Reflection to consider what happened, what was observed, what was learnt (on your part as well as by others), were the outcomes achieved, did anything unexpected occur, what have you learnt that will enable you to improve on your seminar presentations in the future. As you replay the event in your mind make a note of anything significant. A scholarly evaluation would consider evidence
from several sources, here where we consider a single seminar it is important to keep some perspective. As in all evaluations, be clear about what you want to know, in this instance you probably want to know the extent to which you achieved your objectives and some idea of how to improve future seminar presentations.

Asking the participants

Asking yourself

The following is a simple checklist to help you focus on your own contribution to the seminar. Write a brief note beside each question.

- Was the pre-seminar planning adequate?
- Was the session plan appropriate?
- Was there a balance between telling and discussing?
- Did the entire group participate?
- Were others able to contribute to the generation of new knowledge?
- Did I introduce the topic sufficiently?
- Did the first activity involve people in the topic?
- What was the highlight of the session? Why?
- What was the low point of the session? Why?
- How could I present this seminar differently next time?

The evaluation process is not complete until you have made a judgment based on the evidence. In this case you have data from the participants and the product of your own reflection on the event. As in any other evaluation, focus on what your data suggests which you were not aware of as much as on what it confirms what you expected. Write a brief note in your journal about the seminar based on this evidence and include the recommendations that you believe will improve the planning and implementation of a seminar in the future. You may choose to make a more formal report about the seminar; if you are undertaking this activity as part of an accredited program you will have access to more detailed guidelines for an Evaluation Report in the Subject Guide.

Research Paper

1. Choose Your Topic

When choosing a topic, choose one which interests and challenges you and has enough information. It is good to focus on a limited aspect. Select a subject you can manage. Avoid subjects that are too technical, learned, or specialized. Avoid topics that have only a very narrow range of source materials.

2. Locate Information
Use information from a variety of reference sources. These sources include encyclopedias, almanacs, scholarly journals, books, magazines, and newspapers. Find these sources in print form, on CD-ROMS, and on the Internet. Remember to always cite your sources both in-text and in the bibliography.

3. State Your Thesis

Do some critical thinking and write your thesis statement down in one sentence. Your thesis statement is like a declaration of your belief. The main portion of your essay will consist of arguments to support and defend this belief.

4. Prepare an Outline

All points must relate to the same major topic that you first mentioned in your capital Roman numeral. The purpose of an outline is to help you think through your topic carefully and organize it logically before you start writing. A good outline is the most important step in writing a good paper. Check your outline to make sure that the points covered flow logically from one to the other.

- **Introduction** - Brief comment leading into subject matter. State your thesis and the purpose of your research paper clearly and explain briefly the major points you plan to cover in your paper and why your topic is interesting.

- **Body** - This is where you present your arguments to support your thesis statement. Find 3 supporting arguments for each position you take. Begin with a strong argument, then use a stronger one, and end with the strongest argument for your final point.

- **Conclusion** - Summarize your arguments and explain why you have come to this particular conclusion.

5. Organize Your Notes

Organize all the information you have gathered according to your outline. Critically analyze your research data. Using the best available sources, check for accuracy and verify that the information is factual, up-to-date, and correct. Here you will analyze, synthesize, sort, and digest the information you have gathered and hopefully learn something about your topic which is the real purpose of doing a research paper in the first place.

6. Write a Rough Draft

Use your note cards and outline to write a rough draft of your paper. As you write your draft, use numbered footnotes to credit sources from which you take quotations or major ideas.

7. Revise Your Outline and Draft

Read your paper for any content errors and make any changes needed to be sure your ideas are clearly expressed. Double check the facts and figures. Arrange and rearrange ideas to follow your outline. Reorganize your outline if necessary, but always keep the purpose of your paper and your
readers in mind.

8. Prepare Your Bibliography

At the end of your paper, provide a list of all the sources you used to gather information for the paper. List your sources in alphabetical order by the first word.

9. Prepare a Title Page and Table of Contents

The title page is the first page of the paper. It should include the title of your paper, your name, and the date on which the paper is due. The table of contents is the second page. It should list the main topics, important subtopics, and the page on which each is introduced in your paper.

10. Final Checklist

Before handing in your paper, correct all errors that you can spot and improve the overall quality of the paper.

Project

How to Write a Project Report

1. Why is the report important?

If you wish to secure a good mark for your project, it is absolutely essential that you write a good report. It is the report which is marked, not the program or anything else you might have constructed during the project period. No matter how significant your achievements, if you do not write up your work, and write it up well, you will obtain a poor mark. It is essential to understand that the report will be read and marked by a number of examiners (normally 2 - 4), only one of whom - your supervisor - will have any familiarity with the work which the report describes. Examiners are not mind-readers, and cannot give credit for work which you have done but not included in the report.

2. What are the examiners looking for?

Each project report is marked initially by two examiners, one of whom is the supervisor. Each examiner fills in an online mark form, giving marks for various aspects of the report and an overall mark. Studying the mark sheet will give you a good idea of what aspects of the report are important. The notes to examiners which accompany the mark sheet use the terms ‘perfect’, ‘quite good’, ‘abysmal’ and so on to describe the attributes of a particular numerical mark (e.g. 5 is ‘satisfactory’). There is a separate document which goes into great detail about what precisely ‘satisfactory’ means in particular contexts, but I'm not sure that these definitions are widely used: most examiners believe that they have an accurate and objective understanding of what is ‘satisfactory’.

Note that supervisors might specify on the mark sheet that a particular aspect of the project is to be assessed - for example, a review of the project area - even if that area is not covered in the project report. Decisions on what is to be assessed are the supervisor's responsibility, but you should be aware of the standard headings, think carefully about what you present (or do not
present) under each, and discuss and agree it with your supervisor. Remember that your report is an academic dissertation, not a popular article or commercial proposal. For example, rather than describing only a series of events and a final product, try to establish criteria, present arguments, derive principles, pose and answer questions, measure success, analyze alternatives and so on. Where a project has been undertaken with industrial support, the significance of that support for the project, and the relevance of the project to the supporting industry, should be discussed.

3. The mechanics of writing

The problem you have to solve is this: to transfer your own experiences of doing the project, and the knowledge you have gained, from your brain onto paper in a coherent, logical and correct form. There are several ways of achieving this. Different authors have different techniques. My own method, which I think is quite common among technical authors, is to write as quickly as I can, without regard for coherency, structure or order, until I have written down (or rather, typed in) all the points I can think of. If my brain is running faster than my fingers and a thought pops into my head which belongs in another part of the document, I skip to the end of the page and insert a few words there to remind me to expand that point later, then resume where I was. The aim is to transfer as much relevant material from brain to paper as quickly as possible. This method has been called the "brain dump". It is practiced, I think, by some writers as well as by technical authors.

Project report will take you about four weeks to complete, working full-time. You must allow time to prepare the appendices (e.g. program listings) and illustrations. Good-quality illustrations, in particular, take a long time to prepare. You should therefore allow at least six weeks writing the report. If you kept a note-book during the project period, you will find the writing-up process much easier.

4. How to write well

Many students appear not to realize how difficult it is to write well. Any type of writing (except perhaps advertising copy) is difficult, but technical writing is particularly hard.

4.1. Precision

You must strive first to be absolutely precise. When you write, it is not sufficient that you know what you mean; neither is it sufficient that your writing admits of the meaning which you intend: it must admit of no other meaning. What you write must not be capable of misinterpretation. Take exceptional care to choose the right word for the occasion. Do not, for example, write "optimum" if you mean "good". "Approximate" means "close", so "very approximate" means "very close" - which is not what many people seem to think it means.

4.2. Vigour

Precision in writing is mainly a matter of taking sufficient care. Good writing is not only precise, however, it is vigorous, and that is much harder to achieve. It helps if you have read widely, especially novels. Here are some hints which might help you to write forcefully and vigorously. Prefer short sentences to long sentences. Prefer short words to long words, provided that the short word has the meaning you need. Terseness is a great virtue in technical writing. (But don't go too far ;) Avoid circumlocutions. "In almost all sectors of the computing marketplace" can
be replaced in most contexts by "almost everywhere".

The question of whether to use the passive voice in technical writing is a thorny one. Older writers still write "a program was written ..." rather than "I wrote a program ...". Many of your examiners might share this preference for, or prejudice in favour of, the passive voice, but this style is passing out of favour in all technical writing, and I advise you not to use it. Whatever you do, do not use the "royal we" ("we wrote a program" when you mean "I wrote a program").

4.3. Spelling and grammar

You must take exceptional care to spell correctly. Poor spelling is a distraction to the proficient reader. In most cases there is very little excuse nowadays for spelling errors; there are many excellent spell-checker programs which make a good job of finding the errors for you, and excellent (paper) dictionaries which will tell you what the correct spelling is. Be especially careful with words whose common mis-spelling is a correct spelling of a different word, in particular the following pairs: lead/led; loose/lose; affect/effect. It is dangerous to allow the spell-checker to "correct" a mis-spelling by itself; many such hilarious "corrections" have been reported, for example recently in New Scientist.

If you have a medical condition which makes it difficult for you to spell correctly, make sure that your supervisor knows about it, so that it can be taken into account by the examiners.

Take care with apostrophes. Historically, the apostrophe denoted the omission of one or more letters: don't = do not, John's book = John his book. For this reason, careful writers of British English restrict the possessive use of the apostrophe to animate possessors. You may write "John's book" but not "the program's function", since (so the argument goes) one cannot write "the program his function": you must write "the function of the program" instead. This rule is being steadily eroded under American influence, and will probably soon be obsolete.

We mention the "animate possessor" rule in order to illustrate and to explain a very common blunder. Never use an apostrophe with a possessive pronoun. "'It's" means "it is" (the letter that's omitted is an "'i"), not "'it his", which is plain silly. One never sees spurious apostrophes in his, hers, ours, yours, theirs; so why does one so often see "'it's" in place of "'its", which is the correct possessive pronoun?

The brain of the experienced reader, on seeing "'it's", performs a lexical-level macro-expansion, replacing "'it's" by "'it is". This then fails to make syntactic sense in the context, necessitating a backtracking and re-parsing operation, and conscious expenditure of effort. It really does slow down, and consequently annoy, the reader. This crass and ignorant blunder probably does more to distract and to impede the reader of students' reports than any other grammatical solecism.

Summary: "'it's" = "'it is" (needed rarely, if at all, in formal writing). "'Its" is the pronoun (This is my program. Its purpose is to ....) You almost certainly mean "'its".

Even if you yourself do not place a strong emphasis on good spelling and good grammar, most of your examiners do, some fanatically. Most examiners will be irritated by poor spelling and poor grammar. It is always worth doing whatever you can, short of bribery, to put your examiner in a
good mood. Write well and spell well, for this reason if for no other!

4.4. Typography

When I prepared my own final-year project report, I wrote it with pen and ink and handed the manuscript to the departmental secretary who typed it for me on an IBM typewriter. Modern practice is different, and now you yourself are responsible for producing a computer-typeset report. This means that you must be familiar both with the formal requirements set out in the Students' Handbook (restricting the number of pages, type size, width of margins, and so on) and with the rudiments of typography. You will not be penalized severely, if at all, if you violate typographical conventions, but good typography creates a subliminal impression akin to that of good proportion in a painting, and is desirable for that reason. Since it is a matter of simply learning and following the rules, you should try to do so. You should learn at least enough (for example) to know the difference between the hyphen, minus, en-dash and em-dash, and when to use each of them.

4.5. Illustrations

Your report should generally contain illustrations (figures or diagrams), but they must be relevant. Ask yourself if the illustration helps the reader to understand the text. If the text is readily comprehensible without the illustration, delete the illustration. If it is not, it is usually better to make the text clearer than to add a diagram.

All illustrations should be prepared by an appropriate program, such as pic, xfig or grap. They should not be hand-drawn. The only common exception to this rule is circuit diagrams: given the current state of the art in schematic-entry packages, a hand-drawn circuit diagram is usually preferable to a computer-drawn one.

If possible, include figures close to the text which refers to them, rather than all together in an appendix. Circuit diagrams are, again, a possible exception to this rule. It is normal to list tables and figures at the beginning of the report, after the table of contents.

5. Structure

5.1. Top-level structure

At the top level, a typical report is organized in the following way.

1. Abstract. (This is a couple of paragraphs - no more - which summarizes the content of the report. It must be comprehensible to someone who has not read the rest of the report.)

2. Introduction. (The scope of the project, setting the scene for the remainder of the report.)

3. Previous work. (One or more review chapters, describing the research you did at the beginning of the project period.)

4. Several chapters describing what you have done, focusing on the novel aspects of your own work.

5. Further work. (A chapter describing possible ways in which your work could be continued.
or developed. Be imaginative but realistic.)

6. Conclusions. (This is similar to the abstract. The difference is that you should assume here that the reader of the conclusions has read the rest of the report.)

7. References and appendices.

5.2. References

References must be relevant. A typical PR3 project report might contain about one page of pertinent references, if the initial research period was well spent. Do not include references which you have not read, no matter how relevant you think they might be. If you refer to standard material which is covered by a large number of text-books, choose one or two really good ones and cite those, rather than a long list of mediocre texts.

There are many styles for citing references. Although strict standards (e.g. British Standards) for citing references exist, my advice is not to bother with them; instead, find a reputable journal in the library and copy its style.

5.3. Lower-level structure

Structure is a recursive concept. A well-structured report has its top-level sections well ordered, and it is easy to get this right; but each section must in itself be well ordered, and that is more difficult.

Most paper documents, and many on-line documents, are read linearly from beginning to end. This is certainly true of an examiner reading a project report. Consequently, the writer of a well-structured document avoids forward references wherever possible. Try to avoid writing "... as we shall see in chapter 10 ...", especially if the material in chapter 10 is essential to an understanding of the text at the point where the reference occurs. Occasionally such references are unavoidable, but more often than not they are a sign that the text needs to be re-ordered.

In the old days, re-ordering text entailed "cutting and pasting" with real scissors and real paste. Nowadays, the word-processor has made these operations so easy that there is no excuse for slovenly structure. Take your time, and keep rearranging words or phrases within sentences, sentences within paragraphs, paragraphs within sections and sections within the whole report until you have got it right. Aim for a logical progression from beginning to end, with each sentence building on the previous ones.

If the chapters are numbered 1, 2, 3... then the sections within (say) chapter 1 will be numbered 1.1, 1.2,... . It is permissible to sub-divide a section: the sub-sections within section 1.1 will be numbered 1.1.1, 1.1.2,... . Do not however nest sub-sections to more than four levels: sub-sub-section 1.2.3.4 is acceptable, but 1.2.3.4.5 is not. It is quite possible, with care, to write even a large and complex book without using more than three levels.

Footnotes are a nuisance to the reader. They interrupt the linear flow of text and necessitate a mental stack-pushing and stack-popping which demand conscious effort. There are rare occasions when footnotes are acceptable, but they are so rare that it is best to avoid them altogether. To
remove a footnote, first try putting it in-line, surrounded by parentheses. It is likely that the poor structure which was disguised by the footnote apparatus will then become apparent, and can be improved by cutting and pasting.

6. The role of artifacts in projects

Deep down, all students seem to believe that their project is "to write a program" (or, "to build a circuit"). They believe that they will be judged by how much their program does. They are amazed when their supervisor is unconcerned about the inclusion or non-inclusion of a listing in the report. They fear that they will be penalized if their program is small-scale or if they do not make grandiose claims for its power and functionality.

This leads to reports heavy with code and assertions about code, but light on reasoning. Students omit the reasoning because they are short of time and think the code more important, and thereby they lose credit they could have had. It leads also to the omission of testing. Hence there are assertions about the extent of implementation, but no evidence (in the form of records of testing) to back them up.

In summary, credit for the implementation is not the whole story; you should not feel under pressure to make claims that you cannot support. Your reports should clearly separate specification, design, implementation and testing. Taking this advice into account can much improve your mark.

7. You and your supervisor

Writing is a solitary pursuit. Whereas your supervisor will guide you through the early stages of your project work, you must write the report on your own. It is a University assessment, and the rules on plagiarism and collusion (do consult the Students' Handbook!), and the conventions which restrict the amount of help a supervisor can give, apply. Nevertheless, most supervisors will be happy to read and to comment on drafts of sections of your project report before you hand it in, if you give them enough time to do so. It's also a good idea to ask your supervisor to suggest some high-quality past projects in a similar field to yours, and to look them up in the departmental library. This will give you an idea of what is required.

Thesis or Dissertation

Writing a thesis or dissertation is perhaps the most daunting part of graduate education. A thesis or dissertation marks the culmination of thousands of hours of training, research, and writing, and it represents you for years after graduation. Some of the stress related to writing your thesis or dissertation, however, is unwarranted. Dissertation writing is not unrelated to the rest of the academic writing you've done throughout your graduate career. Many of the skills you already possess can be applied to the dissertation writing process. Identifying the purpose of your project, expressing originality and significance, setting appropriate goals, and maintaining strong organization will help you as you develop a high quality dissertation or thesis.

1. Identifying the Purpose of your Dissertation

What is the purpose of your dissertation? It is but one part of your overall degree fulfillment. While
it should reflect the standards and goals of other dissertations in your field, it should also prepare you for whatever career you decide to pursue.

The purpose of the dissertation is to prepare the student to be a professional in the discipline. Through this preparation the student learns and demonstrates the ability to conduct independent, original, and significant research. The dissertation thus shows that the student is able to

• identify/define problems,
• generate questions and hypotheses,
• review and summarize the literature,
• apply appropriate methods,
• collect data properly,
• analyze and judge evidence,
• discuss findings,
• produce publishable results,
• engage in a sustained piece of research or argument,
• think and write critically and coherently.

It is important to maintain an ongoing conversation with your advisors about their expectations for these goals. For example, how can you best demonstrate competency in your field? What parts of the dissertation are most important in your field? Take a moment to step back and look at the dissertation writing process as an outside observer. How would you expect a student to succeed?

2. Understanding Originality and Significance

“Originality” and “significance” are terms that come up frequently when discussing dissertations and theses. What do professors mean when they use these terms?

**Defining Originality**

Lovitts and Wert (2009) define originality using the results from a series of faculty surveys. An original contribution offers a novel or new perspective. The faculty in the social sciences who participated in the study described an original contribution as 'something that has not been done, found, proved, or seen before. It is publishable because it adds to knowledge, changes the way people think, informs policy, moves the field forward, or advances the state of the art. To achieve this goal, you might develop an original insight or advance, or you might borrow a contribution from another discipline and apply it to your field for the first time. It is important to understand that the contribution is not necessarily your entire dissertation but something that is part of it.

It is important to clarify, in early discussions with your advisors, what is expected of you in terms of originality. Consider asking for samples of exemplary completed dissertations, and think critically about how you can most clearly display your original contribution to the reader.
Defining Significance

What is significance?

The faculty who participated in the [Lovitts and Wert] study described asignificant contribution as something that is useful and will have an impact, and is therefore publishable in top-tier journals because it

- offers a nontrivial to a very important breakthrough at the empirical, conceptual, theoretical, or policy level;
- is useful and will have an impact;
- causes those inside, and possibly those outside, the community to see things differently;
- influences the conversation, research, and teaching;
- has implications for and advances the field, the discipline, other disciplines, or society.

As with originality, there are degrees of significance. At the highest level, significance is a function of the field's long-term interest in the problem, the difficulty involved in solving the problem, the influence of the results on further developments in the field, as well as the degree to which the results affect other fields, disciplines, and even society. Again, it is important to talk with your advisors early in the process about their expectations for significance. Are you expected to make a significant contribution in your dissertation, or are you expected to demonstrate that you're capable of making a significant contribution in later work?

3. Aiming for Excellence in the Dissertation

Quality varies across dissertations. As you plan and evaluate your own dissertation, think about appropriate markers for important components of the project. If you answer “yes” to most of the following questions, you are probably working towards a strong dissertation.

Originality and Significance

Does your dissertation ask new questions or address important problems? Does it use current or new tools or methods? Does it expand the boundaries of the discipline? Does it have practical or policy implications? Would an interdisciplinary community find your project interesting?

Understanding of the Discipline

Does your dissertation display a strong understanding and command of preexisting literature? Is the literature challenged or advanced by your research? Does your dissertation clearly state the problem it addresses and explain its importance?

Research Design

Is your research project well-planned and well-executed? Does your dissertation utilize reliable data from multiple sources? Is your dissertation theoretically sophisticated?
Writing

Is your dissertation well-written and organized? Does it clearly explain your project and your findings? Does your writing engage the reader and advance their understanding of your research?

4. Maintaining Consistent Quality within the Dissertation

Again, expectations are crucial as you work toward a high quality dissertation. It is important to talk with advisors about what exactly they mean when they refer to the overall form (e.g., a series of essays or a book) and the smaller components of your dissertation. A typical dissertation is comprised of an introduction, a literature review, a theory section, a method section, a results or data analysis section, a discussion of these results, and a conclusion. With your advisors, discuss expectations for each section and map out a plan for tackling them.

5. Achieving Excellence

After years of training, you are probably already prepared to write a competent dissertation. The guidelines we've already discussed will help you turn that dissertation into an excellent one. We close with some tips for promoting that forward progress.

Practice Academic Honesty

Honesty is the keystone to academic work. The strength of your presentation and contribution are worthless if you plagiarize or misuse data.

Develop Professional-Level Writing Skills

The quality of your writing matters. Brilliant ideas and findings are easily lost in poor writing, not only in your dissertation but throughout your career. Your writing demonstrates your ability to speak to peers in your field.

Take Action to Improve Your Writing

Students often have trouble with grammar and composition, yet most faculty members (with good reason) do not want to devote hours to improving student writing. If the feedback on your drafts indicates that your writing could use some improvement, consider the following steps.

• Know good scholarly writing by familiarizing yourself with the writing style of authors recommended by your advisors.

• Plan your dissertation by mapping or outlining what you want to express prior to writing it. Show this plan to advisors and peers before you begin writing.

• Plan the pieces of your dissertation. Map or outline the order and content of each chapter before actually writing.

• Write and revise in separate steps to improve efficiency. After drafting a section, give it a break before going back to review and revise it. You will likely spot more errors than if you revised it while writing.

• Follow convention. There are norms for the form and style of dissertations in your field. Use handbooks of grammar and style; read books about academic writing; and understand the formatting conventions of your field.
• Get feedback. The feedback of others is extremely important. At Yale, go to the Graduate Writing Center for writing tutoring. Ask peers and faculty advisors for help with short revisions. Join a writing group.

• Practice writing and presenting your research. Take opportunities to practice both written and oral presentation.

Set the Bar

We've said it before, but it's worth repeating: set clear expectations. Setting worthy, transparent, and achievable goals will help any project.

Engage Your Advisors

Be sure to speak with your advisors throughout the process of writing your dissertation. Be clear about goals and deadlines. When you meet, have questions prepared and make sure you understand their directions. Be proactive about solving problems, rather than withdrawing. If you are not getting the guidance you need, consider talking with another professor or administrator who can help.

Engage Your Peers

Sharing your work with your peers is useful. Setting up regular appointments to discuss your research will not only keep you on track with your dissertation, but it will ensure that you have helpful colleagues in the future.

Applaud Yourself

Though you may feel like you are making incremental progress, you have already come so far in your academic career. Be sure step back along the way and acknowledge the work you have done. Writing a dissertation is an enormous endeavor, and you deserve credit for all you've achieved!

UNIT-IV

TECHNIQUES OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH

IDENTIFICATION OF DATA

Data is a collection of facts from which historians reach conclusions. Collection of historical data is not an easy task. Historians collect data to reconstruct history, but collection of authentic data is a major before the historians. Historians collect data mainly from primary and secondary sources. Since sources are very fragmentary evidences, scattered everywhere and are not available in one single place, the historian has to work hard to collect the genuine data. As far as researcher is concerned identification of data is a primary requisite. Above all the identification of proper and relevant data is inevitable and indispensable for producing a good research work. A historian can
collect data from primary, secondary, and tertiary sources. Primary sources are very close or contemporary to the event or period under study. They are the raw materials of the study. It includes both archaeological and written material. Secondary sources are the coherent works of history in any form namely books, articles or dissertations. The particular kind of historical source which may identified in one aspect as ‘primary’ and other aspect as ‘secondary’ is called tertiary sources. Biographies are example of this type of sources.

The data from these sources can be collected using various methods and techniques. For the very purpose archival work, library work, surveys field work, interviews and online research may be utilised. It is also very important to establish the genuineness and authenticity of a data before accepting it for the study. The research scholar has to be more cautious about the constructed data or manipulated data which is deliberately prepared for providing wrong information to society or future generations. It is better to visit the site of the event as part of the identification and collection of data, and also to enquire about the availability of sources like official histories, personal letters, biographies and autobiographies, memoirs and diaries, and newspapers etc.

**PRELIMINARY BIBLIOGRAPHY**

After completing the process of identification of data, the next task before the researcher is to prepare a preliminary bibliography. Bibliography in general is a list of sources of information on a given subject or of literary works of a given author, indicating the range of literature consulted for the collection of data. In the strict sense, a bibliography is a list of published works, but by common usage, both published and unpublished materials are listed in bibliography. It is important for the scholar to understand the variety of sources available and to learn what has written about the topic which he is concerned. It is to find out what resources are available to help answer the question the research scholar posed. This means developing a preliminary bibliography. It is intended to simply get started on the project and to ensure that there are materials available for the scholar to complete the research work.

The researcher has to prepare a full but tentative bibliography of both the primary and secondary sources of subject chosen. It is a continuous work requiring periodical attention. For acquiring a clear picture about the available sources it is very necessary to prepare a preliminary bibliography.

A more useful method for preparing preliminary bibliography is to look at the recommended reading list in a textbook on the topic. Once the scholar found one of the recommended books, he can look at that book’s bibliography for further enquiry. Going from one book to another in this manner would provide a fairly good understanding of the scholarly literature. Those books which most frequently cited are often generally regarded as the most important in the area of study.

Another method is to find a published bibliography on the research topic. For collecting data on major figures and important periods there are very often published bibliographies listing the books and articles published in that field. The periodical index and book reviews are also very important for preparing preliminary bibliography on the topic. Not all of the books and materials the scholar finds in preparing bibliography will be useful for the topic. The researcher should prepare to become more selective for want of time. The researcher cannot possibly read everything in the short span of time available for the research. Before starts reading check the table of contents and the index, it would save time, and make sure that the book really covers the concerned topic.
ONLINE RESEARCH

Online research methods are ways in which researchers can collect data via the internet. It is also referred to as internet research. Many of these online research methods are related to existing research methodologies but ‘re-invent’ and ‘re-imagine’ them in the light of new technologies and conditions associated with internet. The field is relatively new and evolving.

The internet is one of the many pathways to various sites that contain information and much of the information that could be found by using the internet could also be found by moving other paths. After finding a credible source in the internet, that pertaining to the research topic, scan the book for the information, using the table of content or index and mark those pages for future references. Since many online resources are not academically credible, researching history using search engines is not always advisable. Hence online research may begin through an academic library’s home page for online academic resource such as virtual books, databases, and online topic guides prepared by librarians and other professionals.

Internet History source books:

This website offers a collection of public domain and copy permitted historical texts. Topic includes ancient, medieval, modern women’s and Islamic history among others. These source books provides a valuable and time saving resource on various topics include ancient Greek texts or information everyday life in the 17th century France etc.

Internet Public Library:

The internet public library is the first public library of and for the internet community. The library is a collection of online resources, that organised by subject, everything from accounting to social sciences. This Web-based library features standard library such as reference, cataloguing, educational outreach, government documents, special collections and archives, etc.

SEARCHING STRATEGY

A research scholar uses various methods while searching for source material. The archival work and field work are the most important ones.

Archival work

An archive is a collection of historical records, or the physical place where the historical records are located. It contains historical records and documents. Archives contain primary source documents that have accumulated over the course of an individual or organisation’s life time. Archives consists of records that have been selected for permanent or long term preservation on grounds of their enduring cultural, historical or evidentiary value. Archival records are normally unpublished and almost always unique, unlike books or magazines for which many identical copies exist. Archives are quite distinct from libraries with regard to their functions, and organisation, although archival collections can often be found within library buildings.
A person who works in archives is called an archivist. The study and practice of organising, preserving, and providing access to information and materials in archives is called archival science.

The materials in the archives include physical textual document, visual document, audio document or digital document. It is mainly for acquiring primary sources a researcher visit archives. Archives in India started during the British period and continued effectively in the post-independent period. At present there are several archives in India. For collecting the archival materials the researcher has to visit various archives located at central place such as Delhi, Aligarh, Hyderabad, Madras, Bombay, and Poona. One of the major important archives in India is ‘National Archives’, New Delhi. The Pune Archives has the largest collection of documents relating Peshwa period. It contains over 39,000 bundles or rumals of documents, which number approximately 4 crores. The Bombay Archives has the largest English collection in the state of Maharashtra, mainly in connection with Factory and Residency Records. National Archives at Delhi has an abundant collection of official reports, minutes, correspondences, secret intelligent reports and records related to the colonial period, etc.

Field work

Field work or Field research is the collection of raw data in natural settings. The term is mainly used in the natural and social science studies. The interviewing or observation of people to learn their languages, folklore, and social structures constitutes field work. Participant observation and survey research are examples of field research. In the field work mainly two methods are used to collect information- the questionnaire method and interview.

Questionnaire method is the most significant method of data collection. In this method the researcher prepare certain questions pertaining to the subject of the project or thesis in order to acquire information and opinion on particular subject. The questionnaires provide the researcher a fund of information. It is used in particular cases where subject of study is very wide and direct observation is impossible.

The researcher use interview system in order to draw some definite conclusions by taking interview of the contemporary or eye witness persons. Through interview the researcher has a desire to add something new to the existing knowledge of the subject.

In interview the researcher directly meets the people and gathers information from them.

The advantage of field work is the people are closer to real world conditions and the researcher can design the research in the best way to discover the particular information required. The researcher can also be sure that the information gathered is up to date. Its major limitation is that it takes time for the researcher to gather information and that is like to be of small sample size due to the high costs and time it takes.

CARD SYSTEM AND INDEXING

Card system

The first step in writing a historical thesis is the preparation of notes, which has to be done best by keeping certain rules. Card system is used for recording all the details in connection with a research
work. Every details of the study should write on separate slip or paper. As regards the size of the card different measurements are given by different authors. The size of the card is a matter of personal convenience and preference, but 5”X 8” size cards are commonly used for preparation of notes. Generally the research scholars use 4”X 6”or 5”X 8” cards of different colours for differentiating the various categories of the material that is noted down. Most important features of this system are the totality and detachability of each card. On each card or slip only one point is noted. Since each card is detachable it can be taken out from its place and placed anywhere in different arrangements, and also each card can be easily restored its original place. The cards can be arranged in topic wise, subtopic wise, section wise, etc.

As regards the space left on the card for writing various details such as the date and heading pertaining with each point there is no consensus of opinion among the scholars. Prof. K.N. Chitnis put forth the following suggestions or the general pattern to be followed regard with this:

1. The upper central portion of the card is kept for writing the name of the chapter, section and sub section.
2. The upper right corner of the card is always reserved for the date on which the event took place.
3. The central portion of the card is meant for writing the point. As far as possible the point must be written in a very few words.
4. The lower left corner is kept for the name of the author.
5. The lower central portion of the card is left for the title of the book or source.
6. Finally the lower right corner is reserved for the number of the page from which the point is noted.

Index

An index is a list of words or phrases and associated pointers, arranged in an alphabetical order, to where useful materials relating to that heading can be found in a book or document. It includes names of people, places, and events and concepts selected by a person as being relevant and of interest to a possible reader of the book. The pointers in an index are generally page numbers, paragraph numbers, or section numbers. Index permits a quick analysis of important terms, names and places occurring in the text.

Indexes are designed to help the reader to find the information quickly and easily. A complete and truly useful index is not simply a list of the words and phrases used in a publication, but an organised map of its contents, including cross-references, and other useful intellectual analysis. In books, indexes are usually placed near the end.

ARRANGEMENT OF REFERENCES

Foot Notes
In all research work it is very essential to indicate the exact sources utilised in the work, which comes in the form of footnotes. Footnotes give evidence of the scholarship of the researcher. The objects of footnotes are 1) to substantiate the statements made in the thesis 2) to record indebtedness to the source used 3) to relieve the text of less important discussion or information 4) to give cross-references to the matter appearing elsewhere in the book itself 5) to provide the reader with sufficient information to enable him to consult sources independently.

The sources or authorities should be indicated every page. References given in footnotes should first state the name of the author, the title of the work (in italics), place and date of publication, and finally the page reference. The page number should be placed by the letter “p” in the lower case with a point or full stop and followed by another full stop. When a published manuscript is cited, it should be underlined; if unpublished, its place of origin (name of Museums, Archives etc.) should be mentioned. If the source is a periodical, the particular article must be put in inverted commas.

Footnotes are numbered consecutively throughout the chapter and placed either at the bottom of the appropriate page or in list at the end of the chapter. Footnote numerals in the text should come immediately after the part of sentence, never put the numerals in the middle of the sentence. The footnote numbers are put slightly above the line followed by a space.

Sample Footnote Entries:

One Author

An Edited work

Articles from Periodicals
P.M. Joshi, “Muhammad Adil Shah and the Portuguese”, *Journal of Indian History*, 33:7 April, 1955.

In the footnotes only the first reference to the work referred to must be given in its complete form. The reference to the same source thereafter should be given in an abbreviated form. A number of standard abbreviations are used in the footnotes for indicating such citations. The commonly used abbreviations and reference terms used in footnotes are given below:

*Cf.* Abbreviation for *Confer* Meaning “Compare”.

*f.and ff.* Used after pp. “the page, pages following”(eg.4f. page 4 and the following. 4ff. page 4 and the following pages till the subject is finished.

*e.g.* ‘exampli gratia’, “for example”.

*Ibid.* Abbreviation for the Latin *Ibidem* meaning “in the same place”.

*Infra.* Stands for ‘below’.
Loc.cit. Abbreviation for the Latin lococitato meaning “in the place cited”.


Passim. Stands for “throughout the work, here and there.”

p. and pp. Abbreviation for page and pages respectively.

Supra. Stands for “above”.

Appendices

Appendix (plural: appendices or appendixes) is a useful part of the book. It is a useful device to make available to the reader, the material related to the text. An appendix is a group of items. Mention of those relevant events which are not given place in the book are included in the end of the work in the form of appendix. It contains a lot of information about the relevant topic which are not given place in footnotes for want of space. Hence after the end of the book they are given place in the form of short chapters. Appendix may contain the following items:

- Tables and illustrations.
- Technical notes on method.
- Schedules and forms used in collecting data.
- Copies of rare documents generally not available to the reader.

The appendix provides a lot of information to the future writers on the subject. In the absence of appendix some of the important information will not be supplied to the readers, hence their role in the end of book is quite remarkable. All appendices go at the end of the thesis, never at the end of the chapters to which they pertain. Appendices are classified as Appendix A, Appendix B, and so on.

Charts and Tables

Chart is a visual representation of data in which the data are represented by symbols. It depicts such as lines in a ‘line chart’ bars in a ‘bar chart’ and slices in a ‘pie chart’. Data chart is a typical diagram of graphs that organises and represents a set of numerical data. Charts are often used to ease the understanding of large quantities of data. There are various kinds of charts used in the preparation of a research work. The most commonly used models are bar chart, histogram, pie chart and line chart.

Bar chart uses bars to show frequencies or values of different categories. Histogram chart shows the quantity of points that fall within various numeric ranges. Line chart shows two dimensional plot of ordered observations, where observations are connected following their order.

Table is an orderly arrangement of data. In tables data are arranged in columns and rows in an essentially rectangular form. It is prepared to provide more specific details. In tables, information is presented a tabular form. The table should help the reader quickly to follow than the textual presentation.
Both tables and charts should be presented in separate pages, if they occupy more than half a page. Every chart and table should be given a title, which will be a concise summary of what is presented in a chart and table.

**Final Bibliography**

We have already dealt with the preparation of a preliminary bibliography. While the preliminary bibliography is a temporary format of the details of sources to be used in the thesis, the final bibliography is the final form of it with all the additions and changes made. The word Bibliography is derived from the Greek word *biblio* which means book. Any list of books may be called bibliography. The bibliography is a formal list of the sources used by the researcher in the preparation of his thesis. Every research work must contain a bibliography. A bibliography includes all those sources cited in the research work, and may also contain such of the works as are consulted by the research scholar but not cited in his work. The list of sources must contain full bibliographical information on all the books and articles quoted in the text of the thesis and used in the footnotes. Any significant omission in the compilation of one’s bibliography will damage the validity of the writer’s thesis.

Before compiling the sources in the bibliography, they have to classify under different heads according to various criteria. Firstly, they should arrange into two broad groups namely, Primary and Secondary sources. Both primary and secondary sources could further be classified as Published and Unpublished. Historical journals and newspapers would form the third broad division. In all the divisions and sub-divisions the sources must be arranged alphabetically. The sources listed need not be numbered.

The bibliographical entry of a thesis or book consists of the following items:

- The name of the author, or translator, or editor.
- The title of the book.
- The details of publication, i.e., the edition, the place of publication, the name of the publisher and the date of publication.

In a thesis a common pattern follows in the bibliographical entry. The name of the author, editor, translator, or compiler should be written in a generally accepted pattern.

**Sample Bibliographical Entries**

**Books:**

**One Author:**


**Two Authors**

A Translation


News Papers

Times of India, August 16, 2010.
John V.V., ‘The Voters Turn’, Indian Express, October 27, 1979, p.6.

Archival material

“Tarikh-i-Khandan-i-Timuria”, Oriental Public Library, Patna, MS. No. 551.

DATA COLLECTION

The technique of data collection is called heuristics. Heuristic is a word derived from the Greek heuriskein, which means ‘to find’. The term implies techniques of finding material, or related with collection of data. The research scholar should know the exact places of localities where the documents are lying. Documents are very essential for any research work. They are found in various forms in monuments, sculptures, paintings, pottery, coins, tradition, speeches etc. A research scholar who has devoted himself to the task of data collection is required to work hard. He must go through the entire available materials.

Chief sources of Data Collection for Historical Writings

To produce a standard research work which may be called scholarly writing is not very easy task. It not only requires the intelligence of researcher but also authenticity of the data collected by him. Different sources need to be tackled by the scholar in order to create a fine piece of work.

Primary and Secondary sources

The historical sources of data collection can be divided in to two categories namely, primary and secondary sources.

A primary source data is one that the researcher or scholar has collected himself by his own effort. Primary sources are those very close or contemporary to the event or period under study. They are raw material of history. They broadly include archaeological and written material. Archaeological sources include tombs, old buildings, old settlement sites and ruins, and monuments. Written materials include travelogues, chronicles, edicts, charters, official correspondence private letters and diaries, memoirs and so forth. No researcher can be called a competent and authentic unless he has worked in primary material.

Secondary source is the testimony of someone who was not present at the time of happening of the event. The books written by various historians are put in the category of secondary sources. In fact it is necessary for a researcher that he must go through all the secondary sources before the collection of the primary data.
The primary source is more important than the secondary sources because it contained original idea or fact in it. Generally a hand written document is supposed to be more authentic than a typed one as it relates and indicate close relationship between the researcher and event. Actually it is very difficult to draw a line of demarcation between the primary and the secondary source material. Sometime it seems to be so faint that it becomes difficult for a researcher to declare it primary or secondary. But it is sure that both of them help a scholar in establishing the history of the particular period. An autobiography can be both a primary and secondary source when viewed from the point of view of the philosophy of the writer and important event of the period respectively. A researcher can widely use the contemporary records, confidential reports, public reports, public opinions, government documents, questionnaire method, interview system etc., for producing a noteworthy work.

During the process of data collection a researcher has to face some difficulties. There are many names of the places in the data, where many important events of history have taken place but now it is very difficult to identify them in the present context. The names of the places are gone on changing with the passing of time. The name of the significant rulers and authors also differ in description of different scholar; hence it becomes very difficult for the scholar involved in the work of data collection, to trace the exactness of the material collected. All historical data is not available at one place. Therefore a researcher has to feel much difficulty in collecting the scattered data. The researcher has to overcome all these obstacles while collecting the required data for his thesis. It depends upon the intellectual calibre and the efforts undertook by the scholar.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The historical writing is dependent upon the accuracy and observation and veracity of the report, made by the other people. The accuracy and authenticity is ascertained by a process of scientific investigation in to the acceptability of data. This is called analytical operation or the analysis and verification of the authenticity of collected data. It is very essential that a researcher should analyse the validity of the data supporting his thesis. This testing is called criticism. After ascertaining the availability of the source materials the researcher is to find out the reliability of each source before he uses it for writing the historical work. The critical examination of a data or source is divided in to two parts namely, External Criticism and Internal Criticism.

External Criticism

External criticism is aims at preventing the use of false evidences. In external criticism the scholar examines whether records are forged or distorted. It examines whether a particular document or an artefact is genuine or not. External criticism includes the examination of documents like manuscripts, books, pamphlets, maps, including ancient inscriptions and monuments. The aim is that to obtain all possible information of any significance about their origin and if need be of resorting the original form of writing.

External criticism analyse the authorship of documents, handwriting, dates, the question of genuineness, purity etc. Archaeology, Chronology and Palaeography (the study of ancient writings and manuscripts) are used to determine the authenticity of a document. Hence a research scholar must well acquaint with the above tools. In short the object of external criticism is to trace the original text with its essential requisites such as the date and place of its composition and establishes the authenticity of the text. It tries to know the external things about the text, and not its contents.
Internal Criticism

Internal criticism is applied to examine the credibility of a document, whether the contents given in it are believable or not. The internal value of the document must be analysed. The object of internal criticism is to penetrate into the contents, to analyse the text internally, and find out the historical facts contained in it. The internal criticism is the establishment of the credibility of collected data. It endeavours, by the help of analogies mostly borrowed from general Psychology, to reproduce the mental states through which the author of the document passed. In internal criticism the researcher must try to analyse the contents of the real meaning.

Internal criticism is really essential to a researcher, because many of the documents were written without adequate knowledge or with motivation and prejudice. The earlier court historians have written accounts according to the whims and fancies of the king, i.e., his patron. These writings are bounded with prejudice, bias, and partiality. It is the duty of a research scholar to analyse the source fairly. Thus internal criticism deals with the contents of the documents, their probability, author’s veracity etc.

GENERALISATION

Generalisation is an inductive process in which one goes from the particular to the general, infers the unknown from the known. The important task that the research scholar has perform in the concluding operations of history writing is to draw valid generalisations or to frame a formula or to enunciate a principle or doctrine, in the manner in which scientists of the physical phenomena draw scientific laws or formulations from their data. A valid generalisation indicates the depth of the study and is the magnificent achievement of years of research. Framing generalisation is not an easy task; it requires wide range of knowledge in all the data connected with the study. Analysis of various facts about a particular person or historical event and forming a generalisation regard with this gives the book or thesis much reputation.

Forming of Generalisations

One common danger every researcher has cautious against is to generalise on insufficient data, sometimes even on one or two facts only. For example, if one or two convicts were punished severely one cannot generalise that the punishments meted out were to the all culprits were very severe. From the recorded case of an educated Gulbadan Begum or Jahanara Begum, it cannot be concluded that women under the Mughals were educated. Hence much care should be undertaken while framing a formula or generalisation.

The process of generalisation is greatly facilitated by the statistical information about various facts. The quantification of data provides a solid basis for generalisation. It gives a greater degree of probability to the conclusion which is uncertain, turning finally the probabilities into certainties. The quantification is just an aid to the researcher, and ultimately it is for the researcher to generalise properly and intelligently. If the researcher lacks this capacity, no amount of quantification or computerisation of statistics would be any avail to him.
Another process of forming generalisation is analogy. In this method two facts of history -historical events or deeds of persons- are compared in respect of similar features that are already recorded and on the basis of conclusions are drawn about other possible similar features that are not recorded. From the known features of facts the historians take a leap into the unknown features or facts. Samudra Gupta has been compared with Napoleon, Martin Luther King with Mahatma Gandhi, Aurangazeb’s Deccan policy with Napoleon’s peninsular war and so on.

Thus events and situations contain degrees of similarity and general truths. It is this aspect of generality and truths of men, events and situations in history that the historian stresses in drawing up a formula or generalisation at the end of thesis writing.

**QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE RESEARCH**

**Quantitative Research**

Quantitative research is based upon measurement of quantity and is usually applied to subjects like export, import, population, consumption and so forth, which can be calculated in terms of quantity. In social sciences, quantitative research refers to the systematic empirical investigation of social phenomena with the support of statistical, mathematical, or computational techniques. The objective of quantitative research is to develop and employ mathematical models, theories and or hypothesis pertaining to particular phenomena. The process of measurement is central to quantitative research because it provides the fundamental connection between empirical observation and mathematical expression of quantitative relationships.

Quantitative research is generally made using scientific methods, which can include the following:

- The generation of models, theories and hypothesis.
- The development of instruments and methods for measurement.
- Experimental control and manipulation of variables.
- Collection of empirical data.
- Evaluation of results.

**Qualitative Research**

In qualitative research it is intended to find out what the people think or feel about a particular event, person or institution. The purpose of qualitative research is to discover the motives and desires which lead people to behave in a particular way on given situation. Personal interviews are depended upon as the means to find out public attitude and opinion. Qualitative research is mostly associated with the psychological aspects. The qualitative research aims to gather an in-depth understanding of human behaviour and reason that govern such behaviour.

In qualitative researches the following methods used to gather information: participant observation, structured interview, unstructured interview, field notes and analysis of documents and materials.

The most frequently used qualitative research approaches includes the following:
Ethnographic research: it is used for investigating cultures by collecting and describing data that is intended to help in the development of a theory. This method is also called “ethnomethodology” or “methodology of the people”. An example of applied ethnographic research is the study of a particular culture and their understanding of the role of a particular disease in their cultural frame work.

Historical research: it provides the researcher to analyse past and present events in the context of the present condition, and allows one to reflect and provide possible answers to current issues and problems.

Ethical inquiry: it is an intellectual analysis of ethical problems. It includes the study of ethics related to obligation, rights, duty, right and wrong, choice etc.

Critical social research: it is used by a researcher to understand how people communicate and develop symbolic meanings.

SYNTHESIS OF FACTS

The term historical synthesis is concerned with joining, grouping, arranging explaining and interpreting the data. The researcher has the responsibility to utilise the various kind of materials in a way that historical facts come in the light. There should be presentation of facts in most interesting and understandable way. Hence the meaning of synthesis is to arrange the isolated facts into a new form and put different things together with a view to present a new and systematic composition for the readers. Synthesis of fact is joining, grouping, arranging and explaining and interpreting data in a way that reading of material becomes both meaningful and interesting.

Historian has to arrange the facts so that his readers could get exact meaning which the author wishes to convey. Synthesis of historical facts contains three elements. Firstly, contingency or elements of chance or luck in a historical event, the second one is related with necessity i.e., cause and effects in historical events and also plays a vital role in the development of history. Thirdly, Logic- it is very important in synthesis. Historians use logic or order in historical synthesis. It is believed that there is some idea or logic behind every action of a person and without it he would not be able to act. Hence, chance, necessity and logic are three elements of synthesis. Their combination helps the historian to present the fact in a systematic and attractive way. Utmost care and precautions should be taken while grouping or synthesis of facts. The following precautions may take by the historian while grouping the facts:

No facts are to be under estimated.

Much care should be needed while grouping facts, so that no useful fact is left. It may be remembered that sometimes a small fact can be a beginning of an important event.

It must be studied properly whether a certain personality was in a proper order and his influence should also be traced properly on the course of events.

The periods should be clearly divided and there must be a chronological sequence in them. It should be clear that one sequence should lead to another.
Arrangements of facts can be made in the following manner for the convenience of the study:

**Geographical:** it is based with reference to places.

**Chronological:** it is based with reference to dates of happening.

**Topical:** it is based with reference to the contents.

**Individual:** it is based with reference to persons.

**Institutional:** it is based with reference to establishments and thelike.

**FACTS INTERPRETATION**

Facts constitute the raw material of any historical enquiry. The importance of facts in history is very conspicuous as E.H. Carr rightly remarks: “History is a continuous process of interaction between historian and his facts, an unending dialogue between present and past.” There cannot be any history without facts. But all facts are not important, for all facts of the past are not the facts of history.

History becomes meaningful and useful only when it interprets and explains the facts. When a researcher is confronted with a huge variety of facts and number of materials, it is not possible to recollect all in their details. The effective existence of facts is the creation of the historian’s consciousness, it is compulsory on them to make judicious selection of the fact to give meaning to their statements; no statement of history is true if it is not based on facts. Historians’ effort to write history prompts him to be true to facts. It involves a complex process of establishing authenticity of sources, analysis of the sources, and so forth. Historians’ primary duty is to discriminate between general facts and historical facts. While making a selection of facts, the historian must establish the authenticity of the facts and be sure that his facts are reliable evidences. This process involves the system of verification, corroboration and correlation.

Some scholars argue that “facts speak for themselves”, in real sense it is not true because they do not speak for themselves. It is historian’s duty to speak on their behalf, on their basis or through them. It would lead to a clear interpretation of historical facts. It is very apt to say that historians make the facts speak. In all cases, facts remain the integral part of any historical interpretation. The real function of facts is that they fix the limits of historians’ imagination, his point of view or analysis. A true historian never violate the holiness of facts, historical interpretation is based on facts, rather dependent on it.

Famous historian E.H. Carr opines that there is a constant interaction between facts and explanation. In his opinion facts form the bedrock of any historical study, but when lacking of interpretation or explanation, they are dead and useless. Carr explains his perception about the facts and its interpretation through the following arguments in his famous work “what is history”.

The facts of history never come to us ‘pure’ and cannot exist in pure form. Facts are always refracted through the mind of the recorder.
A good historian requires imaginative understanding of facts. It helps him in establishing some kind of contact with the mind of those about whom he is writing.

Historian’s primary duty is to master and understand the facts of the past carefully, he himself psychologically, mentally and intellectually belong to the present.

History means interpretation and explanation; “a hard core of interpretation is rounded up by a pulp of disputable facts”.

In short, it is very clear that the difference between facts of the past and the facts of history determines the element of interpretation. It is primary task of an historian to assure that his facts are accurate and relevant to the theme of his project and the proposed interpretation. Historians task, therefore involves the continuous process of shaping his fact in terms of combination, presentations and theories to suit his interpretation, and his interpretation to his facts without impinging upon the primacy of either of them.

HISTORICAL EXPLANATIONS

The term historical explanation denotes the narrative presentation of history based on a body of techniques, theories and principles of historical research, such as critical examination, evaluation and selection of materials.it imply technique of orderly narrative which also means that there is an explainer- may be a person or a theory, and the explained. History is not a mere recording g of facts. It becomes meaningful and useful only when it explains and interprets the facts. Explanation is the process or problem of relating one’s tested and scrutinized data to conclusions. The process of relating data to conclusions may vary with different historians, depending on the nature of the questions which they seek to answer. Broadly, three kinds of historical explanation can be identified. These are Explanation ‘what’, Explanation ‘why’, and Explanation of ‘significance.’

Explanation ‘what’? tells about what happened. This involves answering questions ‘who did what’?, ‘when’? and ‘where’?. Explanation ‘what’ should include an account of the happening of the peculiar event in terms of the persons involved in it, its time and place of occurrence.

The ‘why’ explanation falls in to two types. The first one explaining historical events in terms of intentions, aims, motives and policies of their human agents. The second type of ‘why’ explanations is made in terms of the vast impersonal forces and circumstances, as for example, forces of economic production and distribution. Independent of human wills these forces determine the general process of human beings social, political, and intellectual life, prompting them to think and act in certain ways.

The third type of explanation and perhaps the most common that historians offer is the explanation of significance or importance of an event or change. The significance may be assessed in terms of results or consequences.

Explanation of the three types - what, how and why, and significance- that a historian offers together constitute his interpretation of past events or changes.