

CHAPTER 1. VIEW OF HISTORY

PART 1. History and its representation

History

What are the intellectual tasks that define the historian's work? In a sense, this question is best answered on the basis of a careful reading of some good historians. But **it will be useful to offer several simple answers to this foundational question as a sort of conceptual map of the nature of historical knowing.**

I. What

First, historians are interested in providing conceptualizations and factual **descriptions** of events and circumstances in the past. This effort is an answer to questions like these: "What happened? What was it like? What were some of the circumstances and happenings that took place during this period in the past?" Sometimes this means simply reconstructing a **[simplified/complicated]** story from **[converged/scattered]** historical sources – for example, in constructing a **narrative** of the Spanish Civil War or **attempting** to **[pass down/sort out]** the series of events that terminated in the Detroit race riot / uprising of 1967. But **sometimes it means engaging in substantial conceptual work in order to [arrive/arriving] at a vocabulary in terms of which to characterize "what happened."** **[Concerning/Considered]** the disorders of 1967 in Detroit: was this a riot or an uprising? How did participants and contemporaries think about it?

2. Why

Second, historians often want to answer "why" questions: "Why did this event occur? **What were the conditions and forces that brought it about?**" What were the motivations of the participants? **This body of questions invites the historian to provide an explanation of the event or pattern he or she describes:** the rise of fascism 파시즘 in Spain, the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the occurrence of **[ethnic/ethical]** cleansing in Bosnia in 1992 and later. And **providing an explanation requires, most basically, an account of the [causal/casual] mechanisms, background circumstances, and human choices that brought the outcome about.** We explain an historical outcome when we identify the social causes, forces, events, and actions that brought it about, or made it **[more/less]** likely.

3. How

Third, historians are sometimes interested in answering a "how" question: "How did this outcome come to pass? **What were the processes [without/through] which the outcome occurred?**" How did the Prussian Army succeed in defeating the superior French Army in 1870? How did the Polish trade union 노동조합 manage **[to bring/bringing]** about the end of Communist rule in Poland in 1989? Here the pragmatic 실용적/실제적 interest of the historian's account derives from the antecedent 선행사건 **[likelihood/unlikelihood]** of the event in question: how was this outcome possible? This too is an explanation; but it is an answer to a **"[why necessary/how possible]"** question rather than a **"[why necessary/how possible]"** question.

4. Interpretation

Fourth, often historians are interested in piecing together the human meanings and intentions that **[underlie/undermine]** a given complex series of historical actions. **They want to help the reader [make/making] sense of the historical events and actions, in terms of the thoughts, motives, and states of mind of the participants.** For example: Why did Napoleon III carelessly provoke Prussia into war in 1870? Why did the parties 당 of the far right 극우/극단적 보수주의 in Germany gain popular support among German citizens in the 1990s? **Why did northern cities in the United States develop such marked patterns of racial [unification/segregation] after World War II?** Answers to questions like these require interpretation of actions, meanings, and intentions – of individual actors and of cultures that characterize whole populations. This aspect of historical thinking is **"hermeneutic 해석의,"** interpretive, and ethnographic 민족사관의.