

INTRODUCTION

**Historical Writing and
Civic Engagement**
A Symbiotic Relationship

STEFAN BERGER

Professional historians have never been just that. The rise of the historical profession from the second half of the eighteenth century onwards was accompanied by the idea of the historian as public intellectual. Yet notions of professionalization have at times sat awkwardly with the willingness of historians to be political and social activists. The ghosts of ‘objectivity’ and a ‘value-free science’ haunted a profession that gained phenomenal authority from the belief that their professionalism made them the only ones who could speak authoritatively about the past.¹ Those historians unwilling to give up their civic engagement and unable to draw a clear line between their historical profession and their political commitment had to find methodological and theoretical justifications for their engagement. This book will give a range of examples of how such justifications worked and what kinds of engagement have been prominent among historians. But the book will also give several examples of historians who were not professional historians and did not have a job at the university or the academy. Whether they were politicians, journalists, publicists or earned their money elsewhere, many people of diverse backgrounds had either some training as a historian or wrote history without such training. Sometimes their histories were far more influential than those of professional historians. Especially

Notes for this section begin on page 22.

when we discuss forms of engaged history writing it would be difficult just to concentrate on professional history writing.

Historians, who decided to act as engaged intellectuals, had to position themselves within a wider societal memory discourse about the past. They became memory agents and through their historical expertise and their professionalism spoke with special authority within broader memory discourses. Even those historians who stuck to their professional work and were reluctant to become engaged in wider societal debates were, through their work on the past, contributing to memory discourses. History thus should not be seen as counter-opposite to memory, a view prominently put forward by Maurice Halbwachs,² but it has to be regarded as having been part and parcel of memory discourses.³ The voices of professional historians were particularly important in memory discourses, where their authoritative historical work spoke to the memory in question. In fact, François Bedarida has argued that historians have a special responsibility in addressing those topics that are particularly troubling for the public and which provide the source of a great deal of moral uncertainty. If historians often have a particular authority in memory discourses, they do not stand apart from them. In fact it makes more sense to see historians as one particular group of memory activists (among others) whose views on the past influence memory discourses.⁴

Positioning the topic of the historian as engaged intellectual between the fields of history of historiography, social movement studies and memory studies also means that future researchers on this topic will have to familiarize themselves with all three areas of research. So far, there is little systematic scholarship on this topic. True, biographies of historians often also contain information on their political and social activism, in so far as it was prominent,⁵ but the dedicated study of the interrelationship between such activism and history writing is still in its infancy. Some books on the historical profession have also dealt with the topic of the engaged intellectual.⁶ Taking his cue from contemporary US (and British) debates in the 1990s and early 2000s about the impact of overspecialization, multiculturalism and the fragmentation of history on the profession, allegedly leading to a lack of public influence, Ian Tyrrell has traced the public influence of historians in American society from the 1890s to the 1970s.⁷ In his history of the decline of public intellectuals in the US, Richard Posner also recalls the work of many public historians, including Gertrude Himmelfarb, whose famous intervention against the impact of 1968 on US American culture has had such strong political repercussions among the political Right in the US.⁸ Marcel vom Lehn has examined West German and Italian historians' public intervention in the media to discuss the fascist and National Socialist past in the post-World War II period – highlighting national differences

such as the greater professionalization of both the historical science and the media in West Germany, their greater (traditional) state orientation and the weaker debating culture in West Germany that can be related to a less polarized political public sphere (exacerbated by the fact that there were two Germanies after 1949).⁹ Some historical journals – among them the *Radical History Review* and *History Workshop Journal* – have at times celebrated the link between historical studies and political engagement.¹⁰

The notion of public history includes an element of political engagement of the historian who perceives his role as that of communicating the past to a wider public and thereby fulfilling a social function in society that goes beyond that of a traditional professional historian.¹¹ Of course, there are a great many varieties of public history. Any aspect of the past that is communicated within public spheres belongs to public history. Historical museums and monuments present the past to the public, as do a variety of different media, including newspapers, radio, television, film and digital media. Historical commissions discuss usually problematic aspects of the past in order to shed more light on the past or work towards reconciliation. Public history also provides fascinating synergies between social movement studies and the history of historiography, precisely because intellectuals played a major role in social movements, often providing important repertoires of ideas and discourses that empowered social movements.¹² The nineteenth-century labour movement already drew support from a range of intellectuals supporting the demands for social reform and revolution. Sidney Webb and his engagement of the Labour Party is a good example of a labour movement intellectual.¹³ Later on, communist parties attracted many intellectuals to their ranks, and the fascist movements also were supported by a range of intellectuals. Whilst social democratic parties post-World War II often sought alliances with intellectuals in their respective countries, the new social movements that emerged from the 1970s onwards also often sought to capitalize on the support of intellectuals. Amongst social movement intellectuals, historians have at different times and places been prominent, as the past was a vital resource for social movements and their political struggles.¹⁴

If historians have been prominent intellectuals for a long time, it is intriguing to note that histories of intellectuals rarely engage with historians.¹⁵ In his book on nineteenth-century intellectuals, Christoph Charle has pointed out that the famous Dreyfus affair in France was not so much the starting point of political intervention by intellectuals than an end point of a long formation process.¹⁶ Charle also warns not to generalize from a very French notion of ‘intellectual’, and indeed we do have different ideas of precursors to the modern intellectual in the French concept of the ‘philosophes’, the English concept of the ‘men of letters’ and the German

concept of the 'Bildungsbürger'.¹⁷ It is notoriously hard to define intellectuals, as their meaning depends invariably on the context in which they are being discussed, and I am not sure whether it is actually helpful to try and find firm definitions, but their rise in European society has a lot to do with the extension of a public sphere from the nineteenth century onwards. Karl Mannheim and Pierre Bourdieu, two sociologists, who have worked extensively on intellectuals, have both argued that their independence of mind is one of their crucial trademarks.¹⁸ But even here, I am not so sure. After all, many intellectuals were serving those with political, economic or social power and were legitimating forms of rule. Of course, we have many intellectuals who did the opposite – they opposed the powerful and, in the famous dictum, spoke truth to power, regardless of the consequences. Joseph Schumpeter described intellectuals as a 'potential irritating factor for any ruling order',¹⁹ and Max Weber thought of them as 'switch operators' of different systems of intellectual thought.²⁰ Intellectuals could be oppositional, but they could also be the handmaidens of those firmly in power. From the second half of the nineteenth century onwards, an inexorably rising public sphere provided the means for a group of intellectuals, who were living of their criticism in the new urban conurbations that were a hub for contesting ideologies and social organizations. They were journalists and literary figures, and quite a few belonged, after 1900, to an ever-growing academic proletariat, who lived of their pen. It is because of the rise of this class that those working in a professional capacity, be it as historians or as representatives of other sciences or the civil service or other professions, were increasingly not seen, or at least not primarily seen, as intellectuals. Yet these groups, as will be exemplified in this volume with regard to professional historians, often played an important role also as intellectuals.

In this introduction I shall provide a brief outline of the relationship between professional historical writing and civic engagement from the Enlightenment to the present day, highlighting several strands of research that need to be developed further in years to come. Last but not least I shall also weave into this historical tapestry of the concept and practice of the historian as engaged intellectual brief summaries of the chapters in this volume, which shed light on diverse aspects of this topic. As the subsequent chapters only provide glimpses of certain aspects of the manifold relationships, there are certain gaps in the comprehensive treatment of this complex topic that will at least be highlighted in this outline. The chapters are ordered according to chronology: following some theoretical and general considerations regarding the relationship between engagement and historical writing, we have a range of case studies highlighting particular aspects of that relationship in different parts of the world. They should be seen as throwing a spotlight on diverse aspects of the complex relationship between commitment

and scholarship. Hopefully they can serve as inspiration for others to explore this subfield in the history of historiography further. It is for future work in this field to fill some of the many gaps that still remain.

It is appropriate to begin the volume with some general conceptual considerations about the relationship between historical scholarship and political engagement, and Jörn Rüsen's contribution here fits the bill perfectly. The equation of a 'scientific' (*wissenschaftlich*) practice of history with a non-political one is false, he argues. Doing 'scientific' history has many potential implications for political engagement, in the past and in the present. But, he continues, it may be necessary to distinguish forms of political engagement and their way of doing history from other modes of doing the same history. As historical thinking is always related to needs of orientation in time and space, and as such orientation often has a political dimension, this function of historical thinking is closely related to political engagement. However, how the past is understood as history, what rules are being followed in disclosing the perception of the past, how the interpretations of the past are represented and how these representations are used in the wider historical culture differs enormously and is intimately related to diverse forms of political commitment emanating from historical scholarship at specific times and in specific places. The historical sciences, Rüsen contends, are never neutral but position themselves in a wider politics in which they take up either self-conscious or unconscious positions informed by history. Such a wider politics has to do with normative horizons of expectations grounded often in particular moral universes of which historians as citizens and human beings are a part. Geoffrey Barraclough, in a famous lecture delivered at Chatham House in the late 1950s, admitted that moral issues are always linked to political judgements but still insisted that one must 'be careful to avoid confusing the position of the historian and the citizen'.²¹ Yet his assumption that historians can avoid in their writings personal horizons of expectations and normative assumptions has to be questionable. Indeed, as Herman Paul has observed, it is impossible for the historians to leave out of the equation of their history writing their scholarly selves, which incorporate moral dimensions and ethical choices.²² Historians are therefore never objective but invariably engaged in an inter-subjective search for historical truth that in turn has political implications. Rüsen warns of ideological commitments for historians, as they tend to lead them to search in history for legitimization of their ideologies rather than approach history with the willingness to let their research hypotheses be falsified. Hence historians need to be prepared to devise research designs that allow them to be surprised by their own findings.²³

Martin Wiklund's chapter provides another entry point into exploring the relationship between the professional historian and political

engagement. He argues that the ideal of justice is eminently important for historians in their roles as engaged intellectuals. In his view justice is the crucial element in what he calls a 'new ethics ... for the use of history'. Public struggles over the past, he argues, resemble a court of justice situation, in which the historian as engaged intellectual can be public prosecutor, defence lawyer or judge depending on which position is best suited in concrete historical situations to enhancing justice. He warns, however, against the historian to be both public prosecutor and judge as this carries the danger of secretly imposing the claims of the prosecutor with the authority of the judge and thus short-circuiting the critical evaluation of the claims of the prosecutor.²⁴

A final chapter dealing with the general relationship between historical scholarship and political engagement is Kalle Pihlainen's attempt to deconstruct the fallacy of many practising historians' beliefs that their epistemological commitments conflict with any potential political commitment. The political in this perception becomes tainted with the brush of being ideological. Instead both the aestheticization of history and its strong commitment to empiricism led, in Pihlainen's view, to its depoliticization. Thus, the enormous energies invested by historians to distinguish 'facts' from 'fiction' are, above all, an attempt to avoid political commitment.²⁵ A range of historians and philosophers discussed by Pihlainen, from Jean-Paul Sartre to Michel Foucault and further to Hayden White, have all problematized this avoidance strategy of historians for political commitment and instead posited a moral imperative for the historian to become a politically active, engaged intellectual.²⁶

The chapters by Rösen, Wiklund and Pihlainen all investigate to what extent and how historians can and shall be engaged intellectuals. The following chapter by Antoon De Baets reminds readers of the important relationship between historical consciousness and political wisdom, which philosophers of history have dealt with time and again. Assembling a list of political leaders with strong historical consciousness, De Baets contrasts this with another list of 'wise leaders' – as expressed in nominations for the Nobel Peace Prize. Checking these lists against each other, he arrives at a list of only four historian politicians who he regards as wise leaders because of their historical consciousness: Woodrow Wilson, Thomas Masaryk, Jawaharlal Nehru and Mikhail Gorbachev.²⁷

De Baets also reminds us that politicians with a close interest in history were often more interested in power than in wisdom. There is no shortage of dictators who had a strong historical consciousness, and the latter is neither related to inclinations for democracy nor for peace. In fact, as De Baets has pointed out elsewhere, historians who were murdered because of political circumstances count in their hundreds. Many more were imprisoned,

suffered relegation and censorship or were threatened with any one of these measures in the light of their political engagement. Oppositional political engagement also often resulted in historians having to flee their country and seek political refuge somewhere else. Hence the topic of the historian as engaged intellectual is closely related to the topic of the exile historian who produces his histories in exile and stands between his former country that he fled and his new host country.²⁸ Nevertheless, we should state at the beginning that we are dealing here with a small phenomenon within the historical profession as a whole. Most professional historians were content with pursuing their historical work and did not think of getting politically involved or playing a political role, even if their professional work had political implications. Yet professionalization meant, above all, specialization, and a highly specialized historical profession included many members whose work had few immediate political repercussions and was not particularly relevant for everyday politics.²⁹ However, there always were prominent exceptions where historical work did have direct political implications and where the politics had led historians to pursue particular historical investigations. Of course, we also find the case of the historian who was a specialist in a particular field of history that had little relation to politics and who became politically active out of a general sense of civic duty or out of a wider historical understanding that did not specifically have to do with his concrete specialism. There are then many different scenarios in which historians became politically active and in which they played roles as public intellectuals, and this volume is an attempt to explore some of those circumstances.

The modern research university, as we know it today, started its rise during the second half of the eighteenth century when the material culture of academia became characterized by processes of rationalization, bureaucratization, commodification and the move towards meritocratic principles. Exams, dissertations and publications became more and more important as did public lecturing and research seminars. The professor was endowed with a certain charisma that allowed him to become a research leader and develop his school of thought – training ‘pupils’ who were to follow in his footsteps.³⁰ This first happened at universities in the German lands, such as Halle, Wittenberg and Göttingen, from where the idea of the research university spread globally and became adapted in a plethora of different ways. It coincided with the age of the Enlightenment, and Enlightenment values were prominently represented at the new research universities.³¹

One of these values was the belief in civic engagement. A famous political protest happened at the University of Göttingen in 1837. The so-called Göttingen Seven, seven professors, amongst them two historians, Friedrich Christoph Dahlmann and Georg Gottfried Gervinus, protested against the

changes introduced to the constitution of the Kingdom of Hannover by its ruler Ernst August. They were dismissed from the university, and three of them, amongst them the two historians, had to leave the country. Yet their action had become a powerful symbol for the constitutional struggle across the German lands, and it became itself the stuff of legend. The memorial culture of Germany makes frequent references to the Göttingen Seven to this day, and their bronze statues can be found near the parliament of Lower Saxony in Hannover.³²

Elsewhere, Enlightenment historians were known for their fierce public criticism of religion and superstition, their championing of the progress of human civilization down the ages and their promotion of rationalism, tolerance, liberty, freedom and constitutionalism. All of these were hotly contested and made many Enlightenment historians into public intellectuals. At the same time as they promoted particular moral and political projects, Enlightenment historians were also crucial in freeing history from the remaining shackles of theology. Up until the eighteenth century, history in many universities was only taught in theology departments. The setting up of separate history departments became the norm at European institutions of higher education only towards the second half of the eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. The new secular history was intensely interested in the emergence of great global civilizations. Historians were influenced by Jean Jacques Rousseau's notion that the age of discoveries had been a wasted opportunity for mankind, as the European conquerors had failed to appreciate the civilizations they encountered.³³ In many Enlightenment histories, the place of God was now taken by the spirits and customs of peoples and civilizations. The Enlightenment historians often became engaged intellectuals qua their moral and normative ideas about individuals and their rights and liberties that clashed with the absolutism of their age.³⁴

Whilst Enlightenment historians looked for universal values in history, both in the universal and the national histories they penned, the subsequent generation of Romantic historians were more and more concerned with national specifics and nation states.³⁵ The nationalizing tendencies in historiography often went hand in hand with nationalist political commitments. The German historian Heinrich von Treitschke and the entire Prussian school of historiography became synonymous with the championing of a small German nationalism through history writing. When that nation state came into being in 1871, the Prussian historians felt vindicated, and some promoted ever more aggressive forms of German nationalism in imperial Germany.³⁶

Elsewhere in Europe, historians were often important in providing historical legitimation to aspiring national movements. Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the Ukraine was not only a major organizer of *Wissenschaft* but also a

political campaigner who promoted federalism in pre-revolutionary Russia and promoted the Ukrainian cause abroad. A staunch opponent of imperialism and a promoter of democratic federalism, his politics marched alongside his historical work throughout his long and distinguished career.³⁷ Those historians whose political commitments lay with nations that had not (yet) got their nation state tended to hang their narratives on a history of the people and their alleged oppression by a state described as foreign. By contrast, those historians who already lived in a nation state often promoted state nationalism in a variety of different ways. In Tsarist Russia the state orientation of many historians was legendary. Sergej Michajovič Solovev, who held the chair in Russian history at the University of Moscow after 1835, not only penned a twenty-nine volume *History of Russia from the Oldest Time*, he also worked tirelessly as a public intellectual to promote the idea that the state was the major factor in constructing the Russian nation. His justification of strong statism went hand in hand with sympathies for liberal reforms and liberal ideas that he had encountered during his travels to Western and Central Europe, where he met fellow historians such as François Guizot, Jules Michelet and František Palacký.³⁸

Many nineteenth-century historians thought of themselves as public intellectuals in the service of their respective nation. The Greek historian Spyridon Lambros remarked that the pen of the historian was more important for nation-building than the guns of the military.³⁹ The very first issue of the *Revue Historique*, published in Paris in 1876, stated very clearly a political calling for professional historians. History, the editors wrote, was ‘to give to our country the unity and moral strength it needs’, in particular for the revenge for 1871 and the recovery of the ‘lost lands’ of Alsace and Lorraine.⁴⁰

Professional historians became festive speakers, political speech writers and the authors of articles in popular media, especially newspapers and journals. They were politically committed not just to the nation but to a variety of different causes next to historiographical nationalism and strongly intertwined with imperialism. In Britain, John Robert Seeley promoted a ‘greater Britain’, extending the nation to incorporate all white settler societies that were part of the British Empire. His *Expansion of England*, published in 1883, was very much written as a public intellectual for a wide audience, and his political-cum-historical role was recognized by a knighthood, awarded in 1894. Seeley’s writings were not just promoting a new understanding of an imperial Britain within the British Isles and the empire, but his works also had a major influence on other historians of empire in other empires, most notably Russia.⁴¹

Throughout much of the nineteenth century, nationalism and imperialism were strongly allied to liberalism. Many historians were political

Liberals, championing ideas of constitutional rule and the political participation of the educated and propertied middle classes. This political commitment provided another vast area for the engagement of historians in wider civil society. Nineteenth-century Whig historiography, as represented by Thomas Babington Macaulay's *History of England* was the archetypal liberal-national-imperial historiography, promoting a view of the long forward march of constitutionalism, parliamentarism, liberty and the rule of law.⁴² Variants of English Whig historiography can be found in many parts of Europe. Thus, for example, in Hungary Mihály Horváth championed the alleged 'original liberty' of the Magyars, and much of nineteenth-century Polish historiography retained a fascination with the Polish constitution of 1791, which had made Poland the alleged homeland of liberty in Europe.⁴³

Political commitments also extended to democratic and socialist historians, although they rarely managed to find a position within European university systems in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Louis Blanc, for example, became one of the most prominent historians of class, for whom the French revolution of 1789 was a class history that represented the precondition for the emergence of socialism.⁴⁴ Around 1900 a thriving autodidactic tradition of historical writing within the nascent European labour movement gave rise to strong class perspectives on modern European history. European socialists, such as Jean Jaures, Eduard Bernstein, Filippo Turati, Robert Grimm and many others wrote history as a way of affirming a particular historical mission for their respective parties. History became a powerful weapon in the class struggle and the attempt to grab political power from the hands of the bourgeoisie.⁴⁵

Apart from direct political commitments, many historians also engaged themselves in the promotion of their Christian beliefs. They championed the history of Christianity in their own writings. British nineteenth-century historians, for example, often described the church as the saviour of the state in medieval England. Later, Protestantism supposedly gave rise to individual liberty, which in turn became the anchor of English national identity.⁴⁶ Where there existed a strong relationship between church and state we find the strong involvement of the clergy in the writing of history and in the promotion of Christian historical narratives.⁴⁷ The pastor historian was by no means an exception in nineteenth-century Europe.⁴⁸ And Catholic historiographies were as publicly engaged as their Protestant counterparts. In Hungary, for example, the Catholic historical master narrative contributed to the public cult surrounding King Stephen, the first king of Hungary in the eleventh century and a Catholic saint.⁴⁹ In the German lands, Protestant historians became champions of the Luther cult, whilst their minoritarian Catholic counterparts sought to develop a similar national cult around the figure of St Bonifaz.⁵⁰

A final example from a long list of possible engagements and commitments of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century historians comes from the nascent women's movement. Women had been prominent historical authors in many parts of Europe in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In England, Catherine Macaulay published an eight-volume *History of England* between 1763 and 1783 that amounted to a rallying cry of liberty against tyranny. Her republicanism made her a strong public intellectual in eighteenth-century historical-political discourses.⁵¹ Yet with the onset of the institutionalization and professionalization of historical studies, they were pushed to the margins, as the profession became overwhelmingly male.⁵² Even thereafter, however, women continued to play a prominent role as non-professional 'amateur' writers and as spouses/partners of professional male historians.⁵³ And in some cases women historians became prominent champions of women's rights and women's emancipation. Thus, for example, Irish female historians established a strong tradition of a politically committed engaged history on behalf of women's rights from the mid nineteenth century onwards.⁵⁴

Whilst the political engagement of historians was manifold, it was the strong nationalist commitment of historiography that produced major tragedy for millions of people, as it contributed to the legitimation of forms of ethnic cleansing, genocide and war – fully coming into its own in the first half of the twentieth century. Emilia Salvanou in her chapter in this volume deals with the Ottoman Greeks, in particular the Thracian Greeks, who were forced to flee their homeland in the interwar period, after the failure of the Greek Megali idea (the idea of a greater Greece including the former western parts of the Greek settlement of the Ottoman Empire) at the end of World War I. In interwar Greece the refugees were widely associated with national shame, and their memories were excluded from the national imaginary. Yet representatives of those refugees were steadfastly seeking ways of representing their traumatic past within a wider Greek national historical narrative. They did so by forming history associations in which intellectuals, often associated with the refugee milieu, sought to progress memory and history work aimed at integrating the refugees' experience with broader Greek history and memory. Salvanou pays special attention in her chapter to the concept of nostalgia and argues that it was important to the refugees, as it allowed them to construct the past as one of 'cancelled potentials'. Overall, she contends that the refugees succeeded in integrating their history into the wider national history the more historians were ready to interpret the trauma of the Ottoman Greeks as a trauma of the entire Greek nation. The nationalization of history and memory alike thus not only produced the trauma in the first instance; it ironically also helped people to deal with it.⁵⁵ The Ottoman Greek diaspora in Greece is only one

of several cases of forced migration and ethnic cleansing that have produced a string of politically committed historical accounts penned by historians keen to lend their pens to public forms of intervention.

So far this account of the relationship between political engagement and the historical sciences has been very Eurocentric. Yet, both history as a 'science' (in the sense of the German 'Wissenschaft') and nationalism were hugely successful export articles of the imperialist European states in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁵⁶ Neither were adopted wholesale and straightforwardly copied in the non-Western world. Instead they were adapted and reformulated in complex processes of transnational receptions that still deserve far more attention in both the histories of historiography and the histories of nationalism. And the non-Western world would in turn write back and begin to influence Western understandings of historical writing and nationalism, most notably through the subaltern school of historians emanating from India in the 1980s and through the diverse reconceptualizations of the national idea and nationalism present in the processes of decolonization beginning in the interwar period and coming fully into their own in the post-World War II period.⁵⁷ In Egypt, for example, Cairo and the Ain Shams University became the undisputed centre of scholarly historical writing in the years after 1945, but the historians who worked there were at the same time politically committed and engaged. Their anti-colonialist nationalism had different ideological shades, and their political convictions differed, but they were in agreement on their perception of history being important beyond the academic ivory tower.⁵⁸

In the present volume Xin Fan is dealing with one such case of the adaptation of Western historical and nationalist ideas in China. Focusing on the historian Lei Haizong and the so-called 'Zhanguo Ce Clique', he analyses their intellectual development in the light of the emergence of greater intellectual freedoms following the end of the Qing Empire in 1911. Although the tradition of writing history is a very old one in China, the 1910s and 1920s saw a strong reception of Western ideas of historical scholarship leading to processes of professionalization and institutionalization of historical studies in urban centres like Shanghai or Beijing. According to Xin Fan, the scholars most closely involved with those processes also adopted Western ideas, including nationalism, liberalism and modernity. In their history writing, they sought to trace and support the forces that were in line with their new-found *Weltanschauung*. Like in the West, notions of academic autonomy sat at best uneasily with ideas of political commitment, the latter especially to the force of nationalism. Fan exemplifies this through Lei Haizong, who was trained as a professional historian in China and the US, receiving his PhD from the University of Chicago before returning to China. Initially not enamoured by Chinese culture, he came to endorse

strong nationalist ideas, including notions of the superiority of Chinese culture, in the context of the war against Japan in the 1930s and 1940s. He was, like other members of the 'Zhanguo Ce Clique', intellectually influenced by cyclical ideas of history championed by Oswald Spengler, and their strong political commitment found expression in support for Chiang Kai-shek.⁵⁹ Whilst the nationalist historiography continued to flourish under the Kuomintang in Taiwan after 1949, the victory of communism on the Chinese mainland meant that Marxist-Leninist and, increasingly, Maoist perspectives on history ruled supreme amongst communist historians in China. The Cold War had produced two historiographical traditions that are currently engaged in an intriguing dialogue about the future of Chinese historical thinking.⁶⁰

In Europe, like in China, the memoryscape of World War II was very differently reconfigured by the Cold War in different parts of the continent. In communist Eastern Europe, it was contextualized within the anti-fascist struggle led by communist parties who fought in fascism the most aggressive political form of the economic system of capitalism. That the Soviet Union was during a brief period allied to the most aggressive form of fascism, National Socialism, and had agreed with its representatives the carving up of spheres of interest in Eastern Europe was comprehensively silenced both in the general memory discourse and in the more specific historiographical discourse during the Cold War.⁶¹ In the capitalist West, by contrast, the history of World War II was seen within the dominant paradigm of totalitarianism. In this narrative, beleaguered liberal democracies of the inter-war period had a hard time fighting both totalitarian temptations – that of fascism and that of communism. During World War II the fascist variant could only be defeated by an alliance of the strongest and most stable liberal democracies of the West with Soviet communism, but after the war, the remaining totalitarianism, that of communism, became the new adversary of the liberal democratic order of the West.⁶²

Yet before the establishment of such a clear Cold War binary world, many European countries witnessed major economic and social challenges to existing liberal-democratic capitalist orders at the end of World War II.⁶³ Nowhere did those challenges result in a regime change, not least because the liberal capitalist West invested heavily in keeping those regions, where the Red Army was not in control, outside of the influence of communism. In Greece this led to a protracted and bloody civil war that followed World War II and in which the strong communist resistance to the fascist occupation of Greece in the World War II was defeated by those in favour of a liberal capitalist restitution after the war. Manos Avgeridis's chapter in this volume draws attention to the case of the historian and public intellectual Christopher Montague Woodhouse. His manifold publications on

Greece during World War II and the immediate postwar period stressed the insignificance of the Greek resistance to the outcome of World War II. Furthermore, he underlined the importance of the British intervention in Greece, starting from 1944, for the eventual defeat of communism and for keeping the country within the realm of the 'liberal West'. His theses provoked a huge debate in Greece, which is examined in detail by Avgeridis. It is interesting to note that Woodhouse's championing of a professional, 'objective' history jarred badly with his own very partisan political engagement as a historian.

The case of Woodhouse is an intriguing one, not just because of what it tells us about the construction of wider Cold War historical narratives but also because it points to the continued existence and importance of the 'amateur' or 'half professional' in European history writing during the second half of the twentieth century. Woodhouse can be regarded as a professional historian, having studied history and later filling the post as general director at the Royal Institute for Foreign Affairs in London. Yet he had also been at different points in his life a diplomat, a member of parliament (for the Conservative Party) and a businessman. He was thus not a million miles removed from many nineteenth-century historians who were also multitaskers, occupying a vast range of professional positions during their lifetimes, including those of journalists, politicians, diplomats, even bishops and government ministers. The histories of the professionalization of the historical discipline emphasize that these existences of nineteenth-century historians who fulfilled many roles and inhabited a range of different professions during their lifetimes gave way to the fully professionalized historians who, after having received their training at university, underwent a lengthy *cursus honorum* that would set them on their paths to becoming professional historians with their own distinct *habitus* and their own communities, networks and institutions. The movement between professions allegedly became increasingly rare. Whilst this is on balance a fair description of professionalization and its consequences, we still often find that historians engaged as intellectuals defied this trend and continued to occupy multiple roles in society. In the light of this finding, it would merit further investigation as to what extent the decisions of historians to become public intellectuals worked against their sole definition as members of a professional and institutionalized community.

During the Cold War, historians as public intellectuals could be found on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Nina Witoszek in her contribution to the volume discusses the role of Polish historians such as Bronisław Geremek, Adam Michnik and Jacek Kuroń, in the Polish revolution of the 1980s. Contributing in a major way to the oppositional Workers' Defence Committee (KOR) in communist Poland, they came to exemplify how

intellectuals could support a humanist agenda. In 1976, when the KOR was founded, it began to erect a 'parallel polis' and a 'republic of friendship' in Poland, including a Flying University. Without its historians as engaged intellectuals, Witoszek argues, Solidarnosc might well have just remained a workers' strike movement, as it had already occurred in Poland before. Public intellectuals like Kuroń pushed the movement further, in the direction of fighting tyranny. They established dialogic orientation in the parallel polis of Solidarnosc, which, Witoszek argues, amounted to an actualization of the *res publica literarum* of the Renaissance.⁶⁴

The appearance of Solidarnosc marked and was itself a symbol of a deep political crisis in Polish society. The political engagement of historians is often particularly prominent at times of political crisis. When a specific political movement appears that raises prominent political demands, historians feel called upon to react and either oppose or support those movements with historical expertise that can justify or undermine those movements. In the nineteenth century, as we have seen above, the synergies between national movements and history writing were considerable. Many historians identified wholeheartedly with various forms of nationalism. In the twentieth century, the world wars as well as the political battles between liberal democracies, fascisms and communisms also were moments of mobilization for historians as political intellectuals. In England, liberal historians such as George Trevelyan wrote political speeches and campaigned in public for the liberal political values that they saw enshrined in British history and endangered on the European continent.⁶⁵ In France, the father figures of the *Annales*, Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch, as well as their admired *Übervater*, Henri Pirenne, also defended a republican and liberal political ideal against the temptations of a deeply nationalist and right-wing historiography that ruled the day in much of interwar Europe. Pirenne had already called on the historical profession to 'unlearn' history from the Germans after World War I, as he was shocked by the nationalist commitments of German historians in that war.⁶⁶ Bloch joined the Resistance during World War II and was killed by the Gestapo for his political choice. He also penned a number of reflections on the historian's craft that have retained their inspirational value to this day.⁶⁷

Yet many historians in the interwar period also committed themselves to the causes of fascism, right-wing authoritarianism and communism – all claiming to supersede the liberal ideas of the nineteenth century. Whilst few historians in Germany were committed National Socialists, many failed to oppose the dictatorship. Some might have been glad at the end of an unloved Weimar Republic; some might have felt proud of the foreign policy successes of the National Socialists in the 1930s; not a few were enamoured by the early successes of the German Wehrmacht in World

War II. The conservative mainstream of the German historical profession had accommodated themselves to the dictatorship, supporting it in parts and paying lip service to the National Socialist regime, performing its historical 'services' where required. A younger group of historians, committed to *Volksgeschichte*, went further in their support for the regime. Historians involved in German Ostforschung and German Westforschung were part and parcel of the National Socialist attempt to restructure the map of Europe in the context of World War II, and they helped the regime to plan and execute ethnic cleansings and expansionist schemes.⁶⁸

Like in National Socialist Germany, in fascist Italy we also find few out-and-out apologists for fascism, even if many historians had sympathies for the regime and were happy to cooperate with it.⁶⁹ Historians also supported the right-wing authoritarian dictatorships that were established in the Iberian peninsula in the interwar period. In Portugal, under the military dictatorship and the Estado Novo, they promoted a traditionalist vision of the nation's past, celebrating the Age of Discoveries and Portugal's golden age whilst silencing the traditions of Portuguese liberalism.⁷⁰ In Francoist Spain, those regarded as disloyal to Francoism were purged from the universities in 1939. It is estimated that about one third of all historians lost their job, and many of them had to go into exile. Those in support of Franco promoted a history writing that emphasized the positive role of Catholicism in Spanish history – betraying the strong influence of the ultra-Catholic Opus Dei on higher education in Spain during the Franco years.⁷¹

After 1917, the victory of Bolshevism in the Soviet Union saw the complete restructuring of the Russian historical profession in the 1920s and 1930s. Historians loyal to the communist regime saw history as a weapon in the struggle for communism and developed a position according to which historians had to be partisan and on the side of the progressive forces in history. The old idea of objectivity was replaced with that of partisanship. Bourgeois historians, critical of Bolshevism, were purged, exiled, imprisoned and killed. Under Stalin, the historical profession was further streamlined, and the critical methodological and theoretical arsenal of Marxist thought became a dull and simplistic ideological straitjacket.⁷² Outside of the Soviet Union, Marxist thought inspired a range of historians who tended to combine their historical work with political engagement on behalf of communism and allied causes. The Communist Party Historians' Group in Britain, including the likes of, among others, Eric Hobsbawm, E.P. Thompson, Dona Torr and Raphael Samuel is a good example of more productive forms of Marxism in historical writing, as is the work of French historians of the Great Revolution, like Albert Soboul.⁷³

In the post-1945 world, the chiffre of 1968 signifies another key moment of political crisis in which historians were again prominent, albeit

to very different degrees and under very different circumstances in diverse parts of the world.⁷⁴ In the West, critical historians aimed at increasing their influence over the Academy and promoted the writing of an engaged history as part and parcel of a strong intervention of historians in civil society.⁷⁵ Although it could at times appear as though they were more concerned with internal factional struggles between different shades of Marxism and the New Left, 1968 undoubtedly saw a strong mobilization of engaged left-wing intellectuals.⁷⁶ In the communist East, 1968 as a crisis year had entirely different connotations from its meanings in the capitalist West. Yet, if we take the example of 1968 in Czechoslovakia, it was also a time of intense historical debate when historians decided to take a stance in favour of political reform. Many of them paid a heavy price when that reform movement was crushed by Soviet tanks. The memory of 1968 was in fact so divisive in Czech history circles that the post-1989 transition saw the settling of many old scores in what often became very ugly public debates about individual historians and their implication in relegations and other discriminations suffered by Czech historians after 1968.⁷⁷

In this volume Michihiro Okamoto discusses the case of Japan, where a group of young historians aligned themselves with the student protest movement, and in founding the journal *Social Movement History (SMH)* sought to contribute to their political struggles. They influenced the turn of Japanese historiography to everyday life history and to anthropological perspectives. Furthermore, they played an important role in importing Western ideas, including *Annales* scholarship from France and critical Marxist approaches, such as those championed by E.P. Thompson in Britain. Okamoto's chapter brings to the fore the issue of how historical work itself can be a contribution to political struggles. A particular way of seeing the past, analysing it and making it visible have political implications that go far beyond the realm of scholarship. It is not by chance that many of the leading historians of the *Annales* have been for many generations also the lead commentators on politics in French newspapers and other media, whilst the role of E.P. Thompson as a transnational peace activist is another prominent example of the direct relationship between historical work and political action.⁷⁸

Historians as engaged intellectuals have at times been in the forefront of protest movements, mobilizing dissent, but they were also at times known for their role as bridge-builders between different ideologies and in diverse political conflicts. I can think of a no more impressive example of both forms of political engagement than Georg G. Iggers, who provides to this volume what he calls a 'personal retrospective' to his own life as a historian and engaged intellectual. A refugee from National Socialist Germany at the age of twelve, he effectively made his life and his career in North America, where eventually he ended up as a distinguished professor of history, writing

books that have become classics and that are widely respected and admired among his peers. Always in close partnership with his wife, Wilma Iggers, herself a distinguished historian of the Czech and Slovak lands, he also performed the role of the historian as engaged intellectual, first by supporting the civil rights movement and the anti-Vietnam War campaign in the US⁷⁹ and later by building bridges between East and West German historiography during the Cold War. Well into his 80s, he was one of the first American historians to build bridges to the historical profession in Cuba, for so long isolated from the West. It is particularly intriguing to observe in his contribution how he relates his historical research to particular ethical and normative positions that also guided his political activism. Although he was not a historian of the civil rights movement, the anti-Vietnam War movement, the Cold War or Cuba, his work, first on democratic socialism and later on German historiography, was informed by similar sentiments and motivations that guided his political work, in particular his strong humanistic and democratic convictions.⁸⁰

Throughout his life, Iggers has been a strong champion of human rights. In this respect, there is a firm connection between his chapter and that of Nina Schneider, who discusses the entanglements of professional historical writing and human rights activism in the twenty-first century. She refers to the case of Elazar Barkan, a contemporary leading scholar on human rights, who has consistently demanded that historians ‘abandon their ivory towers’ and become involved in the ‘cause of reconciliation’. He believes that scholars, who are also historical activists, could promote a ‘shared narrative’ that would form the basis for reconciliation in conflicts involving contestation about the past. Based on Barkan’s assumptions, Schneider investigates Brazil as a country divided by historical memory of the military dictatorship that ruled between 1964 and 1985. The Brazilian case, in her view, shows how problematic Barkan’s notion of history work as work of reconciliation is, for what Brazil needs is not a shared narrative between former perpetrators and former victims but an engaged history that is both truthful and begins to acknowledge the victims’ struggle against the dictatorship. In particular, she assesses the work of the truth commission (2012–2014) against the background of a benchmark that sees historical writing as supporting human rights, even if she has to admit that she herself is not sure how to narrativize such historical writing.

Meize Lucas’s chapter also deals with the Brazilian dictatorship and its censorship of history in historical films. She shows how the anti-communist framework of the Brazilian state and its obsession with ‘national unity’ had implications for which representations of the past were allowed to show up on the big screen. Any references to religious and social conflicts tended to be cut out by the censors, who were also not shy to ban whole films,

including those produced outside of Brazil. Lucas gives us several intriguing examples of how popular histories, represented through film, were seen as a major threat to the dictatorship, underlining to what extent public history was seen as a resource for politics by representatives of the dictatorial state in Brazil.

Truth commissions, such as the one in Brazil, deal with traumatic pasts in the hope that their work will bring about some form of reconciliation. The past is brought out in the open. Testimonies are heard from victims, bystanders and perpetrators, and the public discussions that ensue are thought of as contributing to some form of societal healing process. It is interesting to note that many truth commissions have not included historians in the list of those who are being heard. Historical evidence as the basis of some sort of historical truth is apparently not part of the remit of truth commissions.⁸¹ This indicates that history might not in fact work in the direction of healing but rather in the direction of keeping historical wounds open.

The recognition that history might in fact stand in the way of reconciliation has led to the conscious destruction of historical archives seen as holding unpalatable and unwanted knowledge of the past. It is a well-known fact that failed governments who see themselves under threat of being deposed or overthrown have, time and again, tried to destroy archives and files, mostly in order to prevent knowledge of things that would reflect badly on the government or individuals working for it. Wars and civil wars have repeatedly led to the loss and destruction of archives.⁸² One of the most comprehensive undertakings was the destruction of files by the East German state in the midst of the East German revolution of 1989 and the toppling of its communist regime. The reaction of the post-revolutionary state can also be regarded as one of the most noteworthy in history. It decided to invest considerable resources and energy in trying to put together again hundreds of thousands of documents that had been destroyed by the East German secret police and other government agencies.⁸³ Yet it is one thing for a failed government to destroy archives and quite another for a successor government of a failed one to order the destruction of archives seen as endangering national reconciliation. In this volume, Vangelis Karamanolakis is analysing just such a case that happened in Greece in 1989, precisely the year in which the East German files were destroyed.

But in Greece this did not happen in the midst of a revolution and under secrecy but following a very public debate on what to do with 17 million police and intelligence files that had been assembled on ordinary citizens during the years of the Greek dictatorship. The files had been closed to historians after the junta had come to an end in the 1970s and the country transitioned to democracy. In fact, as Karamanolakis points out, the post-dictatorship phase in Greek history was an extremely fruitful and energetic

one for Greek history writing. Historians played a prominent role in public debates about national and social identities in Greek society. New history journals were established and the profession flourished. Professionalism was strong, with many historians feeling that after the distortions of history under the dictatorship, it was their task to return to a myth- and ideology-free history that would reliably inform the public about the past. However, there were also, especially among Greek left-wing historians, prominent ideas about history as an emancipatory idea that would help bring about social change in Greek society. Greek historical culture saw lively debates on twentieth-century Greek history, including its history during World War II and the Greek civil war. The topic of the military junta was also a prominent one, although it is interesting to observe that the debate on what to do with the secret police files only erupted with a delay of almost fifteen years. Furthermore, it was the government and not the historians starting the debate with the decision to destroy these files. They were seen as endangering social peace in Greece, as they contained information that was deeply upsetting to millions of Greek citizens. As Karamanolakis writes, historians were the main opposition to the burning of those files. They argued that they were a unique source for Greek history under the dictatorship. Whilst they accepted that access should perhaps be prohibited for some time to come and whilst they also agreed that access would have to be strictly limited and controlled, they argued that national reconciliation would not be possible without those files, as they contained access to many rifts that had gone through many Greek families and the entire fabric of Greek society during the years of the dictatorship. Yet, as Karamanolakis also observes, the historians lost the public debate. Opinion polls clearly indicate that a majority of Greek citizens were in favour of the proposed government action, fearing misuse of the files and the return of a past that many were happy to repress. The case detailed here raises many interesting questions, not least about the extent to which history can help or hinder reconciliation and how it may perform a useful function in processes of coming to terms with traumatic memory.

The loss of archives is definitely a major problem for historical research. After all, archives are an integral part of social memory and form the basis on which contestation over the past can be fought out authoritatively. The archivist is a key 'activist in the production of (historical) knowledge'.⁸⁴ Arguably, another problem is the enormous proliferation of archives in the digital age. The impact of digitalization, also, has important consequences for historians as engaged intellectuals, as Effi Gazi argues in her chapter. Digital media make it much easier to intervene in society and bring history into political debates. They have also produced a step change in how historians do, present and perform historical research. Digital archives have

their own challenges and problems with regard to decisions about what is going to be saved and uploaded in the digital repositories of the future. The consequences of all this are highly contested: while some commentators declare the ‘democratization of history’, others bemoan the end of ‘concrete historical narratives’. Undoubtedly, the digital revolution poses new questions regarding ‘usable’ and ‘disposable’ pasts and the relationship of history with memory.⁸⁵

Several contributions to this volume make reference to public uses of history that go far beyond professional history discourses, even if they are often influenced by them. The chapter by Antonis Liakos discusses a particularly prominent example of public history in the recent past, namely the use of history by the Occupy movement. With special reference to Greece and the Greek financial crisis between 2008 and 2011, Liakos analyses political slogans and visual images, such as graffiti in public spaces. He points out how images were often transferred from earlier protest movements to the present one, providing the Occupy movement with memoryscapes of past movements and mobilizations on which it could build.⁸⁶ The memory of past struggles allowed the Occupy movement to construct political traditions and create a usable past for its present political struggles. Quite apart from the transfer of images and slogans from past protest movements, Liakos also points to the contemporary transfer of political slogans and images from other antiglobal protest movements. He points out that one of the strongest resources for protesters was the national past, which was reinterpreted to support the protesters’ arguments. Analogical historical thinking was strongly present in the protests. Thus past political enemies tended to be equated with present ones; for example, in the identification of the troika with the military junta in Greece. Overall, he concludes the uses of history allowed the protesters to construct an alternative vision of the future. The present was endowed with utopian energy by reference to the past.

All contributions to this volume highlight how the practitioners of history have contributed as public intellectuals to historically informed political debates in various contexts. History was and continues to be an important resource for political agendas and mobilizations, and those whose job it is to interpret the past therefore have felt or have been called upon to engage with those agendas and mobilizations. Historians cannot ignore politics, nor can politics ignore historians. However, the most powerful way in which history is politically and socially engaged may not be through an overt political commitment but simply by, as Richard Rorty has suggested, following its disciplinary guidelines in an honest way.⁸⁷ In a similar fashion, Jo Tollebeek has hailed a certain aimless historicist curiosity as the most effective political intervention, as it allows the historian to fully consider the otherness of the past that might well work as a potent criticism of the

present, avoiding the presentist desire to put the contemporary frameworks of reference as absolute.⁸⁸

Stefan Berger is Professor of Social History and Director of the Institute for Social Movements at Ruhr University, Bochum, in Germany. He is also executive chair of the Foundation History of the Ruhr and an Honorary Professor at Cardiff University in the UK. He has published widely on the history of historiography, historical theory, memory studies, the history of social movements and the history of deindustrialization as well as the history of British-German relations. Among his most recent books are *History and Belonging: Representations of the Past in Contemporary European Politics* (Berghahn, 2018, edited with Caner Tekin) and *Palgrave Handbook of Research in Historical Culture and Education* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, edited with Mario Carretero and Maria Grever).

Notes

1. On professionalism and professionalization of the historical sciences see Torstendahl, *The Rise and Propagation of Historical Professionalism*. On scientificity in historical studies see also Feldner, 'The New Scientificity in Historical Writing around 1800', 3–21.

2. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*.

3. On the relationship between history and memory see Lorenz, 'Blurred Lines: History, Memory and the Experience of Time', 73–90; see also Lorenz, 'Drawing the Line: "Scientific History" between Myth-Making and Myth-Breaking', 35–55.

4. Kansteiner, 'Postmoderner Historismus'; Bédarida, 'The Historians' Craft, Historicity and Ethics', 69–76.

5. See, for example, Brown, *An Intellectual Biography*; Joyce and Zinn, *A Radical American Vision*.

6. Banner, *Being a Historian: An Introduction to the Professional World of History*, 158–66; Yerxa (ed.), *Recent Themes on Historians and the Public: Historians in Conversation*.

7. Tyrrell, *Historians in Public: The Practice of American History, 1890–1970*.

8. Posner, *Public Intellectuals: A Study of Decline*, chapter 8.

9. Vom Lehn, *Westdeutsche und italienische Historiker als Intellektuelle? Ihr Umgang mit Nationalsozialismus und Faschismus in den Massenmedien 1943/45–1960*.

10. DuBois, 'Long Live Radical History!', 91–92.

11. The literature on public history has exploded in recent years. See, for example, Lyon, Nix and Shrum, *Introduction to Public History: Interpreting the Past, Engaging Audiences*.

12. Zald and McCarthy, 'Organizational Intellectuals and the Criticism of Society', 97–120; Borg and Mayo, *Public Intellectuals, Radical Democracy and Social Movements: A Book of Interviews*; Baud and Rutten, *Popular Intellectuals and Social Movements: Framing Protest in Asia, Africa and Latin America (International Review of Social History Supplement 12)*; specifically on the relationship between labour movement historians and the construction of particular pasts as a form of political engagement see Irving and Scalmer, *Labour Historians as Labour Intellectuals: Generations and Crises*.

13. Morgan, *The Webbs and Soviet Communism*.

14. With relation to the American labour movement, see Green, *Taking History to Heart: The Power of the Past in Building Social Movements*.

15. See, for example, Hübinger and Hertfelder, *Kritik und Mandat: Intellektuelle in der deutschen Politik*, which is an outstanding volume, but it does not discuss a single historian.

16. Charle, *Naissance des Intellectuels: 1880–1900*; see also idem, *Les Intellectuels en Europe au XIX Siècle: Essai d'Histoire Comparée*. For a specifically French tradition see also Ory and Sirinelli, *Les Intellectuels en France dans l’Affaire Dreyfus à nos Jours*; for Britain see Collini, *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain*; for Germany see Bering, *Die Intellektuellen: Geschichte eines Schimpfworts*; idem, *Die Epoche der Intellektuellen, 1898–2011: Geburt, Begriff, Grabmal*.

17. Hübinger, ‘Die politischen Rollen europäischer Intellektueller im 20. Jahrhundert’, 30–44.

18. Mannheim, *Ideologie und Utopie: Wissenssoziologische Untersuchungen*; Bourdieu, *Satz und Gegensatz: Über die Verantwortung der Intellektuellen*.

19. Schumpeter, *Kapitalismus, Sozialismus, Demokratie*, 237.

20. Weber, *Schriften 1915–1920: Die Wirtschaftsethik der Weltreligionen: Konfuzianismus und Taoismus*, 101.

21. Barraclough, ‘History, Morals, and Politics’, citation on p. 3.

22. Paul, ‘The Epistemic Virtues of Historical Scholarship; or, the Moral Dimensions of a Scholarly Character’, 371–87.

23. See also Rösen, *Evidence and Meaning: A Theory of Historical Studies*.

24. On the intricate relationship between the judge and the historian and their common attempts to look at evidence, proof and testimony, see also the inspirational book by Ginzburg, *The Judge and the Historian: Marginal Notes on a Late Twentieth-Century Miscarriage of Justice*.

25. See also Pihlainen, *The Work of History: Constructivism and a Politics of the Past*.

26. See in particular White, *The Practical Past*. On Foucault’s analysis of power as a basis for political engagement see Bové, *Intellectuals in Power: A Genealogy of Critical Humanism*, 209–37.

27. De Baets’s *Responsible History* is an excellent discussion of how history was abused by politics and how historians carried out their professional duties and what they saw as their duty as citizens in the face of such abuses. See also De Baets, *Censorship of Political Thought: A World Guide, 1945–2000*, which documents the impact of censorship on historical and political thought. And De Baets, *Crimes against History*.

28. A recent special issue of *Storia della Storiografia* that goes back to a session held at the 2015 world historical congress engages with exile historiographies in different parts of the world. See Berger and De Baets, ‘Reflections on Exile Historiographies’, 11–26.

29. On the professionalization of the historical sciences in Europe see also Porciani and Raphael, *Atlas of European Historiography: The Making of a Profession, 1800–2005*; Porciani and Tollebeek, *Setting the Standards: Institutions, Networks and Communities of National Historiography*.

30. Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University*.

31. I follow here John Pocock’s suggestion to speak of Enlightenment rather than Enlightenment in order to highlight the simple fact that this movement had a very different character in different places. See Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion, vol. 1: The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon 1737–1764*, 12. On the development of the European universities from the Enlightenment onwards, see Anderson, *European Universities from the Enlightenment to 1914*.

32. Von See, *Die Göttinger Sieben: Kritik einer Legende*.

33. Rousseau, ‘Discourse on the Origins and Foundations of Inequality among Men’, 84–86.

34. Abbatisa, ‘The Historical Thought of the French Philosophes’, 406–27; Oz-Salzberger, *Translating the Enlightenment: Scottish Civic Discourse in Eighteenth-Century*

Germany; Grell, *L'histoire entre erudition et philosophie: étude sur la connaissance historique à l'âge des Lumières*; Reill, *The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism*.

35. Berger and Conrad, *The Past as History: National Identity and Historical Consciousness in Modern Europe*, chapters 2 and 3.

36. Iggers, *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present*; Gerhards, Heinrich von Treitschke: *Wirkung und Wahrnehmung eines Historikers im 19. Und 20. Jahrhundert*.

37. Plokhly, *Unmaking Imperial Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History*; Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture*.

38. Tolz, *Russia: Inventing the Nation*, 172.

39. Cited in Gazi, 'Theorizing and Practising "Scientific History" in Southeastern Europe: Spyridon Lambos and Nicolae Iorga', 198.

40. Monod and Fagniez, 'Avant-Propos', 4.

41. Mycock and Loskoutova, 'Nation, State and Empire: The Historiography of "High Imperialism" in the British and Russian Empires', 233–58; Semyonov, 'Mirrors of Imperial Imagination in the Early Twentieth-Century Russian Empire', 139–52.

42. Blaas, *Continuity and Anachronism: Parliamentary and Constitutional Development in Whig Historiography and in the Anti-Whig Reaction between 1890 and 1930*; Hall, *Macaulay and Son: Architects of Imperial Britain*.

43. Von Klimó, *Nation, Konfession, Geschichte: Zur nationalen Geschichtskultur Ungarns im europäischen Kontext (1860–1948)*, 37; Fiszman, *Constitution and Reform in Eighteenth-Century Poland: The Constitution of 3 May 1791*; on variants of liberal political commitment of historians in East-Central Europe see also Báár, *Historians and Nationalism: East-Central Europe in the Nineteenth Century*.

44. Loubère, *Louis Blanc: His Life and His Contribution to the Rise of French Jacobin-Socialism*, chapter 14.

45. Deneckere and Welskopp, 'The "Nation" and "Class": European National Master Narratives and their Social "Other"', 135–70.

46. Bentley, *Modernizing England's Past: English Historiography in the Age of Modernism*, 45–69.

47. Hermann and Metzger, 'A Truculent Revenge: The Clergy and the Writing of National History', 313–29.

48. Den Boer, 'Deux aspects de l'historiographie aux Pays-Bas et en France vers 1900: le rôle des facultés de théologie et la non-intervention de l'État', 117.

49. Klimó, *Nation*, 92–130.

50. Weichlein, "'Meine Peitsche ist die Feder": Populäre katholische Geschichtsschreibung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert', 227–58.

51. Hill, *The Republican Virago: The Life and Times of Catherine Macaulay, Historian*.

52. B.G. Smith, *The Gender of History: Men, Women and Historical Practice*.

53. Melman, 'Gender, History and Memory: The Invention of Women's Past in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries', 5–41; Porciani, *History Women, special issue of Storia della Storiografia* 46.

54. N.C. Smith, *A 'Manly Study'? Irish Women Historians 1868–1949*.

55. For the context of the development of Greek historiography, see Gazi, *Scientific National History: The Greek Case in Comparative Perspective*.

56. Berger, *Writing National Histories: A Global Perspective*.

57. Majumdar, *Writing Postcolonial History*; Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*.

58. Gorman, *Historians, State and Politics in Twentieth-Century Egypt: Contesting the Nation*, 43f.

59. See also Schneider, *Nation and Ethnicity: Chinese Discourses on History, Historiography and Nationalism (1900s to 1920s)*.
60. Weigelin-Schwiedrzik, 'Chinese Historical Writing since 1949', 615–36.
61. Antohi, Trencsényi and Apor, *Narratives Unbound: Historical Studies in Post-Communist Eastern Europe*.
62. Friedrich and Brezinski, *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*; for the impact on West Germany see Fellner, 'Nationales und europäisch-atlantisches Geschichtsbild in der Bundesrepublik und im Westen in den Jahren nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkriegs', 213–26.
63. Berger and Boldorf, *Social Movements and the Change of Economic Elites in Europe after 1945*.
64. Zuzowksi, *Political Dissent and Opposition in Poland: The Workers' Defence Committee KOR*.
65. Hernon, 'The Last Whig Historian and Consensus History: George Macaulay Trevelyan 1876–1962', 66–97.
66. Schöttler, 'After the Deluge: The Impact of the Two World Wars on the Historical Work of Henri Pirenne and Marc Bloch', 404–25.
67. Bloch, *The Historian's Craft*.
68. There is, by now, an extensive literature on the political commitment of German historians under National Socialism. See, among others, Schönwälder, *Historiker und Politik: Geschichtswissenschaft im Nationalsozialismus*; Haar and Fahlbusch, *German Scholars and Ethnic Cleansing 1919–1945*.
69. Fogu, *The Historic Imaginary: Politics of History in Fascist Italy*.
70. Matos, *História, mitologia, imaginário nacional: a História no Curso dos Liceus (1895–1939)*.
71. Marin, *Los historiadores españoles en el franquismo 1948–1975*; Pasamar, *Apología and Criticism: Historians and the History of Spain, 1500–2000*, chapter 3.
72. Banerij, *Writing History in the Soviet Union: Making the Past Work*.
73. Kaye, *The British Marxist Historians: An Introductory Analysis*; Kroll, *Kommunistische Intellektuelle in Westeuropa: Frankreich, Österreich, Italien und Grossbritannien im Vergleich 1945–1956*.
74. For 1968 as a global social movement see Horn, '1968: A Social Movement Sui Generis', 515–42.
75. For the US, see Dubermann, *Howard Zinn: A Life on the Left*, 155–80.
76. Green, 'Intellectuals and Activism: The Dilemma of the Radical Historian', 3–5, 28.
77. Rupnik, 'The Politics of History-Writing in Czechoslovakia', 166–68; Kolář and Kopeček, 'A Difficult Quest for New Paradigms: Czech Historiography after 1989', 173–310.
78. On the *Annales*, see Raphael, *Die Erben von Bloch und Febvre: Annales Geschichtsschreibung und nouvelle histoire in Frankreich, 1945–1980*; on E.P. Thompson, see Berger and Wicke, 'A Very Rooted Cosmopolitanism: E.P. Thompson's Englishness and His Transnational Activism'.
79. Also very interesting are the reflections by Michael Adas that all the historical expertise on Vietnam and South Asia had virtually no influence at all on the political decisions taken by the US government during the Vietnam War. This indicates that more than scholarship is needed to make historical knowledge productive in political contexts. See Adas, 'In Defence of Engagement: The Social Use of History in a Time of Intellectual Abdication', 141–56.
80. See also G. and W. Iggers, *Two Lives in Uncertain Times: Facing the Challenges of the Twentieth Century as Scholars and Citizens*.
81. Scheuzger, 'Truth Commissions and the Politics of History: A Critical Appraisal'.

82. International Council on Archives, *Memory of the World at Risk: Archives Destroyed, Archives Reconstituted*; Spurr, 'Iraqi Libraries and Archives in Peril', 273ff.

83. For details see http://www.bstu.bund.de/DE/Archive/RekonstruktionUnterlagen/_node.html (last accessed 11 August 2017).

84. Blouin and Rosenberg, *Processing the Past: Contesting Authority in History and the Archives*, chapter 8.

85. See also Weller, *History in the Digital Age*; Rosenzweig, *Clio Wired: The Future of the Past in the Digital Age*.

86. On the concept of memoryscapes see Phillips and Reyes, *Global Memoryscapes: Contesting Remembrance in a Transnational Age*.

87. Rorty, 'Afterword', 197–204.

88. Tollebeek, "'Italian' History versus French Heritage: Cultural Criticism, Positivism, and Political Commitment in Taine", 125–40.

Bibliography

- Abbatista, G. 'The Historical Thought of the French Philosophes', in J. Rabasa, M. Sato, E. Tortarolo and D. Woolf (eds), *Oxford History of Historical Writing*, vol. 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 406–27.
- Adas, M. 'In Defence of Engagement: The Social Use of History in a Time of Intellectual Abdication', in J. Leerssen and A. Rigney (eds), *History* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2000), 141–56.
- Anderson, R.D. *European Universities from the Enlightenment to 1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Antohi, S., B. Trencsényi and P. Apor (eds). *Narratives Unbound: Historical Studies in Post-Communist Eastern Europe*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007.
- Báár, M. *Historians and Nationalism: East-Central Europe in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Banerji, A. *Writing History in the Soviet Union: Making the Past Work*. New Delhi: Social Science Press, 2008.
- Banner, J.M. *Being a Historian: An Introduction to the Professional World of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Barraclough, G. 'History, Morals, and Politics', *International Affairs* 34(1) (1958), 1–15.
- Baud, M. and R. Rutten (eds). *Popular Intellectuals and Social Movements: Framing Protest in Asia, Africa and Latin America (International Review of Social History Supplement 12)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Bédarida, F. 'The Historians' Craft, Historicity and Ethics', in J. Leerssen and A. Rigney (eds), *Historians and Social Values* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2000), 69–76.
- Bentley, M. *Modernizing England's Past: English Historiography in the Age of Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Berger, S. (ed.). *Writing National Histories: A Global Perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Berger, S. and M. Boldorf (eds). *Social Movements and the Change of Economic Elites in Europe after 1945*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- Berger, S. and C. Conrad. *The Past as History: National Identity and Historical Consciousness in Modern Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Berger, S. and A. De Baets. 'Reflections on Exile Historiographies', *Storia della Storiografia* 69 (2016), 11–26.

- Berger, S. and C. Wicke. 'A Very Rooted Cosmopolitanism: E.P. Thompson's Englishness and His Transnational Activism', in S. Berger and S. Scalmer (eds), *Transnational Activism and Social Movements: A History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- Bering, D. *Die Intellektuellen: Geschichte eines Schimpfworts*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982.
- . *Die Epoche der Intellektuellen, 1898–2011: Geburt, Begriff, Grabmal*. Berlin: Berliner Universitätsverlag, 2010.
- Blaas, P.B.M. *Continuity and Anachronism: Parliamentary and Constitutional Development in Whig Historiography and in the Anti-Whig Reaction between 1890 and 1930*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1978.
- Bloch, M. *The Historian's Craft*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1954.
- Borg, C. and P. Mayo (eds). *Public Intellectuals, Radical Democracy and Social Movements: A Book of Interviews*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Blouin, F.X, Jr and W.G. Rosenberg. *Processing the Past: Contesting Authority in History and the Archives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Bourdieu, P. *Satz und Gegensatz: Über die Verantwortung der Intellektuellen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1993.
- Bové, P. *Intellectuals in Power: A Genealogy of Critical Humanism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Brown, D.S. R. *Hofstadter: An Intellectual Biography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Charle, C. *Naissance des Intellectuels: 1880–1900*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuits, 1990.
- . *Les Intellectuels en Europe au XIX Siècle: Essai d'Histoire Comparée*. Paris: Le Seuil, 2012.
- Chatterjee, P. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*. London: Zed Books, 1986.
- Clark, W. *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Collini, S. *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- De Baets, A. *Censorship of Political Thought: A World Guide, 1945–2000*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002.
- . *Responsible History*. Oxford: Berghahn, 2009.
- . *Crimes against History*. London: Routledge, 2019.
- Den Boer, P. 'Deux aspects de l'historiographie aux Pays-Bas et en France vers 1900: le rôle des facultés de théologie et la non-intervention de l'État', *Revista di Storia della Storiografia Moderna* 95(16) (1995), 117–25.
- Deneckere, G. and T. Welskopp. 'The "Nation" and "Class": European National Master Narratives and their Social "Other"', in S. Berger and C. Lorenz (eds), *The Contested Nation: Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 135–70.
- Dubermann, M. *Howard Zinn: A Life on the Left*. New York: The New Press, 2012.
- DuBois, E.C. 'Long Live Radical History!' *Radical History Review* 79(1) (2001), 91–92.
- Feldner, H. 'The New Scientificity in Historical Writing around 1800', in S. Berger, H. Feldner and K. Passmore (eds), *Writing History: Theory and Practice*, 2nd ed. (London: Bloomsbury, 2010), 3–21.
- Fellner, F. 'Nationales und europäisch-atlantisches Geschichtsbild in der Bundesrepublik und im Westen in den Jahren nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkriegs', in E. Schulin (ed.), *Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg, 1945–1965* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1989), 213–26.
- Fizman, S. (ed.). *Constitution and Reform in Eighteenth-Century Poland: The Constitution of 3 May 1791*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- Fogu, C. *The Historic Imaginary: Politics of History in Fascist Italy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003

- Friedrich, C.J. and Z.K. Brezinski. *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Gazi, E. *Scientific National History: The Greek Case in Comparative Perspective*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000.
- . ‘Theorizing and Practising “Scientific History” in Southeastern Europe: Spyridon Lambos and Nicolae Iorga’, in S. Berger and C. Lorenz (eds), *Nationalizing the Past: Historians as Nation Builders in Modern Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.
- Gerhards, T. *Heinrich von Treitschke: Wirkung und Wahrnehmung eines Historikers im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2013.
- Ginzburg, C. *The Judge and the Historian: Marginal Notes on a Late Twentieth-Century Miscarriage of Justice*. London: Verso, 1999.
- Gorman, A. *Historians, State and Politics in Twentieth-Century Egypt: Contesting the Nation*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Green, J. ‘Intellectuals and Activism: The Dilemma of the Radical Historian’, *The Activist: A Student Journal of Politics and Opinion* 11(2) (1970–1971), 3–5.
- . *Taking History to Heart: The Power of the Past in Building Social Movements*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000.
- Grell, C. *L’histoire entre erudition et philosophie: étude sur la connaissance historique à l’âge des Lumières*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1993.
- Haar I. and M. Fahlbusch (eds). *German Scholars and Ethnic Cleansing 1919–1945*. Oxford: Berghahn, 2005.
- Halbwachs, M. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Hall, C. *Macaulay and Son: Architects of Imperial Britain*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012.
- Hermann, I. and F. Metzger. ‘A Truculent Revenge: The Clergy and the Writing of National History’, in I. Porciani and J. Tollebeek (eds), *Setting the Standards: Institutions, Networks and Communities of National Historiography* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 313–29.
- Hernon, J.M., Jr. ‘The Last Whig Historian and Consensus History: George Macaulay Trevelyan 1876–1962’, *American Historical Review* 81 (1976), 66–97.
- Hill, B. *The Republican Virago: The Life and Times of Catherine Macaulay, Historian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Horn, G.-R. ‘1968: A Social Movement Sui Generis’, in S. Berger and H. Nehring (eds), *The History of Social Movements in Global Perspective: A Survey* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 515–42.
- Hübinger, G. ‘Die politischen Rollen europäischer Intellektueller im 20. Jahrhundert’, in G. Hübinger and T. Hertfelder (eds), *Kritik und Mandat: Intellektuelle in der deutschen Politik* (Stuttgart: DVA, 2000), 30–44.
- Hübinger, G. and T. Hertfelder (eds). *Kritik und Mandat: Intellektuelle in der deutschen Politik*. Stuttgart: DVA, 2000.
- Iggers, G.G. *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present*, revised ed. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983.
- Iggers, G. and W. Iggers. *Two Lives in Uncertain Times: Facing the Challenges of the Twentieth Century as Scholars and Citizens*. Oxford: Berghahn, 2006.
- International Council on Archives. *Memory of the World at Risk: Archives Destroyed, Archives Reconstituted*. Munich: De Gruyter, 1996.
- Irving, T. and S. Scalmer (eds). *Labour Historians as Labour Intellectuals: Generations and Crises*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1999.
- Joyce, D.D. *Howard Zinn: A Radical American Vision*. New York: Prometheus, 2003.

- Kansteiner, W. 'Postmoderner Historismus: Das kulturelle Gedächtnis als neues Paradigma der Kulturwissenschaften', in F. Jäger and J. Straub (eds), *Handbuch der Kulturwissenschaften*, vol. 2: *Paradigmen und Disziplinen*, Stuttgart: Metzler, 2004, 119–139.
- Kaye, H.J. *The British Marxist Historians: An Introductory Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Kolář, P. and M. Kopeček. 'A Difficult Quest for New Paradigms: Czech Historiography after 1989', in S. Antohi, B. Trencsényi and P. Apor (eds), *Narratives Unbound: Historical Studies in Post-Communist Eastern Europe* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2007), 173–310.
- Kroll, T. *Kommunistische Intellektuelle in Westeuropa: Frankreich, Österreich, Italien und Grossbritannien im Vergleich 1945–1956*. Cologne: Böhlau, 2007.
- Lorenz, C. 'Drawing the Line: "Scientific History" between Myth-Making and Myth-Breaking', in S. Berger, L. Eriksonas and A. Mycock (eds), *Narrating the Nation: Representations in History, Media and the Arts* (Oxford: Berghahn, 2008), 35–55.
- . 'Blurred Lines: History, Memory and the Experience of Time', in S. Berger and J. Seiffert (eds), *Erinnerungsorte: Chancen, Grenzen und Perspektiven eines Erfolgskonzeptes in den Kulturwissenschaften* (Essen: Klartext, 2014), 73–90.
- Loubère, L.A. *Louis Blanc: His Life and His Contribution to the Rise of French Jacobin-Socialism*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1961.
- Lyon, C.M., E.M. Nix and R.K. Shrum (eds). *Introduction to Public History: Interpreting the Past, Engaging Audiences*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017.
- Majumdar, R. *Writing Postcolonial History*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010.
- Mannheim, K. *Ideologie und Utopie: Wissenssoziologische Untersuchungen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1985 [1929].
- Marin, M.A. *Los historiadores españoles en el franquismo 1948–1975*. Zaragoza: IFC, 2005.
- Matos, S.C. *História, mitologia, imaginário nacional: a História no Curso dos Liceus (1895–1939)*. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte, 1990.
- Melman, B. 'Gender, History and Memory: The Invention of Women's Past in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries', *History and Memory* 5 (1993), 5–41.
- Monod, G. and G. Fagniez. 'Avant-Propos', *Revue Historique* 1(1) (1876), 1–4.
- Morgan, K. *The Webbs and Soviet Communism*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2006.
- Mycock, A. and M. Loskoutova. 'Nation, State and Empire: The Historiography of "High Imperialism" in the British and Russian Empires', in S. Berger and C. Lorenz (eds), *Nationalizing the Past* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 233–58.
- Ory, P. and J.-F. Sirinelli. *Les Intellectuels en France dans l'Affaire Dreyfus à nos Jours*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1986.
- Oz-Salzberger, F. *Translating the Enlightenment: Scottish Civic Discourse in Eighteenth-Century Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Pasamar, G. *Apologia and Criticism: Historians and the History of Spain, 1500–2000*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Paul, H. 'The Epistemic Virtues of Historical Scholarship; or, the Moral Dimensions of a Scholarly Character', *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 91(3/4) (2008), 371–87.
- Phillips, K.R. and G. Mitchell Reyes (eds). *Global Memoryscapes: Contesting Remembrance in a Transnational Age*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2011.
- Pihlainen, K. *The Work of History: Constructivism and a Politics of the Past*. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Plokhly, S. *Unmaking Imperial Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Pocock, J.G.A. *Barbarism and Religion, vol. 1: The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon 1737–1764*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Porciani, I. (ed.). *History Women, special issue of Storia della Storiografia* 46 (2004).

- Porciani, I. and R. Lutz (eds). *Atlas of European Historiography: The Making of a Profession, 1800–2005*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Porciani, I. and J. Tollebeek (eds). *Setting the Standards: Institutions, Networks and Communities of National Historiography*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Posner, R.A. *Public Intellectuals: A Study of Decline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Prymak, T.M. *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Raphael, L. *Die Erben von Bloch und Febvre: Annales Geschichtsschreibung und nouvelle histoire in Frankreich, 1945–1980*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1994.
- Reill, P.H. *The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
- Rorty, R. 'Afterword', in R. Rosenzweig (ed.), *Clio Wired: The Future of the Past in the Digital Age*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011, 197–204.
- Rousseau, J.J. 'Discourse on the Origins and Foundations of Inequality among Men', in R.D. Masters and C. Kelly (eds), *The Collected Writings of Rousseau* (Hannover, NH: Dartmouth College Press, 1993), 84–86.
- Rupnik, J. 'The Politics of History-Writing in Czechoslovakia', *History Workshop Journal* 11 (1981), 166–68.
- Rüsen, J. *Evidence and Meaning: A Theory of Historical Studies*. Oxford: Berghahn, 2017.
- Scheuzger, S. 'Truth Commissions and the Politics of History: A Critical Appraisal', in B. Bevernage and N. Wouters (eds), *Palgrave Handbook of State-Sponsored History after 1945*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- Schneider, J.C. *Nation and Ethnicity: Chinese Discourses on History, Historiography and Nationalism (1900s to 1920s)*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Schönwälder, K. *Historiker und Politik: Geschichtswissenschaft im Nationalsozialismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1992.
- Schöttler, P. 'After the Deluge: The Impact of the Two World Wars on the Historical Work of Henri Pirenne and Marc Bloch', in S. Berger and C. Lorenz (eds), *Nationalizing the Past* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 404–25.
- Schumpeter, J. *Kapitalismus, Sozialismus, Demokratie*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1993 [1942].
- Semyonov, A. 'Mirrors of Imperial Imagination in the Early Twentieth-Century Russian Empire', in A. Nowak (ed.), *Imperial Victims – Empires as Victims – 44 Views*. Cracow: IPN, 2010, 139–52.
- Smith, B.G. *The Gender of History: Men, Women and Historical Practice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Smith, N.C. *A 'Manly Study'? Irish Women Historians 1868–1949*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Spurr, J. 'Iraqi Libraries and Archives in Peril', in P.G. Stone and J. Farchakh Bajjaly (eds), *The Destruction of Cultural Heritage in Iraq*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2008.
- Tollebeek, J. "'Italian' History versus French Heritage: Cultural Criticism, Positivism, and Political Commitment in Taine', in J. Leerssen and A. Rigney (eds), *Historians* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2000), 125–40.
- Tolz, V. *Russia: Inventing the Nation*. London: Arnold, 2001.
- Torstendahl, R. *The Rise and Propagation of Historical Professionalism*. London: Routledge, 2015.
- Tyrrell, I. *Historians in Public: The Practice of American History, 1890–1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Vom Lehn, M. *Westdeutsche und italienische Historiker als Intellektuelle? Ihr Umgang mit Nationalsozialismus und Faschismus in den Massenmedien 1943/4–1960*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.

- Von Klimó, Á. *Nation, Konfession, Geschichte: Zur nationalen Geschichtskultur Ungarns im europäischen Kontext (1860–1948)*. Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003.
- Von See, K. *Die Göttinger Sieben: Kritik einer Legende*. Cologne: Winter, 2000.
- Weber, M. *Schriften 1915–1920: Die Wirtschaftsethik der Weltreligionen: Konfuzianismus und Taoismus*, vol I, 19. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.
- Weichlein, S. “‘Meine Peitsche ist die Feder’”: Populäre katholische Geschichtsschreibung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert’, in W. Hardtwig and E. Schütz (eds), *Geschichte für Leser: Populäre Geschichtsschreibung in Deutschland im 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005), 227–58.
- Weigelin-Schwiedrzik, S. ‘Chinese Historical Writing since 1949’, in A. Schneider and D. Woolf (eds), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, vol. 5: Historical Writing since 1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 615–36.
- Weller, T. (ed.). *History in the Digital Age*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- White, H. *The Practical Past*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2014.
- Yerxa, D.A. (ed.). *Recent Themes on Historians and the Public: Historians in Conversation*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2009.
- Zald, M.N. and J. McCarthy. ‘Organizational Intellectuals and the Criticism of Society’, in M.N. Zald and J. McCarthy (eds), *Social Movements in an Organizational Society: Collected Essays*. New Brunswick: Transaction, 1987, 97–120.
- Zuzowski, R. *Political Dissent and Opposition in Poland: The Workers’ Defence Committee KOR*. London: Praeger, 1992.