

International Conference
“History between Reflexivity and Critique”

Organized by
the journal *Historiein: a review of the past & other stories*
the *International Commission of Historiography and Theory of History*,
and the *Historical Archive of the University of Athens*.

Athens, October 30th - November 1st, 2008

ABSTRACTS

Michael Bentley (University of St Andrews, UK)
Herbert Butterfield and the Problem of Historical Critique.

The claims of Herbert Butterfield (1900-1979) to be considered a serious thinker about this issue are considerable, though he would not have framed his thoughts in this postmodern language. He spent much of his life reflecting on the practice of historical writing and worrying about historians' lack of interest in the basis of their discipline. His thoughts took him on a journey away from empirical enquiry and towards the study of what he called 'the history of historiography' and his trajectory brought to mind many of the conflicts and tensions involved in trying to frame an understanding of 'critique' while simultaneously resisting any pressures in the direction of epistemological relativism. Butterfield was the first person in the UK – a highly-empirical historical culture – to move along this path and this makes him an interesting figure, bridging a positivist tradition and a later style of 'presentism' in historical thought. My contribution to the conference will consist in a discussion of Butterfield's evolving thought, his contribution to the development of historiography as a serious subject of enquiry, his own understanding of what this made available at the level of 'critique' and a consideration of the very real problems that he faced in trying to square a number of circles in clinging to his notion of 'technical history' as an autonomous endeavour.

Henriette-Rika Benveniste (University of Thessaly, Greece)
The “coming out” of Jewish history in Greece.

Since Y. H. Yerushalmi's *Zakhor* became an academic best-seller it is generally agreed that in the post- emancipatory era Jewish history acquired a new status establishing itself as a main, probably dominant, dimension of identity for many Jews. Moreover, in the “dramatically accelerated” recent history of the Jews, the Holocaust, its traumatic experience, its history and its memories occupy a central place in Jews' self-understanding. In this paper I attempt to analyze the emergence of Jewish History and its interplay with memory and politics in the context of Greek society since the 1990's.

By “coming out” of Jewish history, I refer to a liberating process for its actors - reflected or unconsciously prepared- which is usually considered by others with a kind of astonishment. This process took place in the 1990's and brought to the public sphere various agents who since then have attempted to narrate “Jewish histories” or “Greek-Jewish histories”, expressing contested ideologies and policies. I will focus on public and academic “events”, that include conferences, book editions, especially those which were given big

publicity, commemorations etc. These events imply discourses that belong to wider meta-narratives that underlie arguments about the past or comprehensive explanations of historical experience and knowledge. I will attempt to connect recent events to their historical meta-narratives and to relate them with historiographical trends. The question that underlies my inquiry is the following: What is at stake in every attempt to relate a Jewish past with the Greek national narrative?

Any endeavour to write a Greek-Jewish history was a reflection upon and reaction to the surrounding dominant culture. Since the 1990's, the discourse on the "duty of memory" of the victims of the Shoah forges the framework of three strong meta-narratives of Jewish history which sometimes overlap: The first meta-narrative considers Greece's Jewish past under the spectre either of an ever returning antisemitism or of an idyllic peaceful coexistence between Jews and Christians. The second meta-narrative either emphasizes Jewish contribution to Greek welfare or considers Jews and Judaism as a force disrupting the nation. A third meta-narrative which conflates today's multiculturalism with yesterday's cosmopolitanism runs always the danger of anachronism.

The power of the above meta-narratives has been strong enough to cover the large "lacunae" left by historical research. From an external perspective, the historiographical lacunae could be attributed to the marginal status of Greek Jewish History. A "normalization" would mean the entrance of Jewish History to the academy and this could only happen if Greek historiography opens itself to subjects other than national history or its deconstruction. But this "normalization" could only follow a decline of antisemitism, and a retreat of nationalism. From an internal perspective, one can point to the fact that Greek-Jewish social history has never been conducted. With very few exceptions we passed from a more or less traditional political history to investigations of the cultural meaning of Jewish past realities but we still miss deep knowledge of the formation of social classes and groups. Religious commitment and secularization, occupational transformation, social conflict within the community, mass migration to Palestine, family and gender, philanthropy, popular and high culture are among the common themes of study in social history that still need to be researched. It is obvious that this research would fertilize Greek historiography but the prospects are also promising for Jewish historiography. Admitting Jewish history in Greek historiography would mean testing a comparison of Greek-Jewish history with other Jewish histories.

It would not be unreasonable to argue that we currently go through a second phase of the Jewish history in Greece. The first phase coincided broadly with the 90s, when we witnessed a new vivid interest in the study of Greek Jewry, an interest that could be attributed to, as I will try to show, many factors. Many people, coming from a variety of backgrounds, contributed with their work and their questions in the charting of the Jewish presence in the past. In the end the field of study gained at least some legitimacy in our colleagues' minds, legitimacy that unfortunately is not reflected on an institutional level. If the 90's were the years of "coming out" and innocence, the current second phase is "post-celebratory" and more demanding of reflection. However, this "coming out" of Jewish history in Greece not only has enriched modern Greek historiography and has nourished a more self-consciously critical stance for history making, but it has also positively complexified modern Greek historical consciousness.

Daho Djerbal (Université d'Alger, Algérie)

History writing as cultural and political critique.

(De la difficile écriture de l'histoire d'une société colonisée.

Interférence des niveaux d'historicité et d'individualité historique)

Travailler sur les sociétés coloniales à partir des archives écrites par la puissance occupante peut paraître aisé. Nous entrons de prime abord dans un champ sémantique connu ou du moins dans un champ conceptuel dont le système référentiel nous a été transmis par le savoir académique des sociétés avancées. Tenter de rendre compte du penser et de l'agir du dominé

dans sa tentative de se libérer de la présence étrangère devient plus complexe. Nous sommes là dans un champ d'interférence non seulement de niveaux d'analyse mais aussi de niveaux d'historicité et d'individualité au sens phénoménologique du terme.

Conscience de l'individu et représentations collectives expriment toujours à quelque degré un état du groupe social: elles traduisent, ou pour employer la langue philosophique, elles «symbolisent» sa structure actuelle, la manière dont il réagit en face de tel ou tel événement, la conscience qu'il a de soi-même ou ses intérêts propres. Mais qui est ce «il»?

La complexité du problème de l'interprétation vient du fait que nous sommes devant des processus d'individuation qui ne cessent de s'achever et des processus de dissolution des communautés premières qui ne cessent de redoubler de vivacité au moment même où elles sont sur le point de disparaître.

Ewa Domanska (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan, Poland)

Beyond Anthropocentrism in Historical Studies.

In this presentation I will argue that since the 90's we can see signs in the human sciences of an emerging new paradigm inspired by biology and technoscience. In contemporary human and social sciences there are attempts to extend the range of investigation to include "non-human" beings (posthumanism). Thus we can talk about the seemingly paradoxical "non-anthropocentric human sciences" in which the term "non-anthropocentric" means "not human centered." There are evidences that a similar resistance to the anthropocentric machine has begun also in the discipline of history. For the human and social sciences in general, I identify three main tendencies: conventional anthropocentric, enlightened anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric. The question is: why and in what manner might theorists of history be interested in these new tendencies? What might be the value of a non-anthropocentric approach for historical knowledge? How might theoretical proposals coming from technoscience (offered by, for example Bruno Latour or Andrew Pickering) influence our theoretical reflections on the past? Is a non-anthropocentric history possible?

Haris Exerzoglou (University of the Aegean, Greece)

Can History have a Critical Edge? On History, Memory and Commemoration

The paper discusses the relation of history and memory in the aftermath of the memory boom of the last two decades and in the context of the history wars that took place in Greece. The proliferation of narratives attributed to memory is considered a challenge to professional-academic history and its ability to "speak of the truth". This challenge becomes more acute to the extent that memory is appropriated by institutions and the state. The institutionalization of memory in the form of official commemorations and official acts reveals the tension between memory and critical historiography but at the same time points towards the implicit relation between memory and history. Although memory is directly related to experience it requires some form of rationalization to become meaningful and it can only be expressed in language through the use of discursive and cognitive means which borrows from academic history. In this respect, memory as a mode of remembering follows on the steps of academic historical narratives and reproduces the categories and distinctions of professional historiography albeit in a simplistic and sensory form. The encounter of history and memory exposes history's essentialist and foundational nature, its pretence to "speak of the truth" as if the "truth" comes in the form of a natural object to be described as accurately as possible.

The recognition of the Genocide of the "Greeks of the Ottoman Empire" by the Greek Parliament is a case in point. With two succeeding unanimous resolutions, in 1994 and 1998, the Greek Parliament recognized May 19th of and September 14 as days of national commemoration of the Genocide of the Greeks of the Pontus region and of Asia Minor respectively. The resolutions sparked an intense public debate, despite the unanimous

agreement within the Parliament, which brought to the fore the delicate and complicated of the relation of memory and history.

Kostas Gaganakis (University of Athens, Greece)

Thinking about History in the European Sixteenth Century: La Popelinière and his quest for 'Perfect History'.

Following on the pioneering work of George Huppert and Donald Kelley, among others, historians have focused on the “historical revolution” in the sixteenth century, namely the rise of historical relativism, critique and the historicization not only of national pasts but equally of all disciplines. Main field of investigation has been the French historiography in the sixteenth century, following the cataclysmic events unleashed by the wars of religion between Catholics and Protestants. This paper focuses on Lancelot Voisin de La Popelinière, author of a controversial contemporary history of the French wars of religion and equally, a fervent proponent of the idea of “perfect”, all-inclusive history, through his other major historiographical works, *L'Histoire des Histoires* and *L'Idée de l'Histoire Accomplie*. In the light of the ongoing debate among historians of historiography, this paper seeks to examine the novel, “historicizing” elements in La Popelinière’s thought, by placing them in the broader cultural context of sixteenth-century French humanism.

Kostas Gavroglu (University of Athens, Greece)

Historians and Historians of Science: The Convergence of Diverging Traditions.

It is less than twenty years since historians and historians of science “discovered” common grounds to both. The intensely internalist approaches used by the great majority of historians of science, and the misplaced emphasis that scientists were the privileged audience for history of science had alienated a good many historians from the corpus of history of science. The discussions around the themes of social constructivism, forced historians of science to deal with a host of theoretical issues which turned out to be similar to those of historians. The paper will elaborate on the notion of contingency as one such notion which has contributed towards the convergence of what, for many decades, appeared to be as an unbridgeable divide between historians and historians of science.

Anthony Gorman (University of Edinburgh, UK)

Islam in the Middel East: Critical Histories.

Catherine Hall (University College London, UK)

Postcolonial Reflections on National History: the case of Thomas Babington Macaulay.

How can an historian writing in the C21 from a postcolonial and feminist perspective, engage creatively with a C19 liberal nationalist? Macaulay is probably the most influential national historian of Britain. He created a paradigmatic 'island story' of a history made by internal forces - a remarkable constitution combined with a remarkable and homogeneous people. It is time to re-think this model of British domestic history. What forms of historical writing are appropriate for a multicultural society? How might a critique of Macaulay open the way to a more reflexive and inclusive practice for our own times?

Servanne Jollivet (Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany, *and* Archives Husserl, Paris, France)

Philosophical Historicism as Critical Reflexivity. From Dilthey to Heidegger.

Either as a “critic of the historical reason” by Dilthey, or as an “immanent critic” by Troeltsch, or as a phenomenological “destruction” by Heidegger, the philosophy of history, post-hegelian or post-metaphysical, doesn’t aim to “transcend” history but to bring out its inner presuppositions. In this contribution I propose to revisit the major issues of this new form of historical reflexivity claimed by philosophers from the late 19th century onwards and to question its significance vis-à-vis the historiography, as well as against both relativism and metaphysics.

Qu’elle se donne comme “critique de la raison historique” chez Dilthey, comme «critique immanente» chez Troeltsch ou «destruction» philosophique chez Heidegger, la philosophie de l’histoire post-hégélienne ou post-métaphysique ne vise plus à «dépasser» l’histoire mais, de manière immanente, à dégager ses présupposés. Je me propose ici de ressaisir les enjeux de cette nouvelle forme de réflexivité historique revendiquée par les philosophes dès la fin du 19^e siècle et d’en interroger la portée au regard de l’historiographie, à mi-chemin du relativisme et d’une nouvelle métaphysique de l’histoire.

Patrick Joyce (University of Manchester, *and* London School of Economics, UK)

What is the History of Critical History?

To ask what a critical history might be it is necessary to know what it has been. However, the term itself is amorphous: in order to track its meaning further-in terms of my present historiographical procedure-it is useful to consider terms that are potentially analogous to it. Irinline Veit-Brause considers social history, cultural history, and extra academic history in this light, or so is my reading of her abstract. She does this in a variety of national-academic settings, namely the German one and what she calls the American one, although Anglo-American is perhaps a better term. Hopefully, my paper will complement hers.

I consider (mostly) Anglophone traditions in social history, the cultural turn, and the emergence of cultural history, offering some current possibilities for a reconfigured social history as a bearer of critical elements. I situate this reconfiguration around new readings of the social, and I consider the ethical and political possibilities and limitations of changing academic paradigms such as "social history". In the second part of the paper I want to relate the first part to a particular text which bears on the notion of a "critical history", namely the recently published *Manifestoes for History* (Routledge, London 2007), eds. Keith Jenkins, *et al.* This includes an "Afterword" written by Hayden White. By doing this it will be possible to incorporate Veit-Brause’s third concern, namely critique and extra-academic history, also perhaps Hayden’s subject in this conference, the practical uses of the past. What is the relationship between the practice of academic history and using the past practically?

Nikos Karapidakis (Ionian University, Greece)

Braudel and the Readings of Globalization.

Il revient tout l’honneur à Fernand Braudel d’avoir pensé le décollage (économique et dominateur) de l’Occident en termes d’économie monde, en se faisant ainsi le précurseur lointain, en 1979, d’un autre concept ou pseudo concept, celui de mondialisation (globalisation) employé lui en 1980. Dans la conception de Braudel qui aspirait à une histoire totale, le moteur de ce qui a été la naissance du capitalisme fut la mondialisation de l’économie. Depuis 1980, le concept de mondialisation (globalisation) a fini par prendre de nombreuses significations, dont chacune est venue apporter son teint idéologique pour signifier tout à la fois l’effondrement du communisme, la révolution des communications, la

mondialisation de la culture et de la politique, voire de la démocratie, la victoire du libéralisme économique, la prééminence des Etats-Unis d'Amérique.

Pourtant ni la nouveauté du mot, ni la multiplicité de ses sens ne doivent faire oublier que les mouvements de mondialisation sont bien antérieurs, et de longue durée, pour rester dans la terminologie braudelienne, et commencent toujours par une aspiration à l'ouverture économique pour inclure ensuite l'unification culturelle. Au point de s'interroger si chaque civilisation n'aurait pas sa propre culture de mondialisation relevant, en partie au moins, de ses utopies profondes.

Vasso Kindi (University of Athens, Greece)

A Spectre is Haunting History --the Spectre of Science.

My title alludes to and paraphrases the famous opening sentence of the Communist Manifesto. Just as communism, in the intangible apparition of a ghost, hovered over Europe as both a threat and a much desired prospect, in like manner, the image of science looms over history as both an enforcer of discipline and a motivational ambition. The concern regarding the scientific status of historical writing has constantly preoccupied historians and philosophers, at least since modern times, but it is surprising that it is still an issue after all the developments in the philosophy of science since the 1960s. In the paper, I will bring considerations in contemporary philosophy of science to bear on the debate. In particular, by revisiting the recent exchange between Georg Iggers and Hayden White in *Rethinking History* 4:3(2000), I will attempt to show that science, having lost its high-minded authority after the so-called historicist turn in philosophy of science, can hardly intimidate or inspire. In this vein, I will show that, as the phantasm of scientificity is dissipated, certain oppositions that supposedly mark the difference between science and history are dissolved.

Axel Körner (University College London, UK)

Benjamin, Croce, Gramsci, and the Concept of Critique in the Philosophy of History.

Contrary to Gershom Sholem's hopes of the 1930s and to the beliefs of many more recent contemporary commentators, Walter Benjamin was not the philosopher-critic who translated Jewish mysticism into an idiom of the modern age. Likewise, he was not an early apostle of postmodernism. The fact that he expanded the material base of his philosophy of history to include cultural production and psychological phenomena does not mean that he rejected the fundamental principles of historical materialism. During the 1920s and early 1930s historical materialism was read and understood within a much wider context of ideas than during the subsequent decades of the twentieth century, when totalitarian doctrines imposed their ideological limitations on Europe thought. Rather than the Kabala, which (very much to Scholem's regret) he hardly knew, at the origin of Benjamin's philosophy of history was a specific concept of critique which he shared with a wide range of thinkers who during the 1920s and 30s were able to think about historical continuity and change in a uniquely creative fashion, which went beyond the narrow ideological categories which subsequent generations of theorists, especially since the rise of Fascism, applied to their theoretical frameworks. Instead of a doctrinal insistence on specific theoretical formulae for political ends, the motive behind this approach was to understand the semantics of historical time and to make the experience of modernity meaningful. In this context the concept of critique signifies to understand the history of the world as man made rather than as a given, a consequence of the enlightenment and Kant's proclamation of man's liberation from self-incurred tutelage. Within this conceptual context idealism, positivism and materialism no longer appear necessarily as opposed to each other.

Along with Benjamin the two most interesting proponents of this open concept of critique were Benedetto Croce and Antonio Gramsci. Italy's reading and appropriation of idealism, positivism and Marxism since the turn of the century represented a way of making

the experience of modernity meaningful. Croce confronted himself with the challenges of both Marxism and Idealism, an encounter which had a major impact on Italian intellectual debate since the turn of the century. Croce engaged critically with Hegel's Idealism and the concept of history as a meaningful process, while making the dialectical method the basis of his historical and philosophical enquiries. Like Hegel, Croce placed history at the centre of his new humanism, but his was an "absolute historicism", a history without God. Despite his confrontational relationship with the social sciences in Italy, he had a lively interest in European social theory and socio-economic reform. The theoretical debates of the Italian Left were rooted as much in Croce as in European Marxism. In varying degrees, Italy's Socialist Left engaged with Hegel and Marx in a dialogue which was as original as it was controversial. The outcome was a Philosophy of Praxis with the concept of critique at its centre, very similar to Benjamin's conception. This paper discusses Benjamin, Croce and Gramsci in an integrated conceptual context and aims to present historical criticism as an original contribution to the Philosophy of History of the early twentieth century. While the ideological confrontations of subsequent decades have prevented philosophers and historians to work within a similar open framework, more recent research into the specific semantics of historical time which marked the experience of modernity should invite the historian to reconsider these conceptions.

Alexandra Lianeri (University of Thessaloniki, Greece)

Dêmokratia and the Modern Political Imaginary: Setting the History of Democracy as a Field of Critique

"The Enemy today is not called Empire or Capital. It is called Democracy," wrote Alain Badiou in an attempt to set the current directions of emancipatory critique against the background of what he described as not only the empty form of the 'representative system', but even more "the modern figure of equality before the offer of the market, rendering every individual equal to any other on the sole basis of virtually being, like everyone else, a consumer."¹ How can the history of democracy contribute to this critique? In particular, how can the articulation of that history, over the nineteenth century, as a relation between ancient and modern liberal democracy offer a field for defining the contradictions of the modern democratic imperative from the viewpoint of radical politics?

This paper discusses the entrance of *dêmokratia* into historical temporalities, which founded its links to modern liberal democracy on the aporetic conjunction of the frames of 'one more time' and 'not yet'. *Dêmokratia* acquired historical visibility as the past of the form of government that Badiou designates as an empty shell of representation and consumer equality intended to cover the absence of equality as the principle of political sovereignty and collective political praxis; and yet the ensuing temporality of democracy, as a concept, never implied its identity with its historically manifested forms, whether ancient or modern, but charted, instead, an incomplete trajectory, wherein democracy's links to its past came to testify the difficulty involved in reducing it to its various historical presents. In other words, the relation between ancient and modern democracy gave rise to a political imaginary centred on democracy's becoming. This condition prevents the understanding of democracy as an empirical category designating a political form which is bound to ancient and modern empires or modern capitalism. The historical narratives that linked ancient and modern democracy rather indicate that the democratic imperative has remained irreducible to the ideological forms that enlisted it, more or less successfully, in the cause of imperialism or capitalism; and that democracy, as a claim to political sovereignty, has never attained peace between the self and the self. This implies that today, more than ever, critical politics cannot define its adversaries on the grounds of a split between democracy as an ideological construct, and capitalism or imperialism as the economic setting that exhausted the democratic claim to

¹ Alain Badiou, Prefazione all' edizione italiana ' *Metapolitica*, trans. M. Bruzzese Naples, Cronopio, 2002, pp. 9-15

equality. With regard to this claim, we should rather recognise that its force offers a site of struggle and intervention that might not only survive capitalism in its current global forms, but also be the frame *per excellence* for the radical questioning of the logic of continuous inclusion and co-option underlying the ideology of capitalist and imperialist democracy.

Diana Mishkova (Centre for Advanced Studies Sofia, Bulgaria)

Politics of Regional Representation: Reflection on the History of Southeast-European Historiography

The subject of my paper is the history of supranational/transnational regional history, i.e. of the narratives trying to subsume the competing national visions under a common macro-regional umbrella. Particularly it seeks to analyze the ways Southeast Europe was used as a framework of historical interpretation, assessing its intricate relationship to the national narratives of history. It is important to historicize these regional “challenges” to nation-centered history in Southeast Europe as they did not appear with the same force in different historical moments and places. Different generations and national traditions framed the geographical entity of Southeast Europe in markedly different ways and thus their ideological implications could also differ greatly. Such narratives could be produced internally, but very often they were coming from a trans-national expert community trying to look at the countries in this region from a more encompassing perspective. One should also add the hidden or more explicit agendas behind transnational regionalisms (e.g. *Südostforschung*). There are thus parallel, western and local, external or internal, Southeast European processes of historiographical construction of regional discourses which are not necessarily connected. Needless to say, these regional categories themselves were far from being stable and various historiographical and political projects devised different, partly overlapping regional frameworks. The geographical coverage of concepts like Southeast Europe/Südosteuropa, Balkans, Carpatho-Danubian space changed dramatically over time and these notions often designated parallel scholarly ventures stemming from different political, academic and disciplinary sub-cultures.

Moreover, when getting closer to the details we are faced with shifting and intersecting of frames –national/regional– inherent to the very same historiographical lineage. The same historians could very often partake in different modalities/mental representations, nationalist and regionalist simultaneously. There is thus no clear-cut difference but a complex relationship between the national and the regional representation, which will be my aim to show in the paper. These modalities very often depended on the institutional and political contexts in which the given historical works were produced, and stood for diametrically opposed value systems.

Erato Paris (Centre International de Recherches Helléniques)

La gréco-latinité dans la naissance de La Méditerranée de Fernand Braudel (1924-1947).

A travers un voyage effectué dans les milieux où il a vécu entre 1924 et 1947 (Alger, Paris, São Paulo et l'Allemagne comme prisonnier de guerre), on découvre la genèse intellectuelle de l'œuvre de Fernand Braudel, *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II*, ainsi que la notion capitale de «gréco-latinité».

Alger, 1924. Braudel est nommé professeur d'histoire et de géographie au Lycée Bugeaud. Il a 22 ans, et séjournera dans cette ville méditerranéenne jusqu'en 1932. Cette première étape de la vie de l'historien est marquée d'abord par ses premiers contacts avec des spécialistes, historiens ou géographes, de l'Université d'Alger; puis par ses premiers comptes rendus et articles donnés à la *Revue Africaine*; enfin par des rencontres lors des célébrations du Centenaire de la Conquête française d'Alger en 1930.

L'Université d'Alger des années 20 et 30 recourt à des méthodes pluridisciplinaires qui vont lentement influencer la pensée braudélienne. Dans ce milieu dynamique, ouvert aux

jeunes enseignants brillants venus du continent, porté par la foi dans la réussite coloniale de la France, Braudel rencontre sur sa route les diverses formulations, qui s'expriment alors, d'une vision latine et ethnocentrique où la France apparaît comme l'héritière de Rome, et donc chargée de recréer la cohésion spatiale qui existait au temps de l'Empire entre les deux rives, sud et nord, de la mer intérieure occidentale. Deux moyens s'offrent d'emblée: la France, puissance latine et méditerranéenne, doit accomplir l'union du Maghreb avec la Méditerranée occidentale, comme ses ancêtres latins, en s'appuyant sur une mission civilisatrice; puis, elle doit développer les sciences, ainsi que les techniques maritimes et économiques à l'intérieur de l'Afrique du Nord.

L'époque parisienne de Braudel (1932-1935, 1937-1939) témoigne de façon très nette de l'élargissement de son réseau intellectuel de relations algériennes. Braudel fait la connaissance de toute une pléiade d'éminents historiens, économistes et poètes (Paul Valéry). Le thème "pivot" de l'œuvre de ses inspirateurs est celui d'un humanisme nouveau, à la fois scientifique et colonial. Cet humanisme prend un triple forme: d'une part, un projet d'entente internationale fondée sur l'économie, de façon à prolonger les effets de la reconstruction des années 1920 puis à combattre la dépression des années 30, et sur l'harmonie sociale, pour mieux résister au fascisme montant de l'époque; d'autre part un renforcement de la «conscience méditerranéenne» (Valéry); enfin la coexistence et la symbiose pacifique de nations et civilisations différentes.

C'est aux antipodes de cette façon d'écrire une histoire universelle aux aspirations messianiques et humanistes que se situe l'extrême droite française, et ses idées - que l'on retrouve dans la propagande de l'époque - sur la Méditerranée et le concept de civilisation. Aux yeux de la droite, et surtout de l'Action Française, la France est l'héritière en droite ligne de la civilisation gréco-latine et gallo-romaine, et Mussolini apparaît comme le restaurateur des vertus de la Rome antique. Une forme d'hispanisme enthousiaste se développe chez les partisans de l'Action Française, qui, à l'époque de la guerre civile, "remet l'Espagne à la mode" comme référence historique: celle de la "Reconquista", et de l'expulsion des juifs et des musulmans, appelée à justifier la lutte contre le communisme.

Entre 1935 et 1937, Braudel se trouve au Brésil avec pour mission d'enseigner à l'Université de São Paulo l'histoire globale du passé au présent. C'est là qu'il entrevoit la Méditerranée du long XVI^e siècle comme histoire universelle mais aperçue depuis le rivage atlantique. Braudel et ses collègues se voient confier une autre mission civilisatrice, celle-là dans le droit fil de la politique culturelle de la France dite du pan latinisme: renforcer au Brésil les principes humanistes et démocratiques français, dans l'espoir de contrebalancer l'idéologie de l'intolérance, fasciste ou nazie, diffusée depuis l'Italie et l'Allemagne avec le concours maintes fois empressé de leurs propres communautés locales. Cette mission, relayée par le milieu libéral de l'intelligentsia francophile de São Paulo, consiste à réformer la République brésilienne, d'abord en modernisant ses méthodes scientifiques jusque là anachroniques, ou positivistes, puis en multipliant les études, dans la ligne proposée à la même date par les Annales, sur les réalités socio-économiques du pays. Sous l'égide de la France, donc, nous voyons Braudel et ses collègues contribuer au grand projet œcuménique des Annales, celui d'un humanisme scientifique dont le cœur est le rapprochement fraternel, intercontinental, des civilisations, grâce à l'interdisciplinarité croissante des sciences humaines modernes.

Entre 1940 et 1945, Braudel est prisonnier de guerre dans les Oflags, d'abord de Mayence, puis de Lübeck, réservés aux officiers. Dès le début, Braudel est exposé à la propagande des occupants et de Vichy, diffusée par la radio et les journaux allemands ou pro-allemands. Une fois encore, cette propagande ressasse le thème de la Méditerranée et des civilisations occidentales mais vu à travers le prisme d'un Louis Bertrand, qui est allé jusqu'à considérer Hitler, jusqu'en 1941, comme un «parfait latin». Les prisonniers pouvaient aussi lire dans les journaux qu'Hitler était le «sauveur de l'Église catholique» et le défenseur de l'héritage gréco-latin et chrétien.

Aux antipodes de cette propagande, il y a les Annales, devenues les Mélanges d'Histoire Sociale, et la mission que se sont fixée les deux directeurs de la revue d'étendre la coexistence pacifique entre les civilisations, en France comme partout dans le monde. Il y a aussi leur croisade pour garder intacts les valeurs spirituelles et humanistes du pays dans le

flot déferlant de la sauvagerie et de la propagande fasciste (au sens large du terme), "méditerranéenne" ou "nordique".

«Peut-il y avoir un humanisme actuel, en 1946, sans histoire ambitieuse, consciente de ses devoirs et de ses immenses pouvoirs?» C'est sur ces mots que s'ouvre la préface de sa *Méditerranée*. L'ambition de l'histoire universelle, comme la sienne, consiste d'une part à maintenir et enrichir les valeurs humanistes d'un monde qui doit rester fraternellement unifié ; et d'autre part à démontrer que la méthode d'une histoire globale fondée sur l'économie est celle de ses grands enseignants, partisans de l'humanisme nouveau: ce choix politique aspire à promouvoir l'histoire économique et interdisciplinaire en tant que moyen de constituer et préserver un monde d'alliances d'abord économiques et ensuite politico-sociales.

Kalle Pihlainen (University of Turku, Finland)

Critical Historiography in the Entertainment Age.

Although linguistic constructivism in history has a long way to go before being a self-evident truth for all historians (and perhaps even more importantly for lay readers of traditional histories), it seems that much of the ethico-political impact of the argument has been spent. Positions have been dug and defensive lines drawn that will not be breached by further arguments, however detailed or clever. Ignoring the role of linguistic figuration in history research and writing may not be a theoretically sound position, yet it appears an unassailable one for many. At the same time, there has been subversive activity behind the theoretical lines: "traditional historians" and history as an institution have made room in the establishment for methodologies originally born from critical and oppositional interests. In this way, the political aims of much radical thinking since the 1960s have been appropriated to fill institutionally accepted roles for historical research and writing. Microhistory and feminism, for example, have become fairly standard ways of "doing history" in many history departments. While this may at face value appear to be a good thing, it involves a set of problems quite difficult to resist: Critical historiographies are now challenged on new grounds, by opponents emphasizing the freedom of approaches as well as the "radical" components already existing within the establishment. At the same time, the "anything goes" attitude adopted from a misinterpreted constructivism undermines serious critique. History is thus seen as either about "truth", the reiteration of received ideology, or about representation and play, remaining out of synch with any political intents and purposes.

Against this backdrop, the paper examines the opportunities for and obstacles to recovering the critical role of history writing, arguing that something more must be said than currently is in the discussions revolving around epistemological scepticism or more effective representational means. To answer the question of whether critical historiography is a viable option in the entertainment age, the value of the poststructuralist dictum of constant questioning is foregrounded, and its effective role in existing approaches that seemingly question orthodoxies by choice of materials and novel presentational forms is examined; the tendency of microhistory and cultural history to concentrate on entertainment value rather than any broader sociopolitical significance is of particular concern.

Chen Qineng and Jiang Peng (Institute of World History, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)

Braudel's "Long durée" and Chinese Historiography.

1. Since the foundation of New China in 1949, due to the various reasons China was cut off from the outside world for a long time. This situation was more serious during the period of "Cultural Revolution". Only after pursuing a new policy of reform and opening the door was opened greatly. A lot of different Western trends of thought poured into China, including trends of historiographical thought. The pouring of Western historical thoughts into China in a large-scale was started in the middle of 1980s. Mainly it was concerned about French school

of *Annales*. It was interesting that almost from very beginning many related articles were focused on Fernand Braudel and his theory on “long durée”. Moreover, different generations of Chinese historians did the same without prior consultation. For example, in 1986 some articles on Braudel and his methods were published in Chinese leading journals. They were written either by the old generation of Chinese historians (Prof. Zhang Zhilian), or the young historian who studied overseas (Dr. Edward Wang), or scholar working in China (Wang Zhuwang). Since 1980s there were unceasingly published articles by Chinese historians on Braudel, almost one third of them was devoted to the topic of “long durée”, with such titles as “time and durée”, “Braudel’s long durée theory and its evaluation”, “Braudel’s long durée and Karl Marx’ formation theory”, “Reflections on Braudel, E. Wallerstein, M. Weber”, “World History and Braudel’s ‘Economic World’”, etc. Why Braudel enjoyed high prestige, especially his methods including the long durée theory in Chinese academic circus and among students? Was there any special reason related with the situation in China at that time? Our paper tries to do some explanations in this direction.

2. One of indisputable expressions of Fernand Braudel’s influences in China was that many works of Fernand Braudel were translated into Chinese and published in China, such as “Mediterranean Sea and the Mediterranean World of Epoch of Philippe II” (Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1996), “Material Civilization, Economy and Capitalism, XV – XVIII Centuries” (Beijing: San-Lian Publishing House, 1992), “Grammar of Civilizations” (Guiling: Guangxi Normal University Press, 2003), “Characteristics of France” (History of France), its first volume “Space and Time” (Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1994), its second volume “Man and Thing” (Beijing: Commercial Press, 1996). All these books have had a relative good sale. This fact was an obvious sign of Fernand Braudel’s influence among Chinese readers. Moreover his article specially discussing on “long durée” theory with the title as “History and Social Sciences: long durée” was translated and published even in 1987 in a new Journal “History and Theory”.

3. It was more important that Fernand Braudel and his “long durée” theory broadened Chinese historians’ vision, widened their thinking, promoted their research practice. For example, Fernand Braudel divided historical times into different levels and created corresponding categories to the different time level. Such as the category of structure to the long durée, the category of conjuncture to the middle durée and the category of event to the short durée. Even in 1980s when the “long durée” theory was just introduced into China we could see the impact of this idea of Fernand Braudel on Chinese historians in their researches on Chinese history. For example, why feudalism in China has had a protracted nature? This was an old problem which has gone on for a long time of discussion. In 1980s Chinese historians gradually discovered that the economic structure, political structure, ideological structure have played great role in protraction of feudalism in Chinese history. Obviously, these new elements in Chinese historians’ discourses were the results of using the “long durée” theory. Another example was that in analyzing the reasons of social upheavals in Chinese history, historians started to think about problems of population, production, taxation, prices and tendencies of their changes as one of the important reasons of peasant uprisings and revolution movements.

In Chinese historians’ research practice we could see the overt or covert marks of impact, direct or indirect influences of the “long durée” theory. Some examples:

First was Guo Li-xin’s monography “A Study of Primary Society in the Middle Reaches area of the Yang-zhi River”(Shanghai: Shanghai Ancient Books Press, 2005). Basing on archaeological finds author considered the process of transformation of the primary society in the middle reaches area of the Yang-zhi River from primitive society to civilization epoch during 4300 BC – 2000 BC. Author used the long durée theory and method, totally studied the space, time, environment and population’s changes, division of economic labor, emergence of exchanges and trade in this area on the one hand, and development of settlements, analysis of graves, relationship and evolution of family and personality on the other hand.

Another example was the civilization studies in China. In his works Fernand Braudel usually used the long durée, total history and trans-disciplinary studies together as mixed

method. For example, in “Grammar of Civilizations” Braudel looked at civilization either as “geographical area”, or as “society”, or as “economy”, or as “corrective mentality”. The project of civilization studies just approached the subject of civilization from different angles, and has had all the above mentioned elements, including long durée, total history and trans-disciplinary studies. The project was organized by the Center for Comparative Studies of World Civilizations, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. The project team has already finished and published 12 volumes of “World Civilizations”, and now are working over another 8 volumes of “General Analyses of World Civilizations”. The team members was composed by researchers from different Institutes of CASS, from different fields of social sciences, such as history, philosophy, economic, literature, sociology, religious studies, sinology, anthropology, etc. The trans-disciplinary character was very obvious. The team looked at every civilization as a totality and used different times level for observation of every civilization. Here we could see the influences of Fernand Braudel’s methods, particularly his “long durée” theory.

Masayuki Sato (University of Yamanashi, Japan)

East Asian Annalistic Historiography (Hennen-tai) as a Reflexive Expression of Historical Narrative.

Over the course of 2500 years a style of historical narrative based on the chronological order of events has emerged in East Asia. This style is known as “hennen-tai (Ch. Biannianti).” Such historical accounts are often translated into English as “chronicles,” though this translation does not convey the role and function of the style of “hennen-tai” in the East Asian historiographical context. According to Britannica online, “chronicle” in English simply designates a “continuous historical account of events arranged in order of time without analysis or interpretation.” It is chiefly regarded as a presentation of historical materials for use by the contemporary historian. The East Asian style of “hennen-tai,” however, already includes analysis and interpretation by using commentaries and careful use of meaning-laden Chinese character. It should thus rather be called a “reflexive” style of historical narration. As such it is still seen as the quintessence historical narrative by contemporary East Asian historians, who continue to use it.

Sanjay Seth (Goldsmiths College, University of London, UK)

Historiography after Society.

Recent work has problematized the distinctions between nature and culture, the material and the non-material (or ideological’ and ‘discursive’), and cause and effect, distinctions which were fundamental to the human sciences as they came to be founded and formalised from the 18th C onwards. Historiography is rooted in these distinctions, which it assumes and constantly ‘operationalises’ in its practice; in particular, by assuming that ‘society’ and ‘the social’ are in some sense fundamental (usually, because ‘material’), and that writing history involves ‘explaining’ phenomena by relating them ‘back’ to their social origins or causes. Questionable in themselves, these distinctions, this paper will argue, become especially problematic in writing of non-western pasts. What would happen if historiography took recent critiques of the founding presumptions of the human sciences seriously? What does/would ‘postmodern’, ‘poststructuralist’ or ‘postsocial’ history look like?

Edoardo Tortarolo (University of Eastern Piedmont Amedeo Avogadro, Italy)
The Past as Disturbing Otherness. Presence from the Past in Thomas Carlyle's French Revolution.

Historians are confronted with events, problems, situations whose magnitude and tragic surpassed the scope of everyday language. For them histories are interesting if they challenge the notion that there are unspeakable. By acknowledging that these events and situations are not ordinary, historians defy the conventional way to approach the past and do their best to turn what is unspeakable into a written discourse addressed to an audience that is supposed to understand it and react accordingly. Language and reality confront each other in a shifting balance in historical works. But it is obvious that the catastrophic events, like political upheavals and mass murders, have made historians alert to the limits of language. The Holocaust has been central in focusing the attention of the historians on what has been aptly called the problem of the limits of representation. The 1992 conference at the UCLA organised by Saul Friedlander brought a problem to a head that the linguistic turn on the one hand and the investigation of documents related in various forms to the Holocaust on the other hand had formulated in eventually logically opposite terms. Focusing on the notion of being unspeakable has rejuvenated interest in approaches to history writing before the Holocaust. The subject of this paper is the way Thomas Carlyle has dealt with the French revolution in the 1830s. His treatment of the French revolution lends itself to an analysis of the potential of critical judgement inherent in history writing. According to Carlyle, history writing amounts to a record of God's providence. It is providence that has set a paradigm, a scheme that humankind is supposed to follow. As men have not complied with the divine plan, the historian's task will be first to get a view of the past as a totality, a global perspective of the links between ages, events and individuals, second to assess the degree of obedience that men perform to divine law. Men are structurally inferior to their task, and historians never live up to the requirements of their own discipline. This awareness give Carlyle's narrative a twofold tragic edge: it is the imperfect narration of an imperfect development. Critique of historical texts, of past events and of his own time is therefore inherent in Carlyle's work and deserves a careful interpretation.

Richard T. Vann (Wesleyan University, USA)
Herstoriography as Critique.

Of the varieties of "new history" that have been advertised, achieved, and established themselves in ordinary historical practice, women's history has attracted the most practitioners, generated the greatest number of books, and, potentially at least, raises the most profound and radical theoretical issues.

These, for the most part, have been implicit, slow to emerge, and, as is the habit of historians, usually not overtly discussed. Women's historians—mostly, but not invariably, women historians—have gone about their business, which was, in the first instance, simply to establish the legitimacy of their subject and secure its institutional presence and continuity. This typically took the form of showing that the experience of women in the past was worth investigating—another distinct item in the agenda of "history from below" like that of the working class, enslaved persons, and indigenous sufferers from European imperialism. Many of the earliest works of "herstory"—as some of its proponents called it—studied women's legal disabilities and the struggle of those who were active in the suffragist movement, for higher education for women, and against restrictions on reproductive freedom.

As much was written about nuns and nunneries as about the history of the family, which was seen as the bastion of patriarchy. Spinsters, widows, virgins, and lesbians—women alone—better exemplified how women's agency could be exercised in patriarchal cultures. But as women's history and women's studies secured their place in academic life, historians began to expand this interest in women alone—implied in the neologism "herstory"—so as to integrate women's history into the wider political aims that most of its

proponents endorsed. Joan Scott pointed the way by making the now standard distinction between sex (a physiological characteristic defined by possessing one or another set of reproductive organs) and gender (a social construction of roles). She also—crucially—deconstructed the category “women” itself. She writes that this word can hardly be used without “qualification by factors such as race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, and within these again differentiations in identity and color, which were compounded by political differences within the women’s movement.” Thus “gender history,” which has gradually superseded “women’s history” as a label, gives primary attention to the societal relationships between men and women.

So far this is a story familiar in modern historiography, which has been receptive, and justifiably so, to the insertion of add-ons into its apparently infinitely capacious scope. Our interest here, though, is not in the remarkable accomplishments of “herstory” but in what might be called, if another neologism can be tolerated, “herstoriography.” By that I mean challenges to, and even changes in, the conceptual apparatus of the conventional logic and rhetoric of history-writing in reaction to the widespread participation of women in it.

Understandably, women’s or gender historians have on the whole accepted the conventions of contemporary historical discourse. With a few exceptions they have been content to leave implicit the philosophy of history which is implied by their work as practicing historians. In other words, insofar as women’s or gender history has posed a critique of historiography more generally—and it has been a powerful critique—it has been directed against the over-determined gaps and social amnesia in the way history—even social history—has been written.

But there have been exceptions, to which I now turn. Gender historians like Joan Kelly Gadol have shown how arbitrary is the scheme of periodization that has been imposed on European history (ancient, medieval—sometimes divided into early and late—early modern, and the like) by posing questions like “Did women have a renaissance?” This periodization nevertheless has such a hold that the multi-volume history of women edited by Olwen Hufton reproduces it.

Joan Scott’s emphasis on gender as a social construct depends on the view that the historian must construct gender in her own mind, rather than simply “finding” it. This is a greater use of ideal types than most historians would embrace. Among the standard tropes of both women’s and gender history are bringing to light the hidden, unnoticed, or even invisible women of the past and hearing their previously unheard voices. This should require reconsideration of one of the frequent rhetorical devices that historians, especially men, deploy: the so-called argument from silence. The argument from silence is rhetorical rather than logical, since nothing follows from a negative statement. The huge skewing of our sources towards males should make us more cautious about arguments from the silences of these very sources. It is often rests on the silencing of women.

These are indications that though herstoriography, in the sense of a distinctively feminine way to research, think about, and write history, has not yet developed sufficiently to pose as big a challenge on the formal level as it has on the substantive level, there is no reason to believe that it cannot do so. It is certainly not up to me to criticize women’s historians for not yet doing what male historians have by and large failed to do, nor surely to undertake any of the job myself. I do think, however, that a comment that Virginia Woolf made about the early twentieth-century English novelist Dorothy Richardson is capable of more general application. Richardson preceded Woolf and Joyce in using the technique of stream of consciousness, and Woolf said that she had invented “the psychological sentence of the feminine gender.” Need that sort of sentence be confined to novels? Am I wrong in detecting a masculinist bias not only in the choice of subjects which have dominated historical writing for almost all its history—affairs of state, wars, diplomacy, and constitutional change—but also in its emphasis on agency and easy acceptance of power relationships? Agency and intention, after all, are intrinsic to many theories of historical explanation, just as well-made stories typify its narrative strategies. But if, as I suspect, patience as well as agency and a more acute sense of how plans miscarry and events swirl rather than sort themselves into comprehensible patterns are especially true of women’s historical experience, the

“psychological sentence of the feminine gender” may be required to represent that historical reality.

Irmline Veit-Brause (Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia)

Historical Knowledge and Critique: The History Wars and the Hidden Agendas.

One important dimension of reflexivity in history is the history of historiography which may have the power ‘to historicize’ one’s own position, so to speak. The controversies that preceded the reception and acceptance of a new *Sichtweise*, a new approach to historical research and writing are not always labeled ‘wars.’ That is a term I take from the debate in Australia about the --often criminal and bloody-- relationship between white settlers and indigenous populations.

In my paper I will compare imperatives and motivations, and the pervading *Zeitgeist* governing the strategies used by practitioners in major shifts, and of course the enabling conditions of institutional conditions and funding opportunities. I distinguish between motivations arising from *lebensweltliche* experiences and discipline internal motivations. My examples are: The shift in West German historiography to ‘Social history’ focused on Werner Conze and his *Arbeitskreis fuer Sozialgeschichte*, meticulously analyzed by Thomas Etzmueller; the shift in American history writing to ‘Cultural history’, and I base my analysis on Geoff Eley, *A Crooked Line*; and the expansion of historical thinking into areas much beyond history proper, as analyzed by John E. Toews in *Becoming Historical*. Australian ‘history wars’ that lent the controversies about almost forgotten indigenous history a particularly vicious element, constitute a backdrop, especially regarding the entanglement between history-writing and political exigencies, and the wrangling over a history curriculum.

Lakatos once wrote that at some point a research program becomes exhausted and is replaced by another. How did historians, standing under the imperatives of “novelty” and “originality” branch out to new fields and approaches, yet still remain within the larger discipline of history? How did they achieve hegemony – even if only for a limited time? The processes of reception, acceptance and validity guarantees will be offer some insights toward answering these questions. In all these examples, the choices made on ethical and/or aesthetic grounds (Hayden White) matter profoundly though in different degrees of importance.

Q. Edward Wang (Rowan University, USA/Peking University, PRC)

The Power of Paradox: The Double-Edged Effect of the Postcolonial Challenge to Modern Historiography.

Postcolonialism is born and reared in a paradox: it is at once an offshoot of cultural developments in the modern West as well as a persistent attempt to engage in a relentless criticism with them. This characteristic perhaps is best shown in its assault on modern historiography, one that has documented and still houses the very target of its criticism—the establishment of modernity in the West and its paradigmatic and paradoxical influence around the world. At the same time, the way in which postcolonial critics wage their attacks on modernity has benefited from the very means that first emerged in modern Western scholarship and the spread of which was also associated with the expansion of colonialism from the West to the world. In terms of its influence in historical writing, postcolonial historiography often coincides with the similar concerns self-reflexively addressed by scholars in the Western academic world. Its call for studying the “subaltern,” or the groups and peoples below the normal societal strata or on the margins of a given society or culture, serves as a good example, for it has merged effectively with the intriguing trend of “history from below” among contemporary historians in Euro-America beginning in the post-WWII period. This trend has been part and parcel of the project to transcend the paradigm of nationalist history writing, one of the foci in postcolonial challenge to modern historiography. However, as this paper reveals, the effect of this challenge is double-edged: as soon as

postcolonialism dismantles the paradigm of nationalist history as a symbol of hegemonic influence of modern Western culture, it also undercuts the efficacy of the combat against Western hegemony it intended to help, for nationalist history writing has proved to be an effective way in fighting off the Western expansion.

Hayden White (University of California, Santa Cruz, USA)

The Practical Past.

In one of his last works, Michel Oakshott drew a distinction between "the historical past" and "the practical past" in ways that have disturbing implications for the effort to establish historical studies as a scientific discipline. Oakshott argued that the more scientific historical studies become, the more they are removed from any possibility of contributing to the cultivation of what Kant called "practical reason." Do professional historians own the past in ways that render impossible any reflection on it for practical purposes? Are the criteria adequate to the establishment of "historical truth" pertinent to the attempt to use the past for practical purposes? Is the practical use of the past or knowledge of it always and inevitably mistaken?

Zhu Zhenghui (East China Normal University, Shanghai, CHINA)

Zhang Xuecheng: Historical Criticism in China.

Zhang Xuecheng (1738-1801), was a great historical theoretician in Qing Dynasty, China. His major academic book is "Wen-Shi-Tong-Yi". He made some important exposition in his research on Chinese historiography, including the purpose of historical studies, the methods of historical studies, especially the historical criticism. His academic achievements had been observed by the scholars from United States, France, Japan, South Korea and many countries. Also, his books had been cherished by the scholars as oriental theoretical heritage. I think to study his historical theories may be useful to us, through this topic, we can understand the historical criticism tradition in China, and, to accumulate these theories may be very useful too, for promoting the historical criticism today.