

HISTORY AND THEORY

(HIS2C01)



STUDY MATERIAL

II SEMESTER
CORE COURSE

M.A. HISTORY
(2019 Admission onwards)

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT
SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION
CALICUT UNIVERSITY P.O.
MALAPPURAM - 673 635, KERALA

190505

**SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT**

STUDY MATERIAL

SECOND SEMESTER

**M.A. HISTORY
(2019 Admission onwards)**

CORE COURSE:

HIS2C01 : HISTORY AND THEORY

Prepared by:

**Dr. MYTHRI P U
Assistant Professor (on contract)
Department of History
University of Calicut**

Scrutinized by:

**Sri. MUJEEB RAHIMAN K.G.
Assistant Professor
Department of History
Govt. Arts & Science College
Calicut**

CONTENTS

Module I	Enlightenment and the Perception of Historical Past	7
Module II	History and Classical Social theory	35
Module III	The Annales	63
Module IV	Methodological Debates and Contemporary Trends	84

Module 1

Enlightenment and the Perception of Historical Past

Vico

Giovanni Battista Vico (1668–1744) spent most of his professional life as Professor of Rhetoric at the University of Naples. He was trained in jurisprudence, but read widely in Classics, philology, and philosophy, all of which informed his highly original views on history, historiography, and culture. His thought is most fully expressed in his mature work, the *Scienza Nuova* or *The New Science*. In his own time, Vico was relatively unknown, but from the nineteenth century onwards his views found a wider audience and today his influence is widespread in the humanities and social sciences. In his own time Vico's work was largely neglected and generally misunderstood—he describes himself living as a “stranger” and “quite unknown” in his native city (Vita, 134)—and it was not until the nineteenth century that his thought began to make a significant impression on the philosophical world. The earliest known disseminator of Vico's views in the English-speaking world is Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who was responsible for much of the interest in Vico in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Vico's ideas reached a wider audience with a German translation of *The New Science* by W.E. Weber which appeared in 1822, and, more significantly, through a French version by Jules Michelet in 1824, which was reissued in 1835.

Michelet's translation was widely read and was responsible for a new appreciation of Vico's work in France. Subsequently, Vico's views impacted the work of Wilhelm Dilthey, Karl Marx, R.G. Collingwood, and James Joyce.

Twentieth century scholarship has established illuminating comparisons with the tradition of Hegelian idealism, and taken up the relationship between Vico's thought and that of philosophers in the western tradition and beyond, including Plato, Aristotle, Ibn Khaldun, Thomas Hobbes, Benedict de Spinoza, David Hume, Immanuel Kant, and Friedrich Nietzsche. Comparisons and connections have also been drawn between Vichean themes and the work of various modern and contemporary thinkers, inter alia W.B. Yeats, Friedrich Froebel, Max Horkheimer, Walter Benjamin, Martin Heidegger, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Jürgen Habermas, Paul Ricoeur, Jean-Francois Lyotard, and Alisdair MacIntyre. As a review of recent and current literature demonstrates, an appreciation of Vico's thought has spread far beyond philosophy, and his ideas have been taken up by scholars within a range of contemporary disciplines, including anthropology, cultural theory, education, hermeneutics, history, literary criticism, psychology, and sociology. Thus despite obscure beginnings, Vico is now widely regarded as a highly original thinker who anticipated central currents in later philosophy and the human sciences

To illustrate the difference between modern thought and ancient thought, Vico developed a remarkable theory of the imagination. This theory led to an account of myth based on

ritual and imitation that would resemble some twentieth century anthropological theories. He also developed an account of the development of human institutions that contrasts sharply with his contemporaries in social contract theory. Vico's account centered on the class struggle that prefigures nineteenth and twentieth century discussions.

Vico's idea of the ideal eternal history is, along with the *verum-factum* principle, Vico's most famous concept. The ideal eternal history can be thought of loosely as a Platonic ideal. Stated in the abstract, the ideal eternal history is the perfect course through which all nations pass. In practice, each nation travels through it slightly differently.

Vico describes this ideal eternal history most colorfully when he gives this axiom: "Men first felt necessity, then look for utility, next attend to comfort, still later amuse themselves with pleasure, thence grow dissolute in luxury, and finally go mad and waste their substance". It is possible in the quote to see the same emphasis on utility that Vico had in the Universal Law. However, what changes is that this history is now presented clearly as a circular motion in which nations rise and fall. Nations eternally course and recourse through this cycle passing through these eras over and over again.

Vico divides the ideal eternal history into three ages which he adopts from Varro. Vico first used these three ages in the Universal Law but now he presents it with more clarity. Indeed, Book IV of the *New Science* is a comparison of how different human institutions existed differently in the three ages of history. Clearly the history of Rome is again Vico's primary model for the ideal eternal history.

The first age is the age of gods. In this age, poetic wisdom is very strong. Again, there is an aristocracy of fathers who know how to control themselves and others through religion. These fathers, which Vico calls theological poets, rule over small asylums and the famuli who are wandering outsiders who come to them seeking protection. The famuli is the term Vico now uses for those who wandered into the lands of the fathers in the Universal Law.

The second age is the age of heroes. In this age, the family transform from being simple slaves to plebeians who want some of the privileges of the rulers. The theological poets transform into heroes. These heroes show their strength by fighting each other as illustrated in Homer. However, for Vico, the most important conflict is not between the heroes but between the heroes and the plebeians fighting for their own privileges.

The third age is the age of humans. Divine providence orchestrates the class wars so that the heroes inadvertently undermine themselves by conceding certain powers to the plebeians. The plebeians are able to build these concessions in order to advance a new way of thinking. In the previous ages, society was ruled by poetic wisdom which controlled all actions through ritual. In order to undermine the power of these rituals, the plebeians slowly found ways to assert the power of conceptual wisdom, which is the ability to think scientifically and rationally. This way of thinking gives the plebeians more power and removes the stranglehold of poetic wisdom on humanity.

Unfortunately, while this conceptual wisdom gives the plebeians their freedom, it undermines the cultural unity provided by poetic wisdom. While all in society become free and equal, the religious inspiration to work for the common good rather than the individual becomes lost. Society eventually splinters into a barbarism of reflection in which civil wars are fought solely for personal gain. This is the barbarism of reflection which returns society to its origin.

One of the major debates about the ideal eternal history is whether it is a circle or a spiral. Those who suggest that it is a spiral hold that each time a nation goes through the ideal eternal history, it improves. Those who suggest it is a circle hold that each cycle of the ideal eternal history really does reduce it back to its beginning. Unfortunately, this appears to be an instance where Vico had to remain silent because, had he tried to resolve the issue, he would have had to make some sort of comment on the relation of the church to society which he was not prepared to do. As a result, the debate about how best to read the ideal eternal history continues.

David Hume

David Hume (1711–1776) was a product of Scottish enlightenment and was associated with Anti Cartesianism begun by Vico and reoriented philosophy in the direction of history. He demonstrated that history was a legitimate and valid type of knowledge because history did not promise more than it could perform and it did not depend on any metaphysical hypotheses.

Hume's thorough going empiricism resulted in his skepticism about causality, thus destroying the rational approach to God and the world. His high conception of history made him favour history over philosophical studies. In his essay, "On the study of history", Hume refers to history as an "agreeable entertainment" more interesting than fiction. He applied his principles of philosophy to historical knowledge and showed that historical knowledge is a system of reasonable beliefs based on testimony.

Hume demonstrated that history is a legitimate and valid type of knowledge. He wrote that no other kind of knowledge is more than a system of reasonable beliefs and ancient history did not decay with mere length. He also criticized the idea that human society had originated by a 'social contract'. His rational thinking is very clear in his philosophical piece, 'The treatise of Human Nature' which he wrote at the age of twenty-eight.

Hume hoped to discover in history the causes of the rise and fall of nations and to see in it all the human race pass and review before him. Most of the enlightenment historians including Hume, Gibbon etc. retained the Judeo-Christian teleological view that history was moving and progressing towards a goal. But they consciously shed its theological aspect, rationalized the historical process, and secularized the goal.

Hume's 'History of England' in six volumes was published between 1745 and 1762 and the work covered the story of Britain from Julius Caesar's invasion of the island to

the glorious revolution of 1688. In this work, Hume has analyzed the rise of history of England-its rise and what led to its greatness and the disastrous effects that religion has had on its progress.

Johann Herder

Johann Gottfried Von Herder (1744–1803) was the harbinger of German Romantic movement and was also an innovator in philosophy of history and culture. His work, ‘Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit’ (Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man) published between 1784 and 1791 anticipated Darwin in its claim that all and inorganic life is connected and evolving progressively toward human beings, the highest forms of life. It is divided into four parts and according to historian R.G. Collingwood, it is “a marvelous quantity of fertile and valuable thoughts”. He turned the interests of historians away from political and diplomatic history and toward social, cultural and intellectual history. For him, history as a whole is a purely natural history of human forces, actions and instincts.

Herder proposed a racial division of mankind with evolution of differentiation of mankind into various races, each race closely related to its geographical environment. Among the races thus formed, he held the Europeans as privileged higher form owing to the geographical and climatic peculiarities of Europe. Herder’s philosophy of history and culture caused a ferment of fundamental thinking in Germany known as ‘Romanticism’, and sowed the seeds of cultural nationalism nurtured later by Goethe, Kant, Hegel etc. The

whole movement was based on the primacy of feeling and emotion; and from Germany, its influence spread throughout Europe.

Herder's philosophy of national culture and national character was rooted in Romanticism. He declared that all true culture or civilization must rise from native roots, the 'volk' (life of common people)-and not from the cosmopolitan life of the upper classes. Each civilization, according to him is a biological and spiritual entity, a plant, an organism with its own birth, maturity, decline and death. Each national culture is a unique entity with its own inherent character, its own language, religion, moral code, literature and art. It is this national culture that moulds national character and determined the history of people.

Herder exhorted historians to sympathize with the nation and feel themselves into it. He went against the enlightenment historians and asserted that everything is relatively right into its own historical context. His ideas on race and cultural nationalism were later used in assertion of superiority of Europeans and imperialism.

Romanticism

The expression 'Romantic' became popular during its own time, roughly 1780-1850. But, even within its period of existence, few romantics would have agreed on general meaning. The 'philosophes' of the Enlightenment held a conception of human nature as something uniform and unchanging and treated certain ages of the past like Middle

Ages as primitive and barbaric. Romanticism appeared in conflict with such ideas of the Enlightenment. It is said to have shook the comfortable 18th century 'philosophes' out of their intellectual single-mindedness. The Romanticists looked upon life and its interpretation as based more on feeling than on thought. According to them, enlightenment stifled imagination, sensitivity, feelings, spontaneity and freedom. For the romanticists, the medium of thought itself was feeling. The skepticism, rationalism and intellectualism of the age of reason came to be challenged everywhere by faith and feeling, imagination and mystery, sentiment and romance.

Jean Jacques Rousseau was the inspirer, and messiah of the Romantic Movement. Romanticism was Rousseau's call back to naturalness and freedom, a call for originality, for direct experience and unhindered expression. The romantic tide swept Europe between Rousseau and Darwin. A literature of feeling, sentiment and passion flowed from Germany, England and France. Self-consciousness appears as one of the key elements of Romanticism itself. Romanticism humanized history by divesting it of its pragmatic role as the orator and teacher of prudence and virtue and with humanization came a vast widening of scope of history. The romantic love of the mysterious and unknown contributed to a new interest in strange and distant societies and civilizations such as the Chinese, Arab, Indian, Persian and Egyptian. Unlike the enlightenment historians who viewed the past ages with contempt and disgust, romanticists regarded it with

sympathy and respect. They found in such ages the expression of genuine and valuable human achievements.

Romanticist sympathy for primitive times and for the Middle Ages became an asset which vastly enriched the historical outlook. According to Collingwood, 'this love for the past did not develop into a futile nostalgia for the past as such, owed to another conception of romanticism-the conception of history as a progress, a development of human reason or the education of mankind'. For a romantic historian a past age like the Middle Ages was important doubly-partly because it was of permanent value in itself, as a unique achievement of the human mind; and partly as taking place in a course of development leading onto things of still greater value. So, romantic historiography unlike enlightenment historiography thought of the whole past as one and therefore no part of it was neglected as unworthy of study.

The romanticists emphasized the differences between different ages and different national groups. Rousseau and Herder laid the emotional and philosophical basis of the nationalist creed. The sympathy and admiration felt by the romanticists for the Middle Ages led to an imitation of the mystic and capricious standards of those past centuries. Romanticist insistence on feeling and passion linked literature and historiography more than ever. This also became the cause for criticism as well. Instead of being investigators of truth, some romanticists in a way mystified human life and history. They tried to make history attractive by indulging in fanciful

depictions and compromised in pursuit of rational causes in history.

The romanticist-nationalist view of history propped up dangerous theories of race and culture which provided the ideological basis, for the phenomenon of modern imperialism. It led later to the notion of Aryan superiority and the 'civilizing mission' of the non whites and justification for colonialism.

Nationalism

Modern Nationalism is a powerful sentiment. The national spirit is sometimes given a spiritual character, as the will of the people to live together. This sentiment of unity is usually produced by community of race, language, religion, geographic unity, common political aspirations, and above all, common historical development. The nation-state has become the normal form of political organization in the modern period. The deep emotional basis of romanticism not only stimulated nationalism but linked literature and historiography closely.

The romantic historians were good at evoking the spirit of nation's past and they shifted the universal outlook to national outlook and held that there were certain unconscious creative forces which operate in the development of the nation. They treated each nation as a unit of human culture. The nationalist emphasis on people rather than state had the effect of transforming the exclusive idea of political history more comprehensively, embracing the material and spiritual development of man in society.

The spirit of resurgent nationalism gave a strong impetus to historical studies and supplied a powerful motive for

historical investigation in so far as people endeavored to trace the roots of their national identity. Thus, the 19th century which as the century of nationalism in Europe as also the century of great history writing; its historical output as so vast that any survey of it is bound to be narrowly selective.

The prominence given to the history of separate nations gradually stressed the superiority of one nation over the other. The nationalist histories often carried apolitical message and were didactic in nature. Intended for the political education of the nation, they aimed at inculcating a larger patriotism, training virile citizens, avenging national humiliations and redeeming national honour. In nationalist historiography, national glorification often ended up in the worship of state power and glorification of war.

According to Ernest Gellner: ‘Nationalism is a political principle that holds that national and political units should be congruent. Living in modern times, people tend to take nation and state for granted and moreover, tend to take them to be more or less the same thing because they appear as very nearly the same things. For this coming together of state and nation, there are clearly three pre-Nationalism conditions - there should be a state; there should be a nation; and finally, they should be nationalism to tell the other two that they are meant for each other and cannot live without each other.

There is a terminological and conceptual question of distinguishing nationalism from patriotism. A popular proposal is the contrast between attachment to one’s country as defining patriotism and attachment to one’s people and its traditions as

defining nationalism. There is a fair amount of agreement about the classical, historically paradigmatic form of nationalism. It typically features the supremacy of the nation's claims over other claims to individual allegiance and full sovereignty as the persistent aim of its political program. Territorial sovereignty has traditionally been seen as a defining element of state power and essential for nationhood. It was extolled in classic modern works by Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau and is returning to center stage in the debate, though philosophers are now more skeptical.

In recent times, the focus has moved more in the direction of “liberal nationalism”, the view that mitigates the classical claims and tries to bring together the pro-national attitude and the respect for traditional liberal values. For instance, the territorial state as political unit is seen by classical nationalists as centrally “belonging” to one ethnic-cultural group and as actively charged with protecting and promulgating its traditions. The liberal variety allows for “sharing” of the territorial state with non-dominant ethnic groups. Classical nationalism is the political program that sees the creation and maintenance of a fully sovereign state owned by a given ethno-national group (“people” or “nation”) as a primary duty of each member of the group. Starting from the assumption that the appropriate (or “natural”) unit of culture is an ethno-nation, it claims that a primary duty of each member is to abide by one's recognizably ethno-national culture in all cultural matters.

Liberal nationalists see liberal-democratic principles and pro-national attitudes as belonging together. Of course, some

things have to be sacrificed: that either the meaningfulness of a community or its openness must be sacrificed to some extent as we cannot have them both. Liberal nationalists diverge about the value of multiculturalism. There are two important theories regarding the origin of nation -primordialism and constructivism. Primordialism is the theory that nations have a national identity embedded; nations are rooted in a common cultural heritage and language, and often trace the origin of nation to the pre-modern period. The constructivist theory work upon the theory that a national identity is forged in response to social and historical circumstance in which nationalism is the method of finding replacement for the loss of some cultural concept and assume nation is a modern phenomena and it is often linked to the emergence of industrial economies.

Positivism and History as Science

Positivism emerged out of a situation in which there was tremendous optimism centered on the cognitive power of science evolved at a specific juncture of European history when the entire social landscape altered because of the scientific revolution, the Enlightenment and the French revolution. The roots of early positivism could be found in the first half of the nineteenth century in France, to be more precise-the state of post-revolutionary France. There was a significant change in the domain of knowledge. The separation of science and philosophy became inevitable; new scientific journals started appearing, and a close link between science and industry was established. It was felt that there was a single scientific method applicable to all fields of study.

Auguste Comte (1798-1857), is considered to be the founder of positivism, he saw the contradiction between the two social forces of the period: theological/ military and scientific/ industrial. He felt that this contradiction could be resolved only by the triumph of the scientific/industrial society. Scientists, as he saw all around, were replacing theologians as the moral guardians of the new social order, and industrialists were replacing the warriors. Comte shared the Enlightenment assertion that it was possible for science to grasp the workings of the world. He believed that positivist or scientific knowledge was the inevitable outcome of the progressive growth of the individual mind as well as the historical development of human knowledge.

What made Comte immortal in the discipline was his celebrated 'law of three stages'. First, he spoke of the theological stage: a stage in which the mind explains phenomena or mundane occurrences by ascribing them to the unfathomable gods. The fact is that without some guide one cannot begin to make systematic observations. And sciences in their infancy could not escape the questions relating to the essences of phenomena and their ultimate origins to which theological answers are most appropriate. Second, he spoke of the metaphysical stage in which abstract forces, powers and essences, rather than spiritual forces, are considered responsible for worldly affairs. And finally, as Comte argued, there was a positive or scientific stage in which we abandon the search for ultimate origins, purposes, or abstract forces, and become more concrete and focused: we observe the

relations between phenomena, and arrive at laws because the aim of positive philosophies to consider all phenomena as subject to invariable natural laws. In other words, positivist knowledge is empirical and universal; something that is concrete and demonstrable. Comte was a great proponent of science. He believed in the essential Enlightenment notion of progress and in the arrival of the new age of scientific objectivity. Auguste Comte provided the intellectual foundation of positivist theory.

Positivism in history was a reaction to Romanticism. Romanticism made historical work more imaginative, while positivism viewed all facts and events of the past in their evolutionary order. Romanticism made individuals the centre of attraction, conceived of organic connections and studied the concepts of liberty and progress; positivism rejected individualism and talked of masses, races, societies and tendencies. Romanticism had overthrown instructive, moralizing and serviceable history; positivism insisted on the interdependence of social factors.

Positivism boasted that it made history a science and that it stands for actual, absolute, dependable knowledge derived by the application of scientific methods of inquiry, as in the natural sciences. Scientific revolution of 17th century gave impetus to the attempt to make historical knowledge scientific. The influence of positivism on history could be best seen in the growth of a kind of history marked by meticulous care for details. The result was an unprecedented increase of detailed and carefully sifted historical material, whether literary,

epigraphic or archaeological, and this started the scientific and positive course of historical understanding.

Rankean positivism

Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886), the nineteenth-century German historian, is generally considered as the founding father of the Empirical historiography. The Danish scholar Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776-1831) is generally considered as the pioneer of this new critical method and the source-based historical research. He used the advanced method of linguistic studies and textual analysis for the study of the sources and writing of his book, *History of Rome*, which was published in 1811-12. Although Niebuhr was a crucial figure in developing method of history-writing, it was Ranke who must be credited with the beginning of the modern historiography. In 1824, he published his first book, *The History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations* and in the book he wrote the passage which became the foremost justification of empirical historiography: ‘To history has been assigned the task of judging the past, of instructing the present for the benefit of the future ages. To such lofty functions this work does not aspire. Its aim is merely to show how it really was.’

The Rankean approach to history-writing can be summarised as follows:

1) Ranke believed that the past should be understood in its own terms and not those of the present. The attitudes and behaviour of the people of the past ages should be discerned by the incisive study of that particular period and should not be

viewed by the parameters of the historian's own age. In Ranke's opinion, the historian should avoid the present-centric concerns while studying the past and should try to understand what issues were important to the people of the age he/she was studying. This idea of Ranke and the Empirical school introduced the notion of historicity. It meant that past has its own nature which was different from the present. It is the duty of the historian to uncover the spirit of a particular age.

2) Ranke was an Empiricist who believed that the knowledge is derived only through the sense experience. And the knowledge of the past can come from the sources which are the objective embodiments of the experiences of the people of that particular period. Thus the historian should rely only on the material available in the sources. The historian should not take recourse to imagination or intuition. Any statement to be made about the past should find reference among the sources.

3) But Ranke was also critical towards the sources and did not have blind faith in them. He knew that all sources were not of equal value. He, therefore, advocated the hierarchy of the sources. He gave priority to the sources which were contemporary with the events. These are known as the primary sources. Among these, the records produced by the participants or direct observers should be given preference to those written by others in the same period. Then there are the other sources produced by people later on. These are known as the secondary sources and should be accorded lesser credence than the primary sources while studying the events. Thus the precise dating of all sources became a matter of prime concern.

4) Ranke also emphasised the importance of providing references. This way all the assertions and statements could be supported by giving full details of sources from which they were derived. Here he further refined and elaborated the technique already followed by Gibbon and other historians before him. This practice was important because it provided the opportunity to cross-check the evidences cited by the historians. This would lead to corrections and modifications of the views and interpretations of historians.

5) Ranke differentiated between facts and interpretations. He emphasised on the primacy of facts which were supported by the evidences based on the sources. The historians job is to first establish facts and then interpret them. Thus, in Ranke's opinion, the historian should not look into the sources to confirm his/her hypotheses, but, instead, build his/her hypotheses on the basis of the facts found in the sources.

Ranke and his followers not only established the methodology for professional history but also helped in developing the institutions to support it. Ranke started graduate seminars in the University of Berlin in 1833 where young researchers were systematically trained. It created a group of scholars in Germany in the 1840s who were devoted and who were involved in writing professional history. Even before that, in 1823, the Prussian government had started the publication of *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* which strove to publish all important sources for German medieval history for the historians. Ranke conceptualised history as a rigorous science which should abstain from metaphysical speculations

and value judgments. He further emphasised that the historians must put the sources to philological criticism in order to determine their veracity. In contrast to the Comtean positivism, Ranke stressed the uniqueness of the events and not their universality. For him, it was important to look for the exact details and not for the general laws.

Critics of Positivism

There has been widespread criticism of the positivist and empiricist views of history. Even since the Rankean era there have been historians who criticised this trend of history-writing. Johan Gustav Droysen (1808-1884), professor of History at Berlin from 1859 to 1884, described the objective approach of Ranke as ‘the objectivity of a eunuch’. The work of Jacob Burckhardt (1818-97), Professor of History at Basle from 1845, provided an alternative approach to that of Ranke. He was a disciple of Ranke, but reacted against his method of history-writing and followed the approach of Augustin Thierry (1795-1856) and Jules Michelet (1798-1874). Thierry and Michelet criticised the straightforward empiricism and gave rise to ideas which are associated with the school of ‘historical romanticism’. This trend of historiography stressed the points which the Rankean and Positivist schools had rejected. The historians associated with this trend emphasised the importance of historian’s intervention in the writing of history. They believed that the historian should be passionate and committed rather than detached. They also emphasised the moral side of history-writing in opposition to rational approach. The local and the particular were given more

importance as against universal and general. The history of the community as a whole was emphasised as against the approach which gave prominence to the leaders. As Thierry said that his aim in writing history was to ‘envisage the destiny of peoples and not of certain famous men, to present the adventures of social life and not those of the individual’. This school believed in the importance of literary skills in the writing of history and stressed that history was as much art as it was science. They criticised empiricism for its cult of sources and its emphasis on neutral interpretation. They, in its place, stressed the role of sentiments and feelings in history-writing.

Although there were many historians even before 1914 who seriously questioned the possibility of a scientific, neutral and value-free history, the events of the First World War and their aftermath severely jolted the belief that historical accounts could be produced which would satisfy persons of all nationalities. In fact, the historians of many countries wrote histories which contradicted the ones written by those in other countries. They interpreted events which justified their respective nations. Even though there were exceptions to this rule, the overall tendency was to write nationalist histories rather than ‘scientific’ histories. In fact, the nationalist histories were flaunted as scientific histories.

The Rankean and Positivist ideals of producing ‘scientific’ and ‘objective’ history came under severe strain. The Positivists believed in the methods and ‘truths’ of the natural sciences. They wanted to apply these methods to the study of society as well. Hence, they designated these disciplines as

social sciences. They believed that, by the use of inductive methods, it was possible to predict about the future of society as in the natural sciences. But in the 20th century, the nature of the natural sciences also changed at theoretical level. Albert Einstein's General Theory of Relativity, propounded in 1913, changed the very nature of research in natural sciences. The thinking about history was also influenced by these developments. The Positivist certainty and Rankean objectivity now seemed a thing of the past. Many thinkers now emphasised the relativistic nature of history. Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911) in Germany, Benedetto Croce (1866-1952) in Italy and R.G. Collingwood (1889-1943) in England were among the more influential thinkers in this regard. Croce declared that 'All history is contemporary history' which meant that history is written always in the light of the present concern and is shaped by the ideological tool available to the historian in his/her own era. The American historian, Carl Becker, denied the existence of facts at all by saying that 'the facts of history do not exist for any historian till he creates them'. Collingwood went even further by provocatively stating that 'all history is the history of thought'. Their views received wide acceptance among historians. The role of the historian now acquired huge prominence, as the role of sources had early on. The work of interpretation was always considered the prerogative of the historian. But now even the decision about what should be considered as facts was thought to be the privilege of the historian. As E.H.Carr states that 'the necessity to establish these basic facts rests not on any quality of the facts themselves, but on a priori decision of the historian'. The

facts no longer spoke for themselves, as was the case with the empiricists; they now have to be made to speak in the diction of the historian.

Positivism sought to give a 'scientific status' to the discipline. The search for precision, objectivity, causality and value neutrality made it acceptable. This positivist social science found its logical culmination in the cult of numbers, in the mathematization of social phenomena, in the urge to reduce qualitative human experiences into quantified statistical figures. It is possible to say that what is applicable in the domain of nature is not necessarily applicable in the domain of human society. Because, unlike nature, society consists of self-reflexive agents who think, argue, contest, and through their practices and actions transform the world. Hence society cannot be subject to abstract/universal generalizations. Positivism, it is alleged, undermines the creativity, reflexivity and agency of social actors and that it reduces history to a mere technique, separated from moral/political issues. Positivism can prove to be pro-establishment, status-quoist, non-critical and non-reflexive. In the twentieth century this critique of positivism came rather sharply from critical theorists, or the adherents of the Frankfurt School of Marxism. Post-modernists deconstruct the very foundation of science and thus for post-modernists, positivism loses its cognitive power and legitimacy.

Hegelian philosophy of History

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) is a German thinker who devoted his life wholly to academic pursuits. His

science of logic, dialectical reasoning, encyclopedia of philosophical sciences, and philosophy of Right – all provide an intellectual foundation for modern nationalism. Hegel was an idealist who methodically constructed a comprehensive system of thought about the world. Hegel held that Reality must be Rational and that its ultimate structure is revealed in the structure of our thought. He attempts to give an elaborate, comprehensive and systematic ontology from a logical standpoint.

Hegel was a product of German Idealism, which drew considerable inspiration from Rousseau and Kant and integrated it with contemporary popular desire for German unification leading to the rise of the nation states in Europe. Hegel wrote extensively on various aspects of Political Philosophy. Hegel's writings show that several philosophers and thinkers of the past intensely influenced him. Hegel borrowed his dialectical method from Socrates. One can also discern some influence of Aristotle's teleology on Hegel. Teleology is a theory of knowledge according to which a thing is understood in terms of its end or purpose. The great German rationalist Immanuel Kant's influence is also discernible in Hegel's writings.

The Hegelian idea that the state is founded on reason and the laws made by the state are the dictates of pure reason is quite similar to the Kantian position. Rousseau's General Will influenced him and the Hegelian Idea, Spirit or Reason is infallible. Again like Rousseau, Hegel gives primacy to public interest over the private interest. Hegel's philosophy was

historicist in nature. Historicism is a doctrine, which is variously understood by different thinkers. In its most general sense it is rooted in the assumption that there are limits to scientific knowledge about human activities and achievements and such inadequate scientific knowledge cannot be used as a means for controlling the future course of events. Contrary to this, historicism is linked to ambitions for subjecting all human happenings to rational control.

Hegel's philosophy of history is contained in the lectures that he delivered while he was at the Berlin University. He does not attach much importance to the material things. He views them merely as the cumulative result of evolution of absolute Idea. Absolute idea is dynamic and ever evolving. It moves forward in search of self-realization. This is termed by Hegel as unfolding of the reason. The whole universe is the result of this process of unfolding of Reason. In fact, Hegel's philosophy of history is somewhat similar to the Christian theology, which sees history as a pattern of meaningful events which can be understood in terms of cosmic design. It is unfolding of reason under God's guidance or as willed by God. The Absolute Idea moves forward in an evolutionary process. In this evolutionary process the absolute Idea or the spirit takes many forms, discarding the earlier ones and getting newer ones. The first stage in this evolution is the physical or the inorganic world. At this initial stage the Absolute Idea (or Spirit) acquires the form of gross matter. The second stage in this process is the organic world: animals, plants etc. This stage is an improvement on the earlier stage. The third stage is

the evolution of human beings. Each stage is more complicated than the previous stage. The evolution of human beings marks a qualitatively higher stage because the human beings are rational agents capable of distinguishing between good and bad. The fourth stage marks the evolution of family system, in addition to rational element it involves mutual cooperation and accommodation. The fifth stage marks the evolution of Civil Society. Here economic interdependence is the main feature in addition to mutual cooperation and accommodation. The last and highest stage witnesses the evolution of the state, which represents a perfect moral order.

Hegel argues that family symbolizes unity; civil society symbolizes particularity and the state symbolizes universality. The unity of the family, particularity of the civil society is realized with the appearance of the state as the actuality of the universal order. Both the family and civil society are to some degree rational but only the state is perfectly rational and perfectly ethical. In short, the evolutionary process passes through the following stages and each successive stage is a distinct improvement on the predecessor stages: Inorganic world - organic world - human beings - family - civil society – State. It should be noted that with the help of the above argument Hegel tried to solve the basic problem about the relationship between matter and Spirit. He did so by arguing that matter is only a manifestation of Spirit in its crude form. Matter is not only a negation of Spirit but also the conscious realization of Spirit. The second important dimension of

Hegel's philosophy of history is the doctrine of

historicism. It is difficult to explain this doctrine. Broadly speaking, historicism is a doctrine, which holds that the whole course of history is predetermined course. The human intervention or human effort can be effective only if it falls in line with the dialectical direction of the world history. Like the stoic God history leads the wise man and drags the fool. The third major dimension of Hegel's philosophy of history is the use of Aristotelian teleology. According to it everything in the world is moving towards the realization of its end, its true nature. From the point of view of the human actors, history is a union of irony and tragedy; from the point of view of the Whole it is cyclic. When we look at Hegel's philosophy of history in its totality we can say that it is an attempt to synthesize Kant's and Herder's philosophies of history. Kant advocated scientific understanding of history, while Herder emphasized the place of feelings and speculation. In this sense Hegel's philosophy of history is speculative reason. For Hegel the world history exhibits the development of the consciousness of freedom on the part of Spirit.

Hegel actually applies his philosophy of history when he says that in the oriental world (China etc) there was despotism and slavery and freedom was confined only to the monarch. But in Greek and Roman civilizations although slavery was there, yet the citizens enjoyed freedom. In Europe particularly in Germany there is emphasis on liberty for all and infinite worth of each individual is recognized. The world history thus consists of definite stages of progression-Oriental, Greek, Roman and Germanic. In short, Hegel's philosophy of history

consists of two parts: (i) the general pattern and (ii) various stages in this general pattern. Finally, Hegel's philosophy of history talks of doctrine of moving forces in historical change. He argues that Reason's great design can be carried out with the help of human passions. Certain great men (like Caesar or Alexander) are chosen as instruments of destiny. Such men are necessary if the plot of history is to be carried out. This amounts to saying that ideas are important but there must be will power to implement them.

Hegel looks at history as the gradual evolution of the Absolute Idea or the Spirit. History is progress but it moves in violent spirals. The most significant aspect of his Political Philosophy is his theory of the state which is based on the axiom that what is rational is real and what is real is rational. Hegel's political philosophy has exercised great influence during the last two centuries and a major example was the rise of fascism in Italy. The general swing to the right is said to have drawn inspiration from his philosophy especially since he viewed war as an instrument in the hands of world spirits to facilitate the development of world according to the dialectic of history.

Module II

History and Classical Social theory

Social theory refers to ideas, arguments, hypotheses, thought-experiments and explanatory speculations about how and why human societies—or elements or structures of such societies—come to be formed, change, and develop over time or disappear. Social theory most commonly encompasses the range of explanatory concepts, analytical tools, and heuristic devices on which sociologists and social scientists draw in their efforts to interpret statistical or qualitative data about particular empirical social phenomena. This module discusses some of the classical Social theoreticians and ideas.

Max Weber

Maximilian Carl Emil “Max” Weber (1864–1920) was born in the Erfurt, Prussia. Most of his education was at the universities of Heidelberg and Berlin. Weber was trained in law, eventually writing his *Habilitationsschrift* on Roman law and agrarian history under August Meitzen, a prominent political economist of the time. After the initial years of legal practice and public service, he turned towards academic research and writing. One of his initial research which proposed the displacement of the German agrarian workers in East Prussia by Polish migrant labours invited lot of criticisms and attention on his work. During the time of professorship in political economy at Heidelberg Weber and his associates such as Georg Jellinek, Ernst Troeltsch, and Werner Sombart, Marc Bloch, Robert

Michels, and György Lukács expanded the scope of Social Theory.

Weber's studies into the history as generally categorised as as a developmental history of Western rationalism, the universal history of rationalist culture, and degenerates in modern rational society. Weber's rationalization thesis based on European history is its seeming irreversibility and Eurocentrism in its formulations and theorization of events has later invited criticisms. Weber's theorization of bureaucracy and rationalization of control over social and political life of the people is most vivid in his elaboration of ideal bureaucracy. According to Weber "The development of the modern form of organisation concurs in all sectors with the development and continuous expansion of bureaucratic administration. Because the bureaucratic administration is always observed under equal conditions and from a formal and technical perspective, the most rational type" He further justify the superiority of the bureaucracy by saying that "the main source of the superiority of bureaucratic administration lies in the role of technical knowledge, which, through the development of modern technology and economic methods in goods' production, has become absolutely indispensable" One of the major traits of contemporary bureaucracy is its attempt to build institutions of social and political control has been argued by Weber as one of the major role of bureaucracy in his works. According to him "bureaucratic administration fundamentally means the exercise of domination based on knowledge. This is the trait that makes it specifically rational. It consists, on the one hand, of technical

knowledge, which is, per se, sufficient to ensure a position of extraordinary power for bureaucracy. On the other hand, it should be considered that bureaucratic organisations, or those in power who use it, tend to become even more powerful by the knowledge that comes from the practice that they attain in the function”

The Methodology of Ideal Type

The methodology of “ideal type” is another important theoretical formulation of Weber. According to Weber’s definition, “an ideal type is formed by the one-sided *accentuation* of one or more points of view” according to which “*concrete individual* phenomena ... are arranged into a unified analytical construct” in its purely fictional nature, it is a methodological “utopia that cannot be found empirically anywhere in reality”. Given the premise that the ideal type is fictional in nature, Weber never seeks to claim its validity in terms of a reproduction of or a correspondence with reality. Its validity can be ascertained only in terms of adequacy. This does not mean, however, that objectivity, limited as it is, can be gained by “weighing the various evaluations against one another and making a ‘statesman-like’ compromise among them” which is often proposed as a solution by those sharing Weber’s kind of methodological perspectivism. Such a practice, which Weber calls “syncretism,” is not only impossible but also unethical, for it avoids “the practical duty to stand up for our own ideals”

According to Weber, a clear value commitment, no matter how subjective, is both unavoidable *and* necessary. It is

unavoidable, for otherwise no meaningful knowledge can be attained. Further, it is *necessary*, for otherwise the value position of a researcher would not be foregrounded clearly and admitted as such — not only to the readers of the research outcome but also to the very researcher him/herself. In other words, Weber’s emphasis on “one-sidedness” not only affirms the subjective nature of scientific knowledge but also demands that the researcher be *self-consciously* subjective. The ideal type is devised for this purpose, for “only as an ideal type” can subjective value — “that unfortunate child of misery of our science” — “be given an unambiguous meaning” Along with value-freedom, then, what the ideal type methodology entails in ethical terms is, on the one hand, a daring confrontation with the tragically subjective foundation of our historical and social scientific knowledge and, on the other, a public confession of one’s own subjective value.

Émile Durkheim

David Émile Durkheim was born in April 1858 in Épinal, France. He graduated from *École normale supérieure* in 1882 and began teaching and research. In 1887 he was appointed to teach Social Sciences and Pedagogy at the University of Bordeaux, allowing him to teach the first ever official sociology courses in France. During his time at Bordeaux, Durkheim had great success, publishing his doctoral thesis *On the Division of Social Labor*, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, and *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*.

Society and Social Facts

All elements of society are part of the natural world and can

be studied scientifically, argued Durkheim. Including morality and religion has major role in collective ways of thinking, feeling, and acting. A social fact, Durkheim defined in *Rules*, is “a category of facts which present very special characteristics: they consist of manners of acting, thinking, and feeling external to the individual, which are invested with a coercive power by virtue of which they exercise control over him” According to Durkheim, social facts have an objective reality that researchers can study in a way similar to how other scientists, such as physicists, study the physical world. Durkheim argued that social facts are also *internal* to individuals, and it is only through individuals that social facts are able to exist. In this sense, externality means interior to individuals other than the individual subject. A society is an ensemble of ideas, beliefs, and sentiments of all sorts that are realized through individuals rather than an a group of people live in a geographical location. According to Durkheim this fusion of individual consciences is a *sui generis* reality.

Durkheim identifies different kinds of social facts including a society’s legal code, religious beliefs, concept of beauty, monetary system, ways of dressing, or its language. Social facts create conditions for individuals to follow it and help to understand how society imposes itself onto the individual from the outside through the establishment of social norms and values to which conformity is either expected or encouraged. Currents of opinion, or social phenomena such as rates of marriage, birth, or suicide are expressed themselves through individual cases, are also social facts. There are also social facts

of a morphological or structural order including the demographic and material conditions of life such as the number, nature, and relation of the composing parts of a society, their geographical distribution, their means of communication and so forth.

Durkheim provides a set of rules for studying social facts. The first and most important rule is to treat social facts as things. What Durkheim means by this is that social facts have an existence independent of the knowing subject and that they impose themselves on the observer. Social facts can be recognized by the sign that they resist the action of individual will upon them; as products of the collectivity, changing social facts require laborious effort. The next rule for studying social facts is that the sociologist must clearly delimit and define the group of phenomena being researched. This structures the research and provides the object of study a condition of verifiability. The sociologist must also strive to be as objective towards the facts they are working on as possible and remove any subjective bias or attachment to what they are investigating. Similarly, the sociologist must systematically discard any and all preconceptions and closely examine the facts before saying anything about them.

Durkheim believed that society is an objectively real entity that exists independently and autonomously of any particular individual, a view that is epitomized by his prescription to treat social facts as things. Within this realist position there are two important claims. First, Durkheim makes an ontological claim concerning the *sui generis* reality of social facts. Durkheim also

makes an epistemological and methodological claim, arguing that social facts should be treated as real objects, existing external to the researcher's mind, that can be determined by their ability to coerce behavior. Hence, Durkheim is arguing that social facts have particular properties of being and that they can be discovered and analyzed when the sociologist treats them in the proper, scientific way.

Durkheim was one of the first thinkers in the Western tradition to examine how an individual's social milieu affects the way that individual perceives the world. He argues that many, if not all, facets of an individual's thought and conception of the world are influenced by society. Not only are our common beliefs, ideas, and language determined by our social milieu, but even the concepts and categories necessary for logical thought, such as time, space, causality, and number, have their source in society. This logical structure helps to order and interpret the world, ensuring that individuals have a more or less homogenous understanding of the world and how it operates, without which human society would not be possible. According to Durkheim, no knowledge of the world is possible without humanity in some way representing it.

Language and Social Facts

Durkheim considered language as representation of the collective and he used *représentations collectives*. To him words, or concepts, are unlike individual sensory representations, which are in a perpetual flux and unable to provide a stable and consistent form to thought. Concepts are impersonal, stand outside of time and becoming and the thought

they engender is fixed and resists change. Consequently, language is also the realm through which the idea of truth is able to come into being, since through language individuals are able to conceive of a world of stable ideas that are common to different intelligences. Language, as a set of *représentations collectives*, also has a unique quality in that it plays an active role in structuring an individual's perception of reality. As Durkheim argues, objects of experience do not exist independently of the society that perceives and represents them. They exist only through the relationship they have with society, a relationship that can reveal very different aspects about reality depending on the society. Language is not the only facet of logical thought that society engenders; society also plays a large role in creating the categories of thought, such as time, space, number, causality, personality and so forth. The characteristics of the categories vary from culture to culture, sometimes greatly, leading Durkheim to believe that they are of a social origin. Categories, like concepts, have the qualities of stability and impersonality, both of which are necessary conditions for the mutual understanding of two minds. Like concepts, then, categories have a necessarily social function and are the product of social interaction. Individuals could therefore never create the categories on their own. Durkheim believes that it is possible to overcome the opposition between rationalism and empiricism by accounting for reason without ignoring the world of observable empirical data. In order to do so, Durkheim treats the categories as *représentations collectives*, and studies them as such.

Karl Marx

Karl Marx was born in 1818 in the Rhineland region of Prussia. Marx's father was a lawyer who converted to Christianity when it became necessary for him to do so if he was to continue his legal career. Following an unexceptional school career, Marx studied law and philosophy at the universities of Bonn and Berlin. His doctoral thesis was in ancient philosophy, comparing the philosophies of nature of Democritus (c.460–370 BCE) and Epicurus (341–270 BCE). From early 1842, he embarked on a career as a radical journalist, contributing to, and then editing, the *Rheinische Zeitung*, until the paper was closed by the Prussian authorities in April 1843. He was expelled from Prussia for his political activism. After living in Belgium and France for short periods of time he shifted to London—from late 1849 until his death in 1883—Marx lived in London and he remained in London for the rest of his life.

Marx's early writings are dominated by an understanding of alienation, a distinct type of social ill whose diagnosis looks to rest on a controversial account of human nature and its flourishing. He subsequently developed an influential theory of history—often called historical materialism—centred around the idea that forms of society rise and fall as they further and then impede the development of human productive power. Marx increasingly became preoccupied with an attempt to understand the contemporary capitalist mode of production, as driven by a remorseless pursuit of profit, whose origins are found in the extraction of surplus value from the exploited proletariat. The precise role of morality and moral criticism in

Marx's critique of contemporary capitalist society is much discussed, and there is no settled scholarly consensus on these issues. His understanding of morality may be related to his account of ideology, and his reflection on the extent to which certain widely-shared misunderstandings might help explain the stability of class-divided societies. In the context of his radical journalism, Marx also developed his controversial account of the character and role of the modern state, and more generally of the relation between political and economic life. Marx sees the historical process as proceeding through a series of modes of production, characterised by (more or less explicit) class struggle, and driving humankind towards communism. However, Marx is famously reluctant to say much about the detailed arrangements of the communist alternative that he sought to bring into being, arguing that it would arise through historical processes, and was not the realisation of a pre-determined plan or blueprint.

For well over half of his adult life, a city providing a secure haven for political exiles and a superb vantage point from which to study the world's most advanced capitalist economy. This third and longest exile was dominated by an intellectual and personal struggle to complete his critique of political economy, but his theoretical output extended far beyond that project.

Marx writing enterprise was elaborate and had far reaching impact on critical thinking and political activism throughout the history after it. Marx's initial attempt to make sense of Napoleon III's rise to power in contemporary France is contained in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*

(1852). Between 1852 and 1862 Marx also wrote well over three hundred articles for the *New York Daily Tribune*. After the revolutions of 1848—centred on his involvement in the International Working Men’s Association between 1864 and 1874, and the events of the Paris Commune (1871), in particular. The character and lessons of the Commune—the short-lived, and violently suppressed, municipal rebellion that controlled Paris for several months in the aftermath of the Franco-Prussian war—are discussed in *The Civil War in France* (1871). Also politically important was Marx’s “Critique of the Gotha Programme” (1875), in which he criticises the theoretical influence of Ferdinand Lassalle (1825–1864) on the German labour movement, and portrays the higher stage of a future communist society as endorsing distribution according to “the needs principle”. Volume One of *Capital*, published in 1867 remaining one of the most influential book in the word till today

Alienation is a concept especially, but not uniquely, associated with Marx’s work, and the intellectual tradition that he helped found. It identifies a distinct kind of social ill, involving a separation between a subject and an object that properly belong together. The subject here is typically an individual or a group, while the object is usually an “entity” which variously is not itself a subject, is another subject(s), or is the original subject (that is, the relation here can be reflexive). Theories of alienation vary considerably, but frequently: first, identify a subset of these problematic separations as being of particular importance; second, include an account (sometimes implicit) of what makes the relevant separations problematic;

and, third, propound some explanatory claims about the extent of, and prognosis for, alienation, so understood. Theory of alienation has great influence on the studies on cast system in India.

Mode of production

Mode of production refers to the varied ways that human beings collectively produce the means of subsistence in order to survive and enhance social being. Marx believed that human history could be characterized by the dominant modes of production. In this sense the term refers to a specific economic system. Marx was interested in doing two things: providing an analytical framework for defining specific modes of production and locating those modes in terms of a theory of historical development. The Mode of Production is the unity of the productive forces and the relations of production. Production begins with the development of its determinative aspect – the productive forces – which, once they have reached a certain level, come into conflict with the relations of production within which they have been developing. This leads to an inevitable change in the relations of production, since in the obsolete form they cease to be indispensable condition of the production process. In its turn, the change in the relations of production, which means the substitution of the new economic basis for the old one, leads to more less rapid change in the entire society. Therefore, the change in the Mode of Production comes about not through peoples volition, but by virtue of the correspondence between the productive relations to the character and level of development of the productive forces.

Due to this, the development of society takes the form of the natural historical change of socio-economic formations. Conflict between the productive forces and the relations of production is the economic basis of social revolution. As Marx explained in Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* “at a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or - what is but a legal expression for the same thing -with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution....No social order ever perishes before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed; and new, higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society itself.”

Structural Marxism

Karl Marx’s mature writing from *A Contribution to the Criticism of Political Economy* (1859) through the first edition of *Capital* (1867) offers to analyze social and economic relations as systems and structures that follow scientific laws. In Marx’s vocabulary, a distinction is drawn between the “forces” and “relations” of economic production on the one hand, and class contradiction and human oppression on the other. The first terms are structural, the second historical and humanistic. Structuralism challenged the humanism and historicism of the social sciences of anthropology, psychology, and linguistics.

Thinkers like Jacques Lacan rewrote Freudian psychoanalysis in terms of the structural principles of Saussurean linguistics and Michel Foucault radically questioned the assumption that history is progressive and whether, indeed, the so-called human sciences had a real object of knowledge in the first place made the scope of the structural thinking more diverse. Structuralism, in favoring structure over subject, synchronic over diachronic analysis, opened a prolonged debate in Marxism itself.

Althusser was the most prominent among the philosophers of structural Marxism. The work of Louis Althusser in his two most important books: *Pour Marx*, a collection of his essays written between 1960 and 1965, and *Lire le "Capital,"* co-authored with Etienne Balibar and based on a series of seminars on Marx's writings. The deeper question that Althusser poses for contemporary Marxist thought is whether the concerns of the structuralists, who challenge the veracity of lived experience and the general empiricism of the human sciences, is compatible with Marxism's commitment to political criticism and practical social activity. For Althusser, structuralism does not alter Marxism but, rather, provides the opportunity to reawaken the original spirit of Marx's later writings, especially *Capital*, which already contains and surpasses the structuralist attack on humanism and empiricism. According to Althusser, Marx himself had to overcome the humanistic concerns of his earlier writings, as in *The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* or *The German Ideology*, in order to develop what was truly original and revolutionary about the scientific laws of production and their relation to cultural history.

Althusser's reading of *Capital* as setting the stage for a truly scientific understanding of the entire concept of "production" as the transformative law of all social activity, from the most material economic activity to the cultural practices of literature, law, and family life, which Althusser has dubbed the "functions" of the "Ideological State Apparatuses."

For Althusser, the difference between Hegel and Marx lies precisely in Marx's realization that the process of mediation could never be completed in the name of the human subject, that reality and subjectivity never reach a state of identity, as they are meant to in Hegelian logic. The forces of production perform the transformations of the world and its multiple articulations. Production is the underlying real base of culture, but it can only be apprehended through the filter of ideology.

Structuralism provides Althusser with a terminology for analyzing ideological and symbolic modes of apprehending production without having to resort to the classical lexicon. Without directly supporting the Marxist concept of labor as radical transformative actions upon nature and our own human identity, structuralism, from a strictly linguistic angle, puts into question the link between appearance and meaning, subject/object epistemology with its accompanying metaphors of mimetic or reflective representations of the world, and indeed the entire aesthetic terminology of formalism, organic unity, and the objectlike stability of given works of literature.

For some Marxists, such as Perry Anderson, structuralism should be kept at arm's length because it poses the greatest danger Marxism has had to meet in our time, greater even than

the disgrace of Stalinism, the weakening of Eurocommunism, and the collapse of solidarity among the international labor organizations in Latin American and developing nations. For Althusser, structuralism and Marxism converge because there is no going back to a direct critique of the state or the family or the distribution of wealth. Each object of critique must be determined in a postclassical mode before it can be invoked.

Pierre Macherey's Theory of literary production, published in 1966, was written during the most intense phase of Althusser's own theoretical development. The book is written in a spirit of active collaboration with Althusser. In the theoretical portion of the book, primarily its first part, Macherey follows many of the same lines of inquiry that Althusser does, rejecting all classical approaches to the study of literature that are based in empiricism, formalism, and humanism. Like Althusser on economic appearances, Macherey begins by examining the notion of the literary text as a fixed, stable object for analysis. The link between structure and determinateness is all-important. Macherey bypasses all surface qualities of a literary work that could be confused with mere formalism. Structure, the final shape of a narrative or poem or tale, determines the ideological matrix of the author's culture. The Structural Marxism has made its presence in most of the most of the all most all thinking schemes in the post world war II era. The above discussed are only some of its applications and elaborations made by prominent thinkers of the time.

Critical Theory

The best way to show how Critical Theory offers a

distinctive philosophical approach is to locate it historically in German Idealism and its aftermath. For Marx and his generation, Hegel was the last in the grand tradition of philosophical thought able to give us secure knowledge of humanity and history on its own. The issue for Left Hegelians and Marx was then somehow to overcome Hegelian “theoretical” philosophy, and Marx argues that it can do so only by making philosophy “practical,” in the sense of changing practices by which societies realize their ideals. Once reason was thoroughly socialized and made historical, historicist skepticism emerged at the same time, attempting to relativize philosophical claims about norms and reason to historically and culturally variable forms of life. Critical Theory developed a nonskeptical version of this conception, linking philosophy closely to the human and social sciences. In so doing, it can link empirical and interpretive social science to normative claims of truth, morality and justice, traditionally the purview of philosophy. While it defends the emphasis on normativity and universalist ambitions found in the philosophical tradition, it does so within the context of particular sorts of empirical social research, with which it has to cooperate if it is to understand such normative claims within the current historical context. After presenting the two main versions of this conception of philosophy, I turn to an illuminating example of how this cooperative relation between philosophy and the social sciences works from the point of view of the main figures in Critical Theory who sought to develop it: the critique of ideology, a form of criticism which if generalized threatens to undermine the critical stance itself as one more ideology. Even if Critical

Theorists are united in a common philosophical project, this example shows the large differences between the first and second generation concerning the normative justification of social criticism.

Habermas was one of the pioneers of the Critical Theory. His theories on Democracy and Public Sphere expanded the Critical Theory. For Habermas, rationality consists not so much in the possession of knowledge and thus primarily concerned with the consistency and content of one's beliefs, but rather in “how speaking and acting subjects acquire and use knowledge” (Habermas, 1984, 11). Such a broad definition suggests that the theory could be developed through explicating the general and formal conditions of validity in knowing and reaching understanding through language, and this task falls primarily on “formal pragmatics.”

In its initial phases Critical Theory attempted to develop a normative notion of “real democracy” that was contrasted with actual political forms in liberal societies. According to Horkheimer a democratic society would be rational, because in it individuals could gain “conscious control” over social processes that affect them and their life chances. To the extent that such an aim is possible at all, it required that human beings become “producers of their social life in its totality” And Habermas elaborated the theory by arguing that there are at least three aspects of practical reason relevant to democratic deliberation: pragmatic, ethical, and moral uses of reason are employed with different objects (pragmatic ends, the

interpretation of common values, and the just resolution of conflicts) and thus also different forms of validity.

For Habermas the internal complexity of democratic discourse does not overcome the problem of the application of the democratic principle to contemporary social circumstances. As he puts it, “unavoidable social complexity makes it necessary to apply the criteria of democracy in a differentiated way”. Such complexity restricts the application of fully democratic justification for a number of reasons: first, it is not possible for the sovereign will of the people by their democratic decision-making powers to constitute the whole of society; and, second, a society formed by merely associative and communicative means of coordination and cooperation is no longer possible. This objection to radical democracy is thus directed to those theories that do not figure out how such principles can be institutionally mediated given current social facts. Critical theory in general expanded the thinking on the understanding democracy and social institutions.

Social History

Social History touches on, and arguably helps to focus, major issues of public debate. It mobilises popular enthusiasm and engages popular passions. Its practitioners are counted in thousands rather than hundreds – indeed tens of thousands if one were to include those who fill the search rooms of the Record Offices, and the local history rooms of the public libraries, documenting family 'roots'; the volunteer guides at the open-air museums; or the thousands of railway fanatics who spend their summer holidays acting as guards or station

staff on the narrow gauge lines of the Pennines and North Wales. Social history does not only reflect public interest, it also prefigures and perhaps helps to create it.

As a pedagogic enthusiasm, and latterly as an academic practice, social history derives its vitality from its oppositional character. It prides itself on being concerned with 'real life' rather than abstractions, with 'ordinary' people rather than privileged elites, with everyday things rather than sensational events. As outlined by J.R. Green in his *Short History of the English People* (1874) it was directed against 'Great Man' theories of history, championing the peaceful arts against the bellicose preoccupations of 'drum-and-trumpet' history. Social history owes its current prosperity, both as a popular enthusiasm and as a scholarly practice, to the cultural revolution of the 1960s, and reproduces – in however mediated a form – its leading inspirations.

The spirit of 1960s social history – tacking in its own way to the 'winds of change' – was pre-eminently a modernising one, both chronologically, in the choice of historical subject matter, and methodologically, in the adoption of multi-disciplinary perspectives. Whereas constitutional history had its original heart in medieval studies, and economic history, as it developed in the 1930s and 1940s, was centrally preoccupied with Tudor and Stuart times, the 'new' social history, first in popular publication in the railway books (as of David and Charles) and later in its academic version, was apt to make its historical homeland in Victorian Britain, while latterly, in its enthusiasm for being 'relevant' and up-to-date, it has shown a readiness,

even an eagerness, to extend its inquiry to the present. Methodologically too, in ways presciently announced at the beginning of the decade in E.H. Carr's *What is History?* the new social history was hospitable to the social sciences, and much of the energy behind the expansion of *Past and Present* – the most ecumenical of the social history journals, and the first to be preoccupied with the inter-relationship of history and 'theory' – came from the discovery of historical counterparts to the categories of social anthropology and sociology: e.g. 'sub-cultures', social mobility, crowd psychology, and latterly gender identities.

The general effect of the new social history has been to enlarge the map of historical knowledge and legitimate major new areas of scholarly inquiry – as for example the study of households and kinship; the history of popular culture; the fate of the outcast and the oppressed. It has given a new lease of life to extra-mural work in history, more especially with the recent advent of women's history to which social history has been more hospitable than others. It has built bridges to the popular representation of history on television.

Social history is no a blindly accumulated pile of facts. It should not even be a quilt of testimony, however cunningly devised, each piece cut from abstruse sources. Social history has to be thought out, as well as artfully presented, as a story, a moral tale, a belle-lettre or an essay in intellectual adventure. It has to be thought out, because we interpret the past to the present. We cannot confine ourselves to the intentions and perceptions of historical actors. We know what they did not; we

know what happened next. We should not throw that advantage away lightly.

Historical Anthropology

Historical research defines Anthropological Archaeology and has long been a significant aspect of Social Anthropology. Through work with material artefacts, textual records, and oral narratives, archaeologists and social anthropologists illuminate the historical dynamism of material landscapes, social relations, and cultural meanings. Historical Anthropology research covers a wide range of historical phenomena including, the social, cultural, ecological, legal, and political dimensions of colonialism, processes of decolonization, changing articulations of identity and difference within postcolonial and post-imperial societies, and the production of old and new nationalisms. Many are also deeply engaged with questions of epistemology and method, particularly how to understand overlaps and divergences between anthropological and other disciplinary approaches to the past. Finally, several of our faculty address the changing place of anthropology in the world and how the discipline has been variously implicated in wider processes of state formation, political contestation, and cultural production.

Historical anthropology is a historiographical movement which applies methodologies and objectives from Social and Cultural Anthropology to the study of historical societies. In the trajectory of development of the discipline it is explained in different ways by different scholars, and to some may be synonymous with the history of mentalities, cultural history,

ethno-history, microhistory, history from below etc. Anthropologists whose work has been particularly inspirational to historical anthropology include Emile Durkheim, Clifford Geertz, Arnold van Gennep, Jack Goody, Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, Marcel Mauss and Victor Turner.

In 1960s Marxist historiography diverge away from 'the orthodox Marxist approach to human behaviour in which actors are seen as motivated in the first instance by economics, and only secondarily by culture or ideology', in the work of historians such as E. P. Thompson. Another noted thinker Peter Burke has contrasted historical anthropology with Social History, finding that historical anthropology tends to focus on qualitative rather than quantitative data, smaller communities, and symbolic aspects of culture

Historical anthropology was rooted in the Annales School, associated with a succession of major historians such as Fernand Braudel, Jacques Le Goff, Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie and Pierre Nora, along with researchers from elsewhere in Europe such as Carlo Ginzburg. The label historical anthropology has been actively promoted by some recent Annales School historians, such as Jean-Claude Schmitt. French publications for research in historical anthropology such as The journal *Annales*, *Histoire* and *Sciences sociales* paved a strong foundation for the thriving of the discipline.

Historical anthropology has been open to similar criticisms to anthropology: 'as Bernard Cohn and John and Jean Comaroff have observed, studies in which societies were represented in this way were often partial, biased, and

unwitting handmaidens to the domination of non-Western peoples by Europeans and Americans' But since the Second World War, increasingly reflexive approaches have led to sophisticated developments of the field, and the banner of 'historical anthropology' has often attracted Anglo-American historians in ways that the Annales School did not. This turn around has been led by scholars Sidney Mintz, Jay O'Brien, William Roseberry, Marshall Sahlins, Jane Schneider, Peter Schneider, Eric Wolf, Peter Burke and Aaron Gurevich.

New historicism

New historicism, a form of literary theory which aims to understand intellectual history through literature, and literature through its cultural context, follows the 1950s field of history of ideas and refers to itself as a form of "Cultural Poetics". A critical approach developed in the 1980s in the writings of Stephen Greenblatt, New Historicism is characterised by a parallel reading of a text with its socio-cultural and historical conditions, which form the co-text. New Historians rejected the fundamental tenets of New Criticism (that the text is an autotelic artefact), and Liberal Humanism (that the text has timeless significance and universal value) . On the contrary, New Historicism, as Louis Montrose suggested, deals with the "textuality of history and the historicity of texts." Textuality of history refers to the idea that history is constructed and fictionalised, and the historicity of text refers to its inevitable embedment within the socio-political conditions of its production and interpretation. Though it rejects many of the assumptions of poststructuralism, New Historicism is in a way

poststructuralist in that it rejects the essential idea of a common human nature that is shared by the author, characters and readers; instead it believes that identity is plural and hybrid.

A New Historicist interpretation of a text begins with identifying the literary and non-literary texts available and accessible to the public, at the time of its production, followed by reading and interpreting the text in the light of its co-text. Such an interpretative analysis would ideally begin with a powerful and dramatic explication of the “anecdote”, which is the historical context or the co-text. Thus the text and the context are perceived as expressions of the same historical moment. Stephen Greenblatt’s *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (1980) does a New Historicist reading of Renaissance plays, revealing how ‘self-fashioning’ was an episteme of the era, as depicted in the portraits and literature of the time.

The discipline of New Historicism has been influenced by Althusserian concept of ideology; the Derridian deconstructionist idea that a text is at war with itself; Bakhtinian dialogism which posits that a text contains a multiplicity of conflicting voices; and most prominently by Foucauldian Power/Knowledge and discourse. Analysing the nature of power, Foucault expounds that Power defines what is truth, knowledge, normalcy. New Historicism believes in the Foucauldian idea of the “capillary modes of power” which like Althusser’s Ideology interpellants the lives and actions of the citizens.

New Historicism differs from the old Historicism in large measure not based on the approach but rather on changes in historical methodology, the rise of the so-called New history. The term new history was indebted to the French term *nouvelle histoire*, itself associated particularly with the historian Jacques Le Goff and Pierre Nora, members of the third generation of the Annales School, which appeared in the 1970s. While there may be no precise definition, the new history is best understood in contrast with prior methods of writing history, resisting their focus on politics and "great men;" their insistence on composing historical narrative; their emphasis on administrative documents as key source materials; their concern with individuals' motivations and intentions as explanatory factors for historical events; and their willingness to accept the possibility of historians' objectivity.

Human geography

The study of the interrelationships between people, place, and environment, and how these vary spatially and temporally across and between locations. Whereas physical geography concentrates on spatial and environmental processes that shape the natural world and tends to draw on the natural and physical sciences for its scientific underpinnings and methods of investigation, human geography concentrates on the spatial organization and processes shaping the lives and activities of people, and their interactions with places and nature. Human geography is more allied with the social sciences and humanities, sharing their philosophical approaches and methods.

Human geography consists of a number of sub-disciplinary fields that focus on different elements of human activity and organization, for example, cultural geography, economic geography, health geography, historical geography, political geography, population geography, rural geography, social geography, transport geography, and urban geography. What distinguishes human geography from other related disciplines, such as development, economics, politics, and sociology, are the application of a set of core geographical concepts to the phenomena under investigation, including space, place, scale, landscape, mobility, and nature. These concepts foreground the notion that the world operates spatially and temporally, and that social relations do not operate independently of place and environment, but are thoroughly grounded in and through them.

With respect to methods, human geography uses the full sweep of quantitative and qualitative methods from across the social sciences and humanities, mindful of using them to provide a thorough geographic analysis. It also places emphasis on fieldwork and mapping (see cartography), and has made a number of contributions to developing new methods and techniques, notably in the areas of spatial analysis, spatial statistics etc.

The long-term development of human geography has progressed in tandem with that of the discipline more generally. Since the Quantitative Revolution in the 1950s and 1960s, the philosophy underpinning human geography research has diversified enormously. The 1970s saw the

introduction of behavioural geography, radical geography, and humanistic geography. These were followed in the 1980s by a turn to political economy, the development of feminist geography, and the introduction of critical social theory underpinning the cultural turn. Together these approaches formed the basis for the growth of critical geography, and the introduction of postmodern and post-structural thinking into the discipline in the 1990s. These various developments did not fully replace the theoretical approaches developed in earlier periods, but rather led to further diversification of geographic thought. For example, quantitative geography continues to be a vibrant area of geographical scholarship, especially through the growth of GI Science. The result is that geographical thinking is presently highly pluralist in nature, with no one approach dominating.

Module III

The Annales

The ***Annales school of history*** is a historiographical trend emerged in 20th century. The school had been led by a bunch of historians in France, with a distinctive approach towards history. Founded by Lucien Febvre and Marc Block, the school stressed upon long-term social and economic history by replacing traditional history with its focus upon political events. The base of Annales school could be find in the journal *Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations*, in which March Block and Lucien Febvre kept on publishing works since 1929. They adopted a completely new form of approach towards writing history by deviating from event based narrations. It stood for a a wide and a more human history, by its rejection of the prevailing understanding of historical writing such as centering on diplomatic history, emphasising on great men's life, war and state, focusing on the study of short periods, pattern of event narration and facts collection. The Annales school has been extremely dominant in determining the structure of historiography in France and the trend gradually spread to other parts of the world. As J.H.Hexter states, "The Annales group is "the most productive and lively school of historians practicing their art today,"

British Historian Peter Burke has divided annales school into different stages. The first stage from 1920 to 1945 comprised of Lucien Febvre, March Block and Henri Hauser.

They were highly influential in setting up the movement. It was notably radical in the initial stage and refused the practice of political history.

The second stage from 1945 to 1968 was based on the works of Fernand Braudel, Robert Mandrou, Georges Duby, Pierre Goubert, Jacques Le Goff, Pierre Chaunu and Ernest Labrousse. At this stage, their historical approach has evolved into a school of thought. It began to be based on the concept of structure and conjuncture. It also adopted the method of documenting the changes over a longer period of time.

The third phase of the school from 1968 to 1989 was comprised of Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, Philippe Aries and Jacques Revel. A transition has taken place at this stage in which focus on socio-economic characteristics were shifted to socio-cultural aspects. They gave prominence to writing history from the point of view of mentalities.

The fourth generation of the school was led by the Roger Chartier. This stage did not focus upon the concept of mentalities rather substituted it with the social history of cultural and linguistic aspects.

The Annales school adopted an interdisciplinary approach by incorporating perceptions and methodologies from disciplines like anthropology, sociology, geography, psychology and economics. They initiated an intellectual transaction among various streams of knowledge.

The Agenda of Total History

Arthur Marwick in his book titled *The New Nature of*

History, states that 'Total history, is history which endeavors to integrate together all aspects of human society, aesthetic and cultural, as well as social, economic and political, private as well as public. This historical conceptualisation was initiated by the Annales School and the idea of 'total history' was appeared for the first time in Lucien Febvre's writing. In the later period it was propagated by Fernand Braudel. He placed total history over long historical periods and large geographical space. Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie has been a leading advocate of the idea of "total history" with the publication of his book *Les Paysans de Languedoc* in 1966.

The concept of total history was established with the classic work written by Braudel named, *The Mediterranean*. It systematically presented various stages of historical time called *durees*. It is regarded as an absolute history of Europe during the reign of Philip II. and the total history of the whole continent.

Total history takes into account the incidents of a given time period. It discusses about the co relation between such incidents occurred within a particular time period. It is argued that the idea of total history has a stress on coherency and history is viewed as a series of notable events. As per that, one incident is followed by another in a consecutive manner. In this view, events occur in a usual and sensible manner. This approach towards history consider that. everything is happening without surprise as it is expected to happen. The entire mechanism is viewed as a uniform scheme.

Total history goes beyond the idea of concentrating on one

particular field. It combines all histories beyond disciplinary borders. Due to such an approach, there has always been doubts about the practicability of adopting such a method. Some argue that its not possible to collect adequate information on a particular topic of a specific period to present a total history. Fernand Braudel's book on the Mediterranean has been presented as a classic model to counter such debates about the feasibility of total history.

Fernand Braudel (1902-1985)

Fernand Braudel (1902-1985), regarded as one of the prominent modern historians of the twentieth century was a leading figure in the second stage of Annales school. His concept of *longue durée* instead of short term was the major means for historical inquiry which introduced a new conception of historical time. He is also considered as one of the forerunners of World System Theory. It is argued that "Braudel's history is, above all, structural history". According to Peter Burke, '...his contribution to the renewal of historical studies in our time was greater than that of either Marc Bloch or Lucien Febvre, and possibly greater than that of the two scholars together.'

Braudel's intellectual contributions could be find in the wide range of studies on economic history and historical methodology. He concentrated on the every day life of regular people instead of great people's eventful life. He highlighted the connection between environmental changes and economic conditions to mark the human history.

His most celebrated work, *The Mediterranean*, was

submitted as his PhD thesis in Sorbonne University in 1947 under the guidance of the celebrated historian Lucien Febvre. During the course of his studies he shifted the focus of content from diplomatic affairs of Mediterranean region under Philip II to a detailed investigation of the complex totality of the area in the later part of Sixteenth Century. The work was a geohistorical study and he has done a detailed analysis of the military action between Spain and Ottoman Empire. The two volume book extensively covered the aspects like geography, agriculture, religion, technology etc: - which made it as a comprehensive work. In the concluding part of *The Mediterranean* Braudel states that, 'By temperament I am a structuralist, little attracted by events and only partly by conjuncture, that grouping of events carrying the same sign.'

Braudel's another notable work is *Civilisation and Capitalism (Civilisation Matérielle, Économie et Capitalisme XV-XVIII)*. The three volumes of the work was published in 1979. It gave importance to the role played by wide range of socio-economic factors in the historiographical method. Braudel discusses about his emphasis on the economic state of every-man, a universal approach to socio-economic history, and the procedure of capitalism and its geographical extend. The work deals with the history of modern world prior to industrialisation with emphasise on regular people's economic engagement which led to the functioning of economy.

In the book *Identity of France*, which is the last and unfinished work by Braudel, he presented a geohistorical method to study the country. He discusses about the disorderly

lifestyle and thinking patterns of french people and its connection with the physical variation of the various french geographical regions.

Braudelian Concepts of Structures, Conjuncture and Events

Fernand Braudel took a vast geographical area as his target and studied in accordance with three time scales: the long term, the conjunctural, and that of events. The idea was emerges when he was serving as a prisoner-of-war camp in Germany in 1944. The levels of his three tired category of historical time are Structure, conjuncture and eventment. According to him historical time is a prison and it is impossible for a historian to escape from it. Braudel also states that time is nonstop and irreversible, it is duration and measurement. In *The Mediterranean*, Bradel states that, "the final effect is to dissect historical time into geographical time, social time and individual time."

Structure (*longue duree*). It is practically immobile environmental time or geological time. It consisted of infrastructures, physical structures like geography and social structures like organized behaviour, culture, conventions, attitudes etc:- In this the change is slow and irresistible. In other words it looks upon incidences that took place unnoticeable over a long period of time.

Braudel did not consider structures as only material, as per the normal understanding. In his view mental frameworks and mentalities have to be evenly considered as structure. It is

defined by duration and its impact on individual activities. Braudel conceptualizes *longue durée* as an actual historical structure emerged at the convergence of human action with physical geography in the wider sense. Braudel stated that the structures existed in Middle Age Europe resulted in the occurrence of contemporary cultures existing in Europe.

2. *conjoncture* (*moyenne durée*). It is the medium time of economies, societies and cultures. Mediterranean economy, social groups, empires and civilizations can be connected to this category. Transition at this stage is quick compare to the first category. Braudel states that, “Traditional history, with its concern for the short time span, for the individual and the event, has long accustomed us to the headlong, dramatic, breathless rush of its narrative. The new economic and social history puts cyclical movement in the forefront of its research and is committed to that time span ... side by side with traditional narrative history, there is an account of conjunctures which lays open large sections of the past, ten, twenty, fifty years at a stretch ready for examination”.

3. *Événement* (*courte durée*) It is the brief time of discrete events. It is the political and diplomatic time. It comprised of days, weeks or an year. The third level of time is that of events (*histoire événementielle*). This is the time of history of individuals with names. For Braudel, is the time of surfaces and deceptive effects.

Braudel has been criticised for understating the prominence and role of military and political matters in individual life. He also came under criticism for the apolitical

stand taken by the Annales school in post second world war period. Braudel also kept distance from engaging with ethical and ideological concerns raised by cold war scenario. Braudel's disinclination towards the study of contemporary history was also a matter of criticism

History of Mentalities and Emotions

The history of mentalities (*histoire des mentalités*) is associated with the French intellectual history. In this new form of cultural history, aspects of private life including, childhood, sexuality, family, and death became integral means of study by replacing geographical influences and socioeconomic structures. It opened up a distinct approach towards historical studies by incorporating the history of collective representations, myths, and images. This method has been used by a number of historians from different schools of historical thought and Annales school is the most prominent among them. They used it as a major historical tool to study a specific geographical area and a peculiar time period. It focused upon the thought processes of a section of people, their interactions and world view within a period of time instead of the normal style of historical narration.

The "history of mentalities" taken into account the approach of ordinary people towards the day to day affairs of life. They placed psychological underpinning of human beings instead of material factors. Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch were the pioneers in developing the methodological tool of history of mentalities and were bothered about the collective belief system. Philippe Ariès and Norbert Elias were the other

leading historians dealt with this field. They attempted to identify and formulate theories on early childhood. Michel Foucault on the other hand studied about the mentalities of social deviants and nonconformists. In short these historians tried to analyze the psychological actualities which manage the ideas of cozy relationships, fundamental attitudes of mind, and approach towards the basic course of life. According to Patrick H. Hutton, “the history of mentalities provides not merely an element of "total" history, but a perspective on the civilizing process”.

Annales historians made use of mental tools to address the realities conditioning man in the society through various processes such as the system of beliefs and collective emotions. These factors decided the their fundamental understanding of the world. The history of mentalities never had a clear-cut and extensive set of theoretical work. It was invested more in praxis side than theory.

Lucien Febvre's classic work on "mentalities" titled, “The Problem of Unbelief in the Sixteenth Century – The Religion of Rabelais”, is regarded as a classic work in the history of Annales. The book made detailed analysis of the concept of ‘unbelief’. Published in 1942, the work is a distinguished study on the religious and intellectual history of 16th century. The book primarily focused upon Francois Rabelias, a French renaissance writer, monk and scholar. It is the classic example of the study of the mental life of a person as well as the mentalities of the whole age. It is the result of ten years of research and Febvre attempted to deny the opinion that

Rabelais was a militant anti-Christian covert atheist and a freethinker.

Febvre made a detailed evaluation of the ideologies, beliefs and value systems of Rabelais and collected informations related to his contemporaries. Febvre initiated discussion on one of the most radical idea of the epoch, namely 'atheism' and tried to write about its fundamental limitations and problem with anachronistically reading the 16th century ideological structures.

Another major name associated with the history of mentality is Pierre Nora, a French historian who wrote extensively on memory. Nora's celebrated work *Les Lieux de Memoire*, is a comprehensive study on the identity and national memory of France.

He was particular about the co relation between memory and mentality, and states, "to talk today of collective memory raises the same genre of difficulties and mobilizes basically the same stakes that the word 'mentalités' raised thirty years ago".

Nora views history as a reflection of 'contemporary sadness' and basically fundamentally believed in the 'conquest and eradication of memory by history'. Nora argues that memory developed through three stages, pre-modern, modern, and post-modern. Pierre Nora attempted to understand a national consciousness without nationalism by calling back the spheres of memory.

History from Below

In 1970's, historian Angel Rivera stated, "We face the

problem that the history presented as ours is only part of our history.... What of the history of the history less', the anonymous people who in their collective acts, their work, daily lives and fellowship, have forged our society through the centuries?'

History from below addresses the section of people whose presence have never got acknowledged in mainstream history. It has been variously called in names such as people's history, grassroots history, history of the common people, and history of everyday life'. History from below came as a rejection of history from above. The trend got strengthened since the second world war when a section of historians began to shift focal point from great to the ordinary and from established institutions to culture. This was a carefully developed methodological alteration by touching all aspects of human life and their agency. It tried to incorporate the individuals, localities, cultures and day to day life of a neglected section and attempted to establish these categories as an integral part of historical understanding. They aimed at writing a wide based history and collected sources to reinterpret the already established notions.

According to the Institute of Historical Research, "history from below is history that: "seeks to take as its subjects ordinary people, and concentrates on their experiences and perspectives, contrasting itself with the stereotype of traditional political history and its focus on the actions of 'great men'. It also differed from traditional labour history in that its exponents were more interested in popular protest and culture than in the organisations of the working class."

In this trend history is narrated through the non-elitist individuals who never got highlighted in any major discourses. These people were never considered as a determining factor in shaping the course of history. The historical agency of the common people began to be recognised instead of the deeds rulers, religious heads, political leaders and philosophers. It addressed the people who were continuously neglected in the historical writings such as women, peasants, minority communities, people with various sexual orientations etc.

In the initial stage, History from below was predominated by two distinct schools of thoughts, namely Annales School and Marxist historians of Britain. Both schools were intellectually powerful and interpreted history in terms of collective mentalities and activities. A different version of history from below emerged in the later period with changes in its methodological approaches. The new History from below gathered writings from the marginalised sections and exposed the the grass root level experiences of the common people. The identity of the common people came out in the raw form as more and more people from such category began to participate and write.

In 1932, French historian Lucien Febvre coined idiomatic expression, 'history seen from below and not from above' (*histoire vue d'en bas et non d'en haut*). British historian E.P.Thompson, in his essay 'History from Below', published in 1966, first provided the theoretical basis to this tradition of history-writing. In the book, *The Making of the English Working Class*, Thompson made an attempt to understand the

perspectives and activities of people who had been labeled as backward looking. This study was placed in the larger context of industrial revolution in England by stressing upon workers views. Similarly other British historians like Eric Hobsbawm and Christopher Hill aims to underline the prominence of the views and lives of the people in the bottom of the ladder in understanding history. Eric Hobsbawm argued that such a historical writing is possible 'only from the moment when the ordinary people become a constant factor in the making of such decisions and events.

Christopher Hill in his book, *The World Turned Upside Down* stated that the revolutionary activities of the common people carries the spirit of change which can overthrow the prevailing social order. Eric Hobsbawm is credited with a number of path breaking studies such as *Worlds of Labour* and *Primitive Rebels* which extensively studied about the peasants and working class in England.

French historian Georges Lefebvre was one of the prominent historians with a left tradition involved into the study of history from below. His study on French revolution and the peasant was done with study based on empiricism. In the book *The Peasants of Northern France during the French Revolution* published in the year 1924, he utilized all kind of available statistical data to analyse the life of peasantry in the context of revolution. He initiated a detailed study on the intentions of peasants by making a group by group study of different groups and tried to understand their mode of reactions to the French revolution. Another book written by

Lefebvre titled, *The Great Fear of 1789* published in 1932 intended to understand the the outlook of peasants in the wake of revolution. Both of the work gave utmost importance in understanding the everyday life and action of common people and thus regarded as the major works on the history from below.

Histories of Oppression

Oppression is a systemic, extensive and repeated form of injustice. It is an unkind form of exercise of power generally under the control of governmental authority or cultural frameworks. There exist various forms of oppression in all societies and in all time periods such as social, economic, political, institutional etc.

Social oppression occurs when a particular section of society inequitably takes advantage of another section by making use of supremacy and submission. This will lead to ill treatment and manipulation of a group of individuals or minorities. There exist several dominant social hierarchies through which oppression takes place. They are race, class, gender and sexuality. Racial oppression takes place due to social or institutionalized factors. In United States of America, there exist five different types of oppression based in race. They are genocide, slavery, geographical displacement, non-citizen labour and racial discrimination. Indigenous and black populations in USA have been experiencing most extreme form of oppression.

Class oppression bias and distinction based on social class of individuals. It is based on income, property ownership or

wealth. Upper, middle, lower and working class categories are based on this categorisation. Gender norms prevalent in society are responsible for the oppression based on gender. It frequently affects people belonging to LGBTQ categories. Sexual oppression is the result of the understanding of hetero normativity in society.

Institutionalized oppression is another form of suppression in which establishes institutions like government or religious groups act in favour of particular groups based on individual identity. The condition of economic oppression is on changing according to time periods and forms of application. It exist in several forms like discrimination in case of opportunities, wages disparities, forced labour etc:- and economic differentiation on the basis of nationality,ethnicity, religion and sexuality.

The study on historical oppression tries to identify the historical and contemporary kinds of oppression prevailing in different parts of the world. According to Catherine Burnette, historical oppression deals with the “chronic, pervasive, and intergenerational experiences of oppression that, over time, may be normalized, imposed, and internalized into the daily lives of many indigenous people (including individuals, families, and communities”.

The idea of historical oppression discusses about *historical trauma which include* includes an accumulative, large, and prolonged trauma enforced on a section of people for many generations. The formulation of the idea of historical oppression has emerged from critical theory. It analyses the power dynamics that tries to apply and carry on inequality and subjugation

Gender History

The emergence of Gender history has made a notable change in the study of history in the post Second World War period. Gender history evolved as a response to the intellectual engagements and debates on women's history. Its origin can be traced in American and British women's history field. This area got strengthened with the theoretical progressions propagated by French post structuralism. The advancements in the field of gender history helped the feminist scholars to initiate diverse discussions on gender as a category of analytic thinking. Gender history as a separate field was the result of continuous intellectual debates occurred in the second half of the twentieth century. It became increasingly influential and got a distinct shape by 1980s.

Gender history as a discipline views the past through the lens of gender. It aims to discuss how historical incidents and time periods differently affected women and men. They raised questions related to power, place, renaissance, time, agency etc. They also initiated discussions on the ways in which gender variations were understood and put together at various regions and times. The growth of gender history enriched the area of social history and redefined the idea of feminists.

In 1989 an academic journal named 'Gender and History' was founded in Britain by Leonore Davidoff. Subjects related to gender were placed in the larger canvas and connected to major mile stones in history. It led to radical reinterpretation of some already established ideas. It was in this context John Kelly asked, "Did Women have a Renaissance?" In this way

areas like women's body, sexuality, prostitution, witchcraft etc. were restudied and reinterpreted in the light of new methodological formulations. American historian on France Joan W. Scott states that 'gender is a critical means by which power is expressed or legitimised'. In her famous article named "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis", Scott stated that 'studying gender not only explains women's history, but all history as well'.

Sonya.O.Rose in the famous book what is Gender History? states that, "Gender history is based on the fundamental idea that what it means to be defined as man or women has a history. Gender historians are concerned with the changes over time and the variations within a single society in a particular period in the past with regard to the perceived differences between women and men , the make up of their relationships, and the nature of the relations among women and and among men as gendered beings".

Gender history's focus on masculinity and male emphasise on the thought that masculinity and femininity prevail in-connection with each other. It is related to the study of gender roles. It is a more sophisticated way of explaining how the existing history could be gender- conscious and look at the possible ways to place gender at the study of academic discourses. It could be connected with wide range of subjects such as history of war, conflicts, politics, kinship and revolutions.

Gender history views each category of gender as an agent of history. It addresses the divisions based on sex to realize the

order of society. According to *Catherine Baker*, “Using ‘masculinities’ as a tool of gender analysis opens up even all-male institutions – perhaps *especially* all-male institutions – to a ‘gender lens’. How did norms of ‘manly’ conduct and behaviour, and taken-for-granted notions of authority and leadership as masculine domains, influence how diplomatic men framed and approached the Paris or Dayton peace conferences, and how could we read that from the documents they left behind? How were their imaginations of how states themselves related to each other gendered?”.

Gender history has been using various perspectives including transnational, global and inter sectional. It elaborated the realm of historical knowledge by analyzing the role of gender and its connection with religious sects, political ideologies, state, government, social movements, capitalism, welfare states etc:- It studies, how gender was constructed historically in different continents as per the norms of dominant structures. Gender history has been viewed by many as equal to women’s history and some criticizes it for reducing the importance of women’s history.

History of Slavery

The history of slavery started with the emergence of civilizations and social stratification. Slavery is a condition in which an individual is owned by another individual by denying their human rights and individual liberty. Slaves were considered as a movable or immovable property and were not allowed to geographically move as per their wish. In history there existed various forms of slavery such as house hold,

patriarchal, domestic and productive. This inhuman system prevailed in almost all societies and continued under various cultures and religions. Their social and legal positions were different under different societies and time periods.

The book, *Black History and Historical Profession* states that, “the history of slavery originally was the history of the government's laws and policies toward slavery, and the political debates about it. Black history was promoted very largely at black colleges. The situation changed dramatically with the coming of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s. Attention shifted to the enslaved humans, the free blacks, and the struggles of the black community against adversity”.

Modern historical writings deal with the history of slavery in a detailed manner. In the beginning of the twentieth century, the historiography on slavery was based on racism and presented slaves as inferior. In the later period there was a slight change in this approach but slaves were still presented as objects. By the 1970s and 1980s historians on slavery began to use diverse forms of sources to rewrite history such as music, statistical data, slave narratives or autobiographies etc.

Major historians who studied about the history of slavery were John Blassingame, Eugene Genovese, Leslie Howard Owens, Herbert Gutman, Steven Hahn and Robert. E. Wright. Major historical studies dealing with slavery includes, *A Nation under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration*, *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom*, *Slave Community*, *This Species of Property*, *A Brief History of Slavery: A New Global History* etc.

History of South Asian Caste system

Caste system is one of the most ancient form of social stratification. It has been prevailing in South Asia for centuries with differentiation in patterns in different regions. Caste is a byproduct of complicated histories and operates in multiple forms. Caste-based social relations, identities and dynamics have been a determining factor in many South Asian countries, especially India and it still dominates the social and political sphere.

The historiography of caste system in South Asia is wide and argumentative. These literatures provide an overview of theoretical understanding and everyday practice of caste. A group of historians are of the opinion that caste emerged from the racial antagonism of the Aryans. The second argument was based on the occupational hypothesis in which the scholars talk about the transition from tribal groups to guilds.

A major question related to caste was whether it can be related to an evolutionary series or into an assortment of social forms. Many have shifted the focus from an evolutionary to a synchronic approach. The contemporary debates on South Asian caste system revolve around such debates and provide new impetus to the subject matter.

Sumit Guha, in the book *Beyond Caste: Identity and Power in South Asia, Past and Present* states that “in South Asia caste became a highly involute, politicised form of ethnic ranking shaped by the constant exercise of socio-economic power”. Morton Klass in his book, “The Emergence of South Asian Caste System”

took a neo-evolutionist perspective and observes caste as a objective historical phenomenon. He rejected racial or Aryan conquest theory by arguing that caste is more and more intense in the south Indian states, when Aryan invasion did not occur as in the north. His arguments were known in the name “Marriage Circle Theory”, and reject the claim that caste is not connected with the Aryan Varna system. He views it as a socioeconomic system which originated in relation with the cultivation of grains in the region.

Louis Dumont, Nicholas Dirks, Susan Bayly, Arjan Appadurai, Bernard. S. Cohn, Suvira Jaiswal, Gopal Guru, Christopher Jaffrelot, Surinder Jodhka, Rajni Kothari, Anupama Rao, Sekhar Bandhopadhyay, were the few among the prominent scholars who studied about the caste system in South Asia in general and India in particular.

Module IV

Methodological Debates and Contemporary Trends

Methodological Individualism and Holism

Methodological individualism and holism is about the enquiry and explanation of social phenomena. It tries to understand the role played by the individuals and society in determining the order.

The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy states that “methodological individualism was introduced as a methodological precept for the social sciences by Max Weber, most importantly in the first chapter of *Economy and Society*. It amounts to the claim that social phenomena must be explained through reference to the intentional states that motivate the individual actors”. Methodological individualism argues that the person is a self-reliant entity. It is based on the idea that a person is accountable for his/her destiny. An individual’s success and failure are completely depended upon the way he/she lives and work. In other words, methodological individualism is an idea in which an individual activities decides social phenomena. There is no importance for the activities of any sections or groups which are unreal and incapable, therefore cannot truly explicate social phenomena.

Proponents of Methodological individualism states that, the society includes individuals but the idea of society is just

conceptual. It does not have a objective nature. Supra an individual establishment such as state and society is incapable of engaging in any action alone. Any action occur in such institutions are the activities of each and every individual of that particular establishment.

Holism states that an individual is closely connected to other individuals in the society. It argues that individuals or elements as mutually influencing one other. Sandra Halperin and Oliver Heath states that, “the social wholes are the sum of their individual constituents. The whole affects and is affected by the qualities of its constituents. These constituents are not, as individualism maintains, independent entities that have self contained properties. They are internally related in the sense that each is imbued with, and constituted by, the qualities of others”. Methodological holists or collectivists give less importance to personal embodiment and states that the social wholes are the real historical individuals.

Emile Durkheim was a major advocate of the idea of holism. His works are based on a communitarian stand. His studies on the social facts highlight the idea of role of society in human life. According to him, “determining cause of a social fact should be sought among the social facts preceding it and not among the states of the individual consciousness”.

The debate on the ideas of Methodological Individualism and holism has developed along with the growth of social science. These are visible in the writings of Karl Marx, Hegel, Herbert Spencer, Auguste Comte etc:- The debates occurred between Emile Durkheim and Gabriel Trade on the idea of

social facts was the most prominent in this line. Other debates on holism was initiated by thinkers like Karl Popper and F.A Hayek

May Brodbeck, in "Methodological Individualisms: Definition and Reduction," expresses a common opinion when she writes: "Culturally, holism is intimately connected with hostility toward the liberal political individualism of the Western tradition." Individualists, in their turn, have been castigated by their opponents for encouraging laissez-faire in economics and anarchy in politics, the alleged natural consequences of adopting an "atomistic" view of social life.

Structure and Agency

The concepts of structure and agency and relationship between them are central to social science theory. Major concepts related to agency are the individual, action, will, intentionality, choice and freedom. On the other hand structure deals with ideas such as determinism, society, environment and inevitability. Thinkers who explained about the power system focused upon structures the other section who wrote about the power of agents emphasized upon actors.

Structures are generally viewed as a fixed element in the social landscape. It is considered as a as an instrument to create an order for different aspects of social life. It was in the 19th century that the term structure was began to apply in apply science. Karl Marx, wrote about the economic structure and political and legal superstructures. The idea of structure was ideologically presented for the first time by the British

philosopher Herbert Spencer. He presented the example of biological analogies to talk about social structure. He viewed society as an organism consisting of mutually connected elements which forms a structure correspondent to the living body. Contemporary social structure theories are associated with the works of Émile Durkheim who talked about the interdependency in society.

According to Radcliff-Brown, "social structure is a part of the social structure of all social relations of person to person. In the study of social structure the concrete reality with which we are concerned is the set of actually existing relations at a given moment of time that link together certain human beings".

Agency is associated with the thoughts, actions and capacity of persons to act individually, make their own independent choices and express their individual power.

In this, individuals will think about themselves and work in many ways which subsequently formulate their experiences. Agency could be in both individual and collective forms. It varies according to region, gender, education, economic status etc.

An individual's agency is his or her independent ability to act on one's will. American Journal of Sociology defined agency as a "temporally embedded process that encompasses three different constitutive elements: iteration, projectivity and practical evaluation". The basic idea of agency emerged in the period of enlightenment. John Locke emphasis on an the freedom of individual based on self interest. .

In modern social science there is an ongoing intellectual argumentation over the importance of structure or agency in molding the behaviour of human beings. The structure versus agency debate has to be taken into account as a matter of socialisation against autonomy. It deals with whether a person can engage in society without restrictions or as per the direction of the social structure.

The historical trajectory of the debate between structure and agency revolves around many schools of thoughts in social theory. The major streams which discussed about its nature and importance are structuralism, symbolic interactionism, and post-structuralism.

German sociologist Georg Simmel belongs to the first generation theorists who studied about the concepts of structure and agency. Norbert Elias stressed on the relationship between power, behaviour, emotion, and knowledge in different time periods. American sociologist Talcott Parsons do not agree with the existence of structure–agency problem instead he considers it as a pseudo-problem. Pierre Bourdieu wrote extensively on structure agency. It began with the work *An Outline of the Theory of Practice*. He studied about the theory of practice on the duality understanding of the correlation between agency and structure. James Coleman in his theory of Coleman’s Boat made a detailed analysis on the connection between macro-sociological phenomena and individual behaviour. Anthony Giddens argued for the duality of structures and tried to go beyond dualism of structure and agency. Peter Berger and Thomas Luckman presented a

dialectically grounded relationship between structure and agency.

Essentialism and Relativism

Both Essentialism and Relativism are two ideas in belief. They try to find out that, in what ways things evolved and currently what they are. These ideas are completely different from each other and observe things in distinct ways.

Essentialism argues that any particular establishments stand with a some strict conceptions which in turn decide the nature of it. Essentialism tries to prove that every living thing, object, or whatever existing in the world are under a particular set of directions and a kind of necessary actuality is working behind them. This concept suggests that each and every entity has a system which decides the shape of its present condition. It put forward the idea that a group of features are important for its function. In Ancient western philosophical thought, idealism of Plato explained about such essence or form. It is known as at the Platonic idealism. Essentialism shares the view that few categories such as, ethnic groups, transgenders, an original sculpture etc. has certain inherent realities or real characteristic which cannot be identified directly.

Essentialism in the discipline of history considers basic characteristics of a state, nation or culture base on the assumption that the specialties of that region could be understood in this way. In certain circumstances, this concept had been use as anticipation to approve and denounce national, regional or political identities. This concept has been used by

the colonialism as well as the condemnation of colonialism. Contemporary historians have negated the essentialist methodologies but some are still making use of certain variants.

Relativism works on the other lines of essentialism. According to this concept, there are no definite truths and this truth changes according to the beliefs and social norms. It gives importance to the relative values. Relativism states that there are no absolute truths and each thing is different in perception and consideration. It argues that everything will keep on changing as per the consciousness and consideration.

Relativism acknowledges the claims to objectivity within a specific sphere. It affirms that facts in that sphere are relative to the orientation of a perceiver. There are various types of relativism. They vary in scope and nature. These include moral relativism, epistemic relativism, alethic relativism and cultural relativism. Moral relativism deals with the dissimilarities in moral judgments among individuals and cultures. Epistemic relativism argues that there are no definite facts related to social norms. Alethic relativism states that there is no absolute truth and truth always have a relative character.

Truth and Objectivity

Historical objectivity is closely associated with the idea of value-judgment. Objectivity in history is the view that any historical writing should have the backup of concrete facts. There should be absenteeism of sentiments, partiality and preconception. All these factors should jointly put together

beyond identities such as race, ethnicity, nationality, gender etc. It is simply considered as giving honour to the truth. In other words, it is the separation of researcher from object or subject in order to get an unbiased result.

Historical discourses are considered as subjective rather than objective because there is an understanding that, those who are writing history cannot keep their statements with scientific ways. Mark Bevir states that, “in general terms, the argument is that we cannot have objective historical knowledge because we do not have access to a given past against which to judge rival interpretations”. In short, it is argued that historical objectivity is not obtainable. Main reason for this are the nature and selection of historical incident. Other reason is the personality, motives and habits of the author.

In Twentieth century, there was an attempt by the historians and philosophers to find out the empirical truth in history, which means pure and objective history. Sigmund Freud observes that ancient historians were not overly concerned with being historical at all. He states, “While empirical history did not exist within the methodology of these ancient historians, as scholars we know that these sources possess academic value despite of their lack of historical credibility. If we remain within the borders of our modernist forefathers' impossible desire for purely objective truth, we will never conceive the broader, undeniable truth that encompasses both subjective (ancient) and objective (modern) realities” F. Ankersmit states that, “In fact, the question whether there is something special about truth in history is one of the most important problems in philosophy of history.”

Truth in history is about the epistemological proposition, the objectivity of historical truth and the social conditioning of historical knowledge. As Marek Tamm states, “truth claims in history writing are based not on their direct relation with reality but on a disciplinary consensus as to the methods of inquiry, cognitive values and epistemic virtues”.

The main argument related to the truth and objectivity in history is based on the cognitive relationship of the historian. Historians expressed diverse views on the causes of French revolution or the nature of industrial revolution. The lack of objectivity and truth in history leads to the contradictory narration of historical facts.

Foucault and the history of power

Power is considered as a repressive force or a negative force used to keep something in check. Hierarchy, control, order and discipline are some terms closely associated with the word power. In a liberal sense of the term, “Power” could be defined as the ability to influence the behaviour of others or a course of events into one’s favour. Michel Foucault (1926–1984), a 20th century French philosopher associated with the Structuralist and Post-Structuralist movement disagreed with this definition. According to him, power was not just wielded by a few individuals but people are themselves the instruments of the power that they are subjected to. He also believed that science and knowledge cannot be separated from power.

Foucault explains his analysis through the micro-politics of power. Power is not concentrated to specific strata of the society but is actually present everywhere and can be explained by the concept of force relation that exists throughout the social system. The sum total of the force relations of all inequalities that exists in the social structure results in the flow of power.

Foucault doesn't see power in a negative light. He sees it as something that is present in every basic institution and aspect of the society. He used two main methodologies to study about the micro-politics of power, namely the "Archaeology of knowledge" which he later shifts into Genealogy of power. He divides power into three types, which could overlap or coexist at any given point of time. Foucault examines how power and knowledge are interrelated and developed in concrete and historical frameworks.

According to Foucault, there are three types of power, each of which could overlap and co-exist at any given period of time. The three main types of power are as follows:

1. Sovereign Power
2. Disciplinary Power
3. Bio-power

1. Sovereign power:

This type of power enforces violence and physical punishment. The power is highly repressive in nature. Army and law enforcement bodies hold the apex position of power in this kind of power. Absolute monarchy and dictatorships are

common forms of sovereign power. Public display of state induced violence is common to threaten and keep the public in check. Here the power is exercised on the people from an external factor to follow rules or discipline.

2. Disciplinary power:

The individuals of the society are both objects and instruments of exercising the disciplinary power. There is constant surveillance by the society. The expression of this power is by normalizing it. Here, the display of power is more important than the actual exertion. Panopticon prison is a classic example of this. In 18th Century Jeremy Bentham, an English social theorist designed a circular prison concept called the Panopticon, where the guard was placed in an observation tower in the centre of the prison, from which he could watch any prisoner at any point of time without their knowledge. This threat of constant surveillance forced the prisoners to be at their best behaviour all the time.

3. Biopower

In this there is a large scale regulatory power that even the human body becomes controlled. Biopower is actually disciplinary power when used over large populations instead of individuals. The Genocide is an example where the elimination of Jewish population was normalized by the disciplinary powers of the society.

Expression of Power

The power is expressed either by repression or by normalizing it. Repression is the common known expression of

power and often uses explicit form of violence. Normalizing power is the subtle form of expression, but it is actually the most dangerous form. By normalizing power, the subjects do what they think, they actually want to do but in turn is formed by the influence of morals, ethics and rules put in place by the existing forces of power. The personalized advertisements that pops up on social media, which tempts you to buy a new dress, is a less dangerous manifestation of this, while malpractices like apartheid are the evil faces of this normalization of power.

Relation between Power and Knowledge

Discipline encompasses individuals as both objects and instruments of exercising power. There are actually three procedures of enforcing disciplinary power, namely hierarchical observation, normalizing judgments and examination. It is interesting to note that the formation of knowledge follows the same path, observation, normalization and evaluation. This actually shows us how individualization and tantalization of knowledge is used to enforce or normalize power.

It is visible that, how the sum total of aesthetic conduct, everyday reality, self-reflection, faith and empiricism and western political rationalizations form part of the tantalization and individualization technologies that could be in turn used to discipline others or discipline the self. Thus leading to power domination.

According to Foucault truth or knowledge can be internal to oneself or can be discovered and extracted by intervention of others. He analysis that power related to sickness/madness,

sexuality or punishments produce effects of truth, which are conditional, invested and fabricated and these truths could be challenged and changed depending on the enforcement of power. So discipline is connected to identity- constitution influenced by knowledge-production.

Foucault's argues that power is not concentrated to a particular section of the society. It interacts through force control arising due to inequality and unbalance and is therefore everywhere and everyone is subjected to it. The subject of the power could be the object and instrument of control at the same time. Discourses have the power to question and change the power dynamics. Power is neither a negative term nor positive; it is something that exists like physics. Identity, knowledge and science cannot be separated from power. Foucault rejects the idea of a universal truth. According to him, every ethics and paths of self reflection whether it is the pursuits of self-identification of Platonic ways, self mastery of the stoics, the Christian confessions and the new world western political rationalization are all forms of exercising power.

Bourdieu and Reflexive Social Science

Pierre Bourdieu (1930- 2002) was a French sociologist, public intellectual and anthropologist. He wrote extensively on education, popular culture, media and aesthetics. His intellectual engagements aim to deal with the dynamics and relations of power in society, logic of everyday life and reflexive sociology. Bourdieu's works enquire about how power moves and sustain the social order in all time periods and there by influencing generations.

He introduced prominent concepts in social sciences like Theory of capital and class distinction, Theory of Habitus, Disposition, social hierarchy, Field Theory etc. Bourdieu tried to overcome the duality in the field of social theory such as empirical and theoretical, objective and subjective, micro and macro, material and symbolic, structure and agency, Public and private etc:- He was influenced by a number a number of intellectuals including Karl Marx, Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, Maurice Merleau Ponty and Levi Strauss. His major works include, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (1979), *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1972), *The Field of Cultural Production* (1993), *The Rules of Art* (1996), *The State Nobility* (1989), *On Television* (1996).

By 1980s Bourdieu entered into the public realm of debates and by 1990s he began to engage more with political activism. He was an ardent critique of globalisation and neoliberalism. He started to a project to study the impact of neoliberal discourses and structural reforms in France. The study report was published in 1993 in the name "The Weight of the World". He frequently made comments on the political affairs of France. In 1989 he launched a review journal named *Liber*.

Bourdieu makes large use of the idea of reflexivity in many of his writings. Reflexivity refers to the activity of reflecting things or the activity of self reference. In the realm of sociology of knowledge the idea of reflexivity is related to the globular connection between cause and effect. It is mainly related to the composition of individual belief. It

deals with the ability of an individual to acknowledge the powers of socialisation and restructuring their position in the social composition.

Bourdieu emphasized on the value of reflexive sociology. He states that the social scientists has to conduct their studies with proper care about the impact of their personal stand and their already understood ideas on social structure. They have to be vigilant about how these internalized ideas are going to influence the objectivity. In his view, the sociologists should deal with the sociology of sociology. It is important for a social scientist to stress upon a conscious vigilance therefore they can understand their own biased positions in the academic work. Bourdieu states that the scientist has to understand their prejudices getting from their social position.

Bourdieu is of the opinion that reflexivity can be taught and understand, and integrated into various levels of practicals. There are three levels of analysis related to the concept of reflexivity. They are, The level of ‘ordinary reflexivity, the level of ‘scientific reflexivity and the the level of‘ societal reflexivity.

The different facets of Bourdieu’s multi-layered conception of reflexivity can be traced in his key writings. The most important component of Bourdieu’s conception of reflexivity is science. Other elements include , vigilance, consciousness, self awareness, critique, self objectification, distance taking, rupture, epistemology, historicisation, understanding and emancipation.

Bourdieu’s understanding of reflexivity is complicated and

multidimensional. In his point of view, the concept of ‘reflexivity plays a major role in the pursuit of sociology.

In short, as Loic Wacquant argued , “Reflexive Sociology starts with the ‘very primitive assumption that theory is made by the praxis of men in all their wholeness and is shaped by the lives they lead’”. Thus the the idea of reflexivity is a dependable methodological tool for the building of critical epistemologies. It will also help for the pursual of social research.

The Cracked Mirror: An Indian Debate on Experience and Theory- Gopal Guru and Sundar Sarukkai

The Cracked Mirror: An Indian Debate on Experience and Theory, coauthored by political theorist Gopal Guru and philosopher of science Sundar Sarukkai, published in 2012 by Oxford University Press, is a work on Dalit experiences and untouchability in India. The book was written in a dialogue and mutual conversation format and aims to address the relationship between experience and theory in Indian social science.

The book deals with the issues related to theory in Indian social scenario, the character of individual and collective experiences, ethical issues in theorizing and epistemology, the relationship between ethics and theory and politics of experience. The authors bring up the image of a cracked mirror to propose a complicated and malformed relation between experience and theory.

Gopal Guru presents the argument that the Brahmins in Indian social sciences are engaging in theoretical work and the

Shudras have been left with the ‘earthen pot full of empirical details. Guru also argues how Dalits need theory as a social necessity. He is of the opinion that few among upper caste scholars are controlling the spaces and ruling the theory. They also take over the dalit and adivasi experiences that originally belong to the dalit adivasi intellectual universe.

The authors are of the opinion that the base of theorization should be experience, particularly the experiences of victimized and the marginalized. Sarukkai, discusses about the extent of experience and the necessity for further consideration to highlight its importance.

The book basically talks about the theorization of Dalit experiences. It also conceptualize the debatable category of untouchability. Authors made use of both Indian and western intellectual traditions to materialize the debates and discussion on this area.