

HIS – 40002: Approaches to Historical Research

(30 credits)

Autumn Semester, 2017



Module Convenor / Programme Director

Dr. Rachel Bright

CBB 0.060

Phone: 01782 733466

r.k.bright@keele.ac.uk

This module introduces different approaches to the research and writing of history, engages with debates on the status of historical knowledge, and examines the sources and resources available. The course aims to broaden students' understanding of methodological debates within history and to provide conceptual and other tools for their own research work. The core seminars are led by specialists within the department and are open to all postgraduates in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Throughout, students are encouraged to reflect on the relevance of the material under consideration to their own research topic.

Those students taking the module as part of their MA and MRes degree will give a short presentation in the final week of the course and write a 4000 – 5000 word essay. Both elements will normally centre on the methodological or sources/resource issues at stake in their own research project. Only the essay is subject to formal assessment and is worth 30 credits. You should discuss your essay topic and title with your dissertation supervisor, though I will be happy to help as well.

ASSESSMENT

4000-5,000 word essay (100%)

The topic of this essay is flexible, and should be decided through discussion with your supervisor. Below are suggestions, although this should be treated as guidance, not definitive instruction. Students may:

- Reflect on one or two methodologies covered in the module and relate them to their intended dissertation topic (considering methodology to include sources themselves and frameworks of interpretation).
- If you are not yet sure of your dissertation's topic, especially if you are a part-time student, you explore a particular aspect of historical methodology which interests you and may later be useful. For instance, if you are broadly interested in gender, then it is worth writing a literature review about that.
- You may also use the essay as a feasibility study for a particular topic, identifying potential sources and identifying relevant methodologies and if there are any potential issues.

Essay topics should support the development of your ideas and understandings but cannot later be copied into the dissertation or other assignments (such as HIS-40017 Research Skills). This is counted as self-plagiarism, and is treated as severely as any other form of plagiarism.

It is important that you discuss your essay title and topic with your supervisor well in advance. You can ask your supervisor or me to read through drafts or essay plans, but you will need to ensure you allow for plenty of time for feedback.

Due date: Noon, 23 January 2018 via KLE.

SEMINAR PROGRAMME

1. Introductory Meeting (RB)	28 September 2017
2. What is History? Historians, Historical Writing (PM)	5 October 2017
3. Sources, Evidence and Explanation (KC)	12 October 2017
4. Micro-Histories: The Case of Martin Guerre (IA)	19 October 2017
5. Archives, Sources and Evidence (BA)	26 October 2017
6. Conflict in history versus the 'undivided past' (ArK)	2 November 2017
7. Reading Week. NO CLASS	9 November 2017
8. Beyond the National in History (RB)	16 November 2017
9. Sexuality & Queer Studies (DJ)	23 November 2017
10. Social Theory and History (AnK)	30 November 2017
11. Archaeology and Material Culture (AS)	7 December 2017
12. Summary and Student presentations (RB)	14 December 2017

GENERAL READING

Appleby, Joyce and Hunt, Lynn (eds), *Telling the Truth about History* (1994).

Burke, Peter, ed. *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (1992).

Cannadine, David, ed., *What is History Now?* (2002).

Carr, E.H., *What is History?* (2001).

Collingwood, R.G., *The Idea of History*, rev'd edn (1993).

Jordanova, Ludmilla, *History in Practice* (2000).

Southgate, B., *History: What and Why?* (1996).

Tosh, John with Lang, Sean, *The Pursuit of History* 4th edn (2006).

Tosh, John, *Why History Matters* (2008).

Warren, J., *History and the Historians* (1999).

SEMINAR READING

All material is available in the university library. Key readings are digitised and available on Blackboard. Additional copies of some chapters and articles are held in the Short Loan Collection. If you are having problems getting hold of material please contact me.

WEEK 1**Introductory meeting.**

Dr Rachel Bright: r.k.bright@keele.ac.uk

WEEK 2**What is History? Historians, Historical Writing and Historical Awareness**

Dr Philip Morgan: p.j.morgan@keele.ac.uk

What is history? How do historians know what they think they know? How valuable is historical research and why are some historians having doubts about our ability to understand the past? Recently some academic historians have begun to question how far we can confidently talk about what has happened in the past, and to deny that we can ever understand 'the truth'. Instead they have started to concentrate on the variety of ways we can imagine the past and on the language people use to express themselves (both historically and now). But, historians are simply one group of practitioners who might be said to work with the past.

This session will have three parts:

I. Before reading this week's texts (see below), read through and consider the following questions. You do not need to have a definitive reply, just try to answer them impressionistically. Then read the chapters below and see if your thoughts have changed. Make a note of both your initial thoughts and your subsequent ideas to bring to the seminar.

- What is history? Why do you study history? What sorts of history best satisfy your curiosity?
- Is it possible just to say what happened? Does history contain more than a transparent account and if so what else is included?
- What are academic historians trying to achieve when they write history? Do they aim to write 'the truth', composed from 'facts'? Is it possible to write a purely factual account?
- What sort of ideas might underpin historical writing? Is it possible to write history without taking a specific viewpoint (which people either admit to, tacitly confirm or deny)?
- Can the past be said to exist? If so, how? If not, why not?

Please read one OR more of the following (all digitised):

Cannadine, David, ed., *What is History Now?* (2002), 1-19, G.R. Evans, 'Prologue'.

Carr, E.H., *What is History?* (2001), 1-24.

Collingwood, R.G., *The Idea of History*, revised edn (1993), 1-13.

Jordanova, Ludmilla, *History in Practice* (2nd edition, 2006), 27-58.

Tosh, John with Lang, Sean, *The Pursuit of History* 5th edn (2010), 1-45.

II. How would you challenge the statement that follows (taken from L. Jordanova, *History in Practice*, London, 2000, p. 91)?

'Historians produce knowledge of the past, which draws its authority from a number of sources. These include the meticulous study of a wide range of primary materials, the evaluation of results by a range of experts, the provision of transparent scholarly apparatus so that claims can be checked by other scholars, specialised training in approaches and techniques, and the careful scrutiny of references and qualifications when university appointments are made. When it comes

to publication, refereeing guarantees quality. The evidence historians use indicates what happened, and thus historical knowledge offers a kind of objectivity and in this respect is unlike, say, literary criticism where a significant element of subjectivity is involved. While historians cannot predict the future, they can explain the past, which involves showing why things happened. Some areas of history, such as cliometrics, are more "scientific" than others, and the goal of the discipline as a whole is recounting what really happened.'

III. Finally, please come prepared to discuss ONE example of a piece of historical writing relevant to your topic. What readerships are expected? What different aims and purposes do the examples reveal? How do the sources used vary? Why are particular writing and referencing styles adopted?

***** Email your extract top.j.morgan@keele.ac.uk in advance of the session so that I can arrange for everyone to have a copy. *****

WEEK 3

Sources, Evidence and Explanation

Dr K.G. Cushing: k.g.cushing@keele.ac.uk

Ancient, medieval and early modern sources include a tremendous variety of written records (scrolls, manuscripts, printed pamphlets, etc) and genres, as well as architecture, reliquaries, liturgical and other objects, vestments, material culture and the evidence of archaeology. Modern sources extend this spectrum in terms of a variety of written genres: ostensibly verbatim court proceedings, journalism, medical and statistical documentation, oral history (videoed, taped or otherwise), photography, film, documentaries, and now of course the Internet. The assumptions and ambitions of ancient, medieval and early modern writers as well as their varied 'texts', however, can differ radically from those of our time. 'Modern' sources are in some ways even more difficult about which to generalise, chiefly on account of what is meant by 'modernity'.

We tend to assume that modern historical sources writing is objective, impartial, critical and 'accurate'; that the memories or testimonies of eyewitnesses, perpetrators, bystanders, survivors and victims are unbiased and are not subject to context, interpretation or especially to change. These all, even 'unedited' filmed footage, offer at best 'a truth' rather than 'the truth'.

In this seminar we will address the 'raw materials' that historians use to recreate and interpret the past and begin to address issues involved with using different types of sources across a wide timeframe. A document pack will be provided in advance. Please look at/read through this and come prepared to discuss the following questions/themes listed below, with reference to these sources:

- 1) How can or should the historian cope with a partial or fragmentary record? i.e. what strategies of reading or interpretation can be useful?
- 2) How should the fantastic or 'impossible' be understood, or is it simply to be disregarded?
- 3) Medieval writers talked about different levels for the interpretation of texts. What are these, and how might they help the historian?

- 4) How can the historian recognize a negotiated 'text'?
- 5) How important is contextualization for understanding a text or object's shifting meaning?

You are also asked to find a primary source related to your topic which has been interpreted in radically different ways and come prepared to discuss it.

There is no set reading for this seminar but students may find it helpful to consult one or more of the following:

Arnold, J., *History: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, 2000).

Black, J. and MacRaid, D.M, *Studying History* (1997, 2nd edition 2000), chp.4 'Approaches to History: Sources, Methods and Historians'.

Tosh, John with Lang, Sean, *The Pursuit of History* 4th edn (2006), 57-113. (**EBOOK**)

Southern, R.W., 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing, 4. The Sense of the Past', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser. (1973), 243-63.

Spiegel, G., *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore, 1997).

Stock, B., *Listening for the Text: On the Uses of the Past* (Baltimore, 1990).

WEEK 4

Micro-Histories: The Case of Martin Guerre

Dr. Ian Atherton: ij.atherton@keele.ac.uk

N.Z. Davis's short *Return of Martin Guerre* poses interesting questions for historians about the limits of historical knowledge, about the use of anthropological approaches, and also about the nature and value of the case study or micro-history. Accused by her critics of 'novelizing' the past, Davis helped turn the story of the sixteenth-century French peasant Martin Guerre into a film, *Le Retour de Martin Guerre* (1982) which has been adapted for various media: given the Hollywood treatment (and transposed to the American Civil War) in *Sommersby*, 1993; made into the 1996 West-End musical *Martin Guerre*, and Guy Meredith's Radio 4 play, *The True Story of Martin Guerre*, first broadcast in 1996.

Questions to frame your reading and thinking

- 1) What are the principal strengths and weaknesses of Davis's account of Arnaud du Tilh?
- 2) To what extent is Natalie Zemon Davis guilty of 'novelizing' the past in *The Return of Martin Guerre*?
- 3) 'Historical reconstruction at best must go beyond vulgar Baconian reasoning upon data; it must include the (also Baconian) category of imagination' (Donald R. Kelley). Discuss.
- 4) How should a historian approach gaps in the historical record?
- 5) What would you have done if you had unearthed the case of Arnaud du Tilh?
- 6) How far does Davis's work support the value of what Clifford Geertz calls 'Thick Description'?
- 7) What is the value, and what are the limitations, of microhistory?
- 8) What other examples of microhistory would you recommend?
- 9) What role do imagination and empathy play in the writing of history?

Reading * = available online

Start with Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Harvard UP: Cambridge, MA, 1983), a good, short read.

Almost any standard work on historiography or the writing of history (the kinds of works many of you may have read for the level-two module Sources & Debates, HIS-20020) will make some passing reference to Davis and her work, and will introduce questions of the limits of historical knowledge with discussions about evidence and interpretation.

A good starting point linking Davis, anthropology, Geertz, microhistory and the so-called 'new cultural history' is Peter Burke, *History and Social Theory* (1992), pp. 38-42, 128-9, 158-65

For discussion of *Martin Guerre* see:

Debate between Robert Finlay and N.Z. Davis in *American Historical Review*, 93 (1988)

R. Finlay, 'The Refashioning of Martin Guerre', pp. 553-71 *

N.Z. Davis, "On the Lame", pp. 572-603 *

Lisa Jardine, 'Unpicking the Tapestry: The Scholar of Women's History as Penelope among Her Suitors', in B.S. Travitsky & A.F. Seeff, eds, *Attending to Women in Early Modern England* (1994), pp. 123-44

D. Goodman, 'The Martin Guerre Story: A Non-Persian Source for Persian Letter CXLI', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 51:2 (1990), pp. 311-16

N.Z. Davis, 'A Life of Learning' (Charles Homer Haskins Lecture for 1997), *American Council of Learned Societies, Occasional paper*, no. 39:

http://www.acls.org/Publications/OP/Haskins/1997_NatalieZemonDavis.pdf *

Reviews of *The Return of Martin Guerre*:

D.R. Kelley, in *Renaissance Quarterly*, 37:2 (1984), pp. 252-4 *

A.L. Moote, in *American Historical Review*, 90:4 (1985), p. 943 *

D. Potter, in *English Historical Review*, 101:400 (1986), pp. 713-14 *

E. Le Roy Ladurie, in *New York Review of Books*, Volume 30, Issue 20 (22 December 1983), pp. 12-13

On microhistory, Clifford Geertz and 'thick description':

István Szijártó, 'Four Arguments for Microhistory', *Rethinking History*, 6:2 (2002), pp. 209-215 *

B.S. Gregory, 'Is Small Beautiful? Micro-history and the History of Everyday Life', *History and Theory*, 38:1 (Feb. 1999), pp. 100-10 *

Clifford Geertz, 'Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture', in his *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, 1973, but various edns.), pp. 3-30.

Giovanni Levi, 'On Microhistory', in P. Burke, ed., *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (2nd edition, 2001), pp. 97-119

WEEK 5**Archives, Sources and Evidence**

Dr Ben Anderson b.anderson@keele.ac.uk

Ancient, medieval and early modern sources include a tremendous variety of written records (scrolls, manuscripts, printed pamphlets, etc) and genres, as well as architecture, reliquaries, liturgical and other objects, vestments, material culture and the evidence of archaeology. Modern sources extend this spectrum in terms of a variety of written genres: ostensibly verbatim court proceedings, journalism, medical and statistical documentation, oral history (videoed, taped or otherwise), photography, film, documentaries, and now of course the Internet. The assumptions and ambitions of ancient, medieval and early modern writers as well as their varied 'texts', however, can differ radically from those of our time. For sources closer to our own period, on the other hand, the temptation to read today's meaning back onto apparently familiar language can lead to mistaken assumptions, mis-readings and missed meanings on the part of the historian. In particular, the familiar subjectivity of modern sources leads to our common assumption that they provide an objective, impartial, critical and 'accurate' window on the past; that the memories or testimonies of eyewitnesses, perpetrators, bystanders, survivors and victims are now subject to context, interpretation, or especially to change.

The historian's task is further complicated by the incomplete and partial character of the sources which we do have, collected together, and catalogued in archives that emerged as a historical process in their own right. Not only are all sources 'biased' (hence the meaningless of this particular word), providing us with 'a truth' rather than 'the truth' about the past. All sources are also mediated, selected, adjusted, catalogued and recorded through subsequent history; we need to be mindful that the availability, quality and quantity of source material is not merely a matter of luck and chance. For historians of later periods this presents a further problematic, since our evidence is *both* partial, *and* yet extensive enough to prevent any single historian from reading everything on even the narrowest research agenda.

In preparation for this seminar, you should:

1. Bring with you three sources which you think would be useful for an archive on 'Autumn 2016 in Staffordshire'. These could be created by you, or taken from somewhere else – do not spend too much time on this, but try to bring three different *types* of source.
2. Read or examine the sources in the document pack, and think about the following questions:
 - a. How can or should the historian cope with a partial or fragmentary record? i.e. what strategies of reading or interpretation can be useful?
 - b. Conversely, how can or should the historian cope with an overwhelming surfeit of material? What strategies might we utilise?
 - c. What are the opportunities of using online material? What should historians be mindful of in the digital world?
 - d. How important is contextualization for understanding a text or object's shifting meaning?
3. You are also asked to find a primary source related to your topic which you think is in some way problematic, and come prepared to discuss it.

Since that is already quite a lot, you are not required to do any further reading for this seminar, but the following literature is of use for the issues which will be raised:

On Archives and History:

Patrick Joyce, 'The Politics of the Liberal Archive', *History of the Human Sciences* 12:2 (1999), 35-49.

Marlene Manoff, 'Theories of the Archive from Across the Disciplines', *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 4:1 (2004), 9-25 online at <http://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/35687/4.1manoff.pdf?sequence=1>

Carolyn Steedman, 'The Space of Memory: In an Archive', *History of the Human Sciences* 11:4 (1998), 65-83,

Carolyn Steedman, *Dust* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001).

Matthew Kurz, 'Situating Practices: The Archive and the File Cabinet', *Historical Geography* 29 (2001), 26-37.

Marlene Manoff, 'Archive and Database as Metaphor: Theorizing the Historical Record', *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 10:4 (2010), 385-398.

On primary sources more generally:

Arnold, J., *History: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, 2000).

Black, J. and MacRaild, D.M, *Studying History* (1997, 2nd edition 2000), chp.4 'Approaches to History: Sources, Methods and Historians'.

Tosh, John with Lang, Sean, *The Pursuit of History* 4th edn (2006), 57-113.

Southern, R.W., 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing, 4. The Sense of the Past', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser. (1973), 243-63.

Spiegel, G., *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore, 1997).

Stock, B., *Listening for the Text: On the Uses of the Past* (Baltimore, 1990).

WEEK 6

Conflict in history versus the 'undivided past'

Prof Aristotle Kallis a.kallis@keele.ac.uk

Is there a thing called 'humanity' as one? We may refer to it rhetorically, especially at moments of crisis or when talking about noble universal ideas. Yet, strangely, our histories are mostly about dividing the world: into units, into historical periods, into conflicting parts.

In his controversial book *The Undivided Past*, David Cannadine argues that it is baffling "how so much of the writing of history has been driven by a fatal desire to dramatize differences—to create an 'us versus them'". Cannadine takes issue with grand narratives that have underpinned historical methodology and writing - whether Marxist (the idea that the vehicle of history is class conflict) or otherwise (focusing on military, religious, political or ideological conflict).

Cannadine's book devotes one chapter to each of these traditional divisive narratives - nation, race, gender, class, religion, civilisation. It is the last one that will form the focus of our discussion. Cannadine concludes this chapter by stating that "[o]f all collective forms of human identity, civilization is the most nebulous, and it is this very vagueness that makes it at once so appealing and so dangerous. As Dr. Johnson realized, it [civilisation] is a word, a concept, a category, and a version of human aggregation and conflict we would be much better off without". Cannadine considers our understanding of civilisation as culture-specific, laden with assumptions and assertions of superiority, retrospectively applied to others, wrongfully determined.

A very large part of this critique relates to an earlier publication by Samuel Huntington. In 1993, Huntington published an article titled "The Clash of Civilizations?" (later developed into a book-length publication), in the wake of the euphoria for the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the communist bloc in Europe, to paint a less rosy future for the world. His point was summarised on the first page of his article:

It is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future.

This was a very controversial thesis and article, with many strong supporters and equally many fierce critics. Taken together, Cannadine's and Huntington's works present two very different approaches to understanding the past, present, and future. At the same time, however, they also confront historians with fundamental questions about how they define their subjects, understand and construct the past, reconfigure and narrate the fragments of history.

Preparation

1. Pick a thematic chapter from Cannadine's book - for example, on religion or nation or race. Now reflect on your own approach as a historian - your interests, your past endeavours to construct historical narratives in an essay or a dissertation, your current research as an advanced history student. Are you deploying such divisive categories, consciously or inadvertently? Are you reproducing stereotypical divisions even when you are trying to deconstruct them? Are you assuming that identities (national, religious, cultural, civilisational) are more or less objective historical artefacts?
2. You may or may not have heard about plans to create a 'Museum of European History'. You can read the background to this project at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004_2009/documents/dv/745/745721/745721_en.pdf. What is even more interesting is that recently the project has adopted the appellation 'European civil war' for the period from 1914 to 1945. What are your views on this? As part of the Museum's narrative, 1946 will also be presented as 'year zero'. Again, how do you view this decision?
3. Consider this quote by William H McNeil (in Cannadine, p. 329): "Humanity entire possesses a commonality which historians may hope to understand just as firmly as they can comprehend what unites any lesser group. Instead of enhancing conflicts, as parochial historiography inevitably does, an intelligible world history might be expected to diminish the lethality of group encounters by cultivating a sense of individual identification with the triumphs and tribulations of humanity as a whole. This, indeed, strikes me as the moral duty of the historical profession in our time." Do you agree with the final proposition about the 'moral' duty of the historical profession?

Essential Reading

Samuel Huntington, "The Clash of Civilisations?", *Foreign Affairs*, 72/3(1993): 22-49

David Cannadine, *The Undivided Past: History Beyond Our Differences*, London: Allen Lane, 2013, esp 238-78

WEEK 7**Reading Week****WEEK 8****Beyond the National in History**

Dr. Rachel Bright: r.k.bright@keele.ac.uk

The emergence of professional academic history coincided with the formation of the modern nation-state and for that reason it became one of its major ideological pillars. Consequently, few historians questioned whether a national or continental history actually existed until recently; even today, most histories are written within a national framework. However, historians have recently attempted to break away from 'traditional' national, Eurocentric histories, and have found a variety of ways to restructure the boundaries (temporal and spacial) of history. Various terms have emerged, largely (though not exclusively) focusing on the process of 'globalisation', including World, Global, International, Transnational and even Translocal History. This field of history is very much in its infancy and there is still much debate concerning definitions, methodology, subject matter and priorities. Since empires span beyond a single nation-state, and because they are seen as an important catalyst to modern globalisation, they have been of particular focus to historians and academics in other fields who have tried to grapple with this field. This class will focus on how historians have tried to imagine the 'spaces' of history, with specific reference to modern empires. Regardless of your own research interests, however, it is worth examining how your own work is spatially and temporally framed, and how this shapes the sorts of questions you ask and the history you write.

Questions for class discussion:

- 1) Why have national frameworks dominated the ways History has been written? What about other ways of dividing up History? How has this shaped the sorts of history which we write?
- 2) How is History taught, and why is this sometimes different from how historians research and write about history?
- 3) What are the problems and benefits of writing a 'traditional' national or comparative history?
- 4) Do current ideas about globalization help or hinder historical investigation?
- 5) What is the best way to divide up history into narratives (narratives in research and narratives in curriculum structures)
- 6) How useful are geographical concepts like webs or networks in writing 'global' history?
- 7) What is the difference (if any) between: World, Global, International, Translocal and Transnational History? In practice, does it matter how we label the history we write?
- 8) How is your own research framed spatially and temporally?

Required Readings:

- Philip D. Curtin, 'Depth, Span, and Relevance', *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 89, No. 1 (Feb., 1984), 1-9
- A. Burton, 'Who Needs the Nation? Interrogating "British" History', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, Vol. 10 No. 3 September (1997)
- Simon Potter, *British Imperial History* (2015), ch.5: 'Going Global', pp.106-122
- Janny de Jong, 'World History: A Brief Introduction', in Seija Jalagin, Susanna Tavera, Andrew Dilley (eds.), *World and Global History: Research and Teaching* (2011), pp.1-11 - ebook

Further Readings: (*=priority reading)

- *Klaus Kiran Patel, 'Transnational History', <http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/theories-and-methods/transnational-history/klaus-kiran-patel-transnational-history>
- *'AHR Conversation: On Transnational History', *American Historical Review*, December (2006), 1441-1464
- *Arif Dirlik, 'Performing the World: Reality and Representation in the Making of World Histor(ies)', *Journal of World History*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (2005) - 'translocal'
- *Pierre-Yves Saunier, *Transnational History*, ch.6 'On Methodology', pp.117-134 - DIGITISED
- Pamela Crossley, *What is Global History?* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008)
- Bruce Mazlish, *The New Global History* (2015) - EBOOK
- Laura Briggs, Gladys McCormick, J. T. Way, 'Transnationalism: A Category of Analysis', *American Quarterly*, Volume 60, Number 3, September 2008, 625-648
- *C. A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914* (2004) Introduction (pp.1-21)
- A.G. Hopkins (ed.), *Globalization in World History* (London, 2002), esp. the chapters by Hopkins, Harper and Ballantyne
- A.G. Hopkins (ed.), *Global history: interactions between the universal and the local* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), Introduction, pp.1-38
- Patrick O'Brien, 'Historiographical traditions and modern imperatives for the restoration of global history', *Journal of Global History* (2006) 1, 3-39
- *Frederick Cooper, 'What is the Concept of Globalization Good for?', *African Affairs*, 100 (2001), 189-213 (an extended version is in his book, *Colonialism in Question*) - a critique of globalisation
- Peter N. Stearns, *Exploring Themes in World History* - ebook

Further reading on nations and empires

- Stefan Berger (ed.), *Representations of the Past: The Writing of National Histories in Europe* (6 volumes)
- Stefan Berger and Chris Lorenz, *Nationalizing the past: historians as nation builders in modern Europe* (2015)
- Stefan Berger (ed.), *Writing the Nation, a global perspective* (2007), esp. ch.2
- Antonis Liakos, 'The Canon of European History and the Conceptual Framework of National Historiographies', in Matthias Middell & Lluís Roura i Aulinas (eds.), *Transnational Challenges to National History Writing* (2013), pp.315-342
- Daniel Woolf, 'Of Nations, Nationalism, and National Identity: reflections on the historiographical organization of the past', in *Of Nations, Nationalism and National Identity*, Q. Edward Wang & Franz Fillafer (eds.), *The Many Faces of Clio: Cross-cultural Approaches to Historiography* (2006), pp. 71-103. – available at http://www.culturahistorica.es/daniel_woolf/nationalism_and_historiography.pdf

- A.G. Hopkins, 'Back to the Future: From National History to Imperial History', *Past & Present*, no.164 (1999), 198–243 - partly a response to Burton
- Tony Ballantyne, 'Race and the Webs of Empire: Aryanism from India to the Pacific', *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, Volume 2, Number 3 (Winter 2001)
- Morgan, Philip D. & Jack P. Greene (eds.), *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (OUP: 2009), ch.12
- Pamella S. Nadell & Kate Haulman (eds.), *Making Women's Histories: Beyond National Perspectives* (2013)

WEEK 9

Sexuality and Queer Studies

Professor Dominic Janes: d.janes@keele.ac.uk

In this session we will be thinking about sexuality and queer studies as providing tools for carrying out a wide range of historical research, not simply that which relates directly to sexual identity. Rather these materials and approaches will be considered as providing resources which can help us to understand society as a whole and its power structures. This will involve looking at the history of sexuality itself as well as the role of leading 'theorists' of sexuality. A particular focus will be placed on Michel Foucault (1926-1984) and the generation of (mainly) American thinkers who produced important work in the context of feminist and queer responses to the AIDS crisis in the 1980s and 1990s. I will also be exploring some of my own research into these topics, some of which has gone into unexpected directions, including into explorations of the everyday environment and British power politics.

Questions for Discussion:

- 1) Why was sexuality little studied by historians before the 1970s?
- 2) What is the significance of thinking about sexualities as having been 'constructed'?
- 3) How do you account for the influence of Foucault's theories amongst historians?
- 4) Does modern sexuality studies risk reading contemporary attitudes back into the past – and, if it does, how can we deal with any resulting issues of anachronism (for instance can we write a history of homosexuality before the term was invented/popularised?)

Required Readings:

- J. Bristow, *Sexuality*, 2nd ed., London, 2011, pp. 151-196 on 'discursive desires'.
- F. Dabhoiwala, *The Origins of Sex*, London, 2012, pp. 1-35, on 'the culture of discipline'

Optional Readings:

a. Theoretical approaches

- P. Burke, *What is Cultural History*, Cambridge, 2004.
- J. Butler and Sara Salih, *The Judith Butler Reader* Oxford, 2004.

- F. Driver, 'Bodies in space: Foucault's account of disciplinary power', in C. Jones and R. Porter, eds., *Reassessing Foucault: Power, Medicine and the Body*. London, 1993, pp. 113-31.
- L. Edelman. *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive*. Durham, NC, 2004.
- M. Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, Volume 1.; New York, 1978 [or any later edition]
- G. Gutting, *A Very Short Introduction to Foucault*. Oxford, 2005.
- M. G. E. Kelly, *Foucault's 'History of Sexuality Volume I, The Will to Knowledge': An Edinburgh Philosophical Guide*. Edinburgh, 2013.
- E. Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley, 1990.
- G. Noiriel, 'Foucault and history: the lessons of a disillusion', *Journal of Modern History*, 66, 1994, pp. 547-68
- J. Weeks, 'Foucault for historians', *History Workshop Journal*, 14, 1982, pp. 106-119.

b. Historical applications

- M. Cook, et al. *A Gay History of Britain: Love and Sex between Men since the Middle Ages*. Oxford, 2007.
- B. Lewis, ed. *British Queer History: New Approaches and Perspectives*. Manchester, 2013.
- M. Houlbrook, *Queer London: Perils and Pleasures in the Sexual Metropolis, 1918-1957*. Chicago, 2006.
- D. Janes, *Picturing the Closet: Male Secrecy and Homosexual Visibility in Britain*. Oxford, 2015.
- H. Oosterhuis, *Stepchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Sexual Identity*. Chicago Press, 2000.

WEEK 10

Social Theory and History

Dr Anthony Kauders a.d.kauders@keele.ac.uk

In the 1960s, secondary school teachers sought to assess the epistemological make-up of history by drawing a line on the blackboard and asking pupils to determine where history belonged on the continuum. All the way on the left they wrote SCIENCE, all the way on the right they scribbled LITERATURE. Pupils were prodded to consider the scientific as opposed to the literary merits of history. Not surprisingly, most of them placed history somewhere in the middle, hoping to account for the exacting as well as the artistic nature of the discipline.

Theorists today would dismiss this exercise as rather naïve, given the discursive developments that have ensued. Changes have occurred on several fronts. Science, for example, is no longer seen as the simple rendition of chemical, physical, and biological facts "out there". The work of Thomas Kuhn and Ludwik Fleck in particular has seriously undermined the idea of linear progress in science. Both contextualized science as a practice defined by the intellectual options and strategies available to scientists at a given time, in a given place.

While the literary qualities of historical works remain important for readers and prize committees alike, many theorists have become interested in the literary conventions adopted by historians.

More seriously, deconstructionists have dismissed the very notion of clear boundaries separating different disciplines, such as history and literature or literature and philosophy. Boundaries are blurred, this reading suggests, because everything is a text, and since everything is a text, disciplinary divisions cannot account for (or rein in) the limitless possibilities of reading and understanding written documents.

These trends might suggest that we ought to embrace the “and” in the title of today’s session: history *and* social theory, since social theory emerges in historical time and since both are texts pure and simple. But I would like to return to the “naïve” divisions of yesteryear by doing two things:

First, I would like you to contemplate the following questions, based both on the previous sessions in *Approaches to Historical Research* and on your own work. (I would ask you to think about these questions before reading the texts below.)

- 1) When you are writing historical texts, are you aware of a divide?
- 2) When you add tables or statistics, do you feel that your texts are more solid, more scientific than otherwise?
- 3) Do you yourself feel threatened by the idea that everything is a text? If so, why? If not, why not?
- 4) Do you sometimes feel that style obscures content?
- 5) What counts more when you are reading a text: the facts that you can gather and underline or the rhetorical skills of the author?

We shall discuss these questions at the beginning of the seminar.

Second, once you have considered answers to these questions and written them down for discussion in class, I would like you to engage with *Social Theory* in a more detailed and reflective manner by reading the following:

Elizabeth A. Clark, *History, Theory, Text. Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge, MA 2004), **chapter 3**.

Stefan Berger, Heiko Feldner, Kevin Passmore (eds.), *Writing History. Theory and Practice* (CUP 2003), **chapters 4 (digitised on KLE) & 5**.

Peter Lambert and Philipp Schofield (eds.), *Making History. An Introduction to the history and practices of a discipline* (London 2004), **chapters 2 (digitised on KLE) & 9**.

William H. Sewell Jr., *Logics of History. Social Theory and Social Transformations* (Chicago 2005), **chapter 1**.

During the second part of our meeting, we will discuss questions related to these readings. Come prepared, i.e. make sure you have read the pieces and understood central concepts such as structuralism, post-structuralism, Marxism.

WEEK 11

Archaeology and Material Culture

Dr Andrew Sargent, a.sargent1@keele.ac.uk

TBA

WEEK 12

Summary and student presentations

This is your chance to reflect on the course as a whole and its relationship to your own research. If you have taken the course as part of your MRes degree, come prepared to give a presentation of up to 10 minutes on your work, the methodological challenges it poses and the ways in which the material considered on this course has helped (or hindered!) you.

Generic Assessment Criteria Level 7				
	Knowledge understanding and application	Analysis and argument	Use of appropriate literature	Communications skills
90.10 0%	Exceptional work showing an excellent understanding of complex issues and methodologies at the forefront of the subject or practice.	The work shows exceptional evidence of original independent critical thinking and is based upon a sophisticated and rigorous argument. Explores at, and at times beyond the boundaries of existing knowledge and is able to reflect on the limitations of theory and/or research.	Accurately supported by evidence derived from a wide range of source material including primary sources and current research. Materials are evaluated with utmost skill and their assumptions Accurately supported by evidence derived from a wide range of source material including primary sources and current research.	Excellent communication skills. Demonstrates the ability to interpret and/or data in a variety of forms in an extremely critical and constructive way.
80.89 %	Outstanding work demonstrating an excellent level of understanding of complex issues and methodologies at the forefront of the subject or practice.	The work displays independent critical thought, is strong and sophisticated, with well organised argument. Explores at the boundaries of existing knowledge and is able to reflect on the limitations of theory and/or research.	Accurately supported by evidence derived from a wide range of source material including primary sources and current research. Materials are evaluated very skilfully and their assumptions appraised and/or arguments challenged. Accurate use of academic conventions.	Excellent communication skills. Demonstrates the ability to interpret and/or data in a variety of forms in a very critical and constructive way.
70.79 %	Excellent work demonstrating a very good level of understanding of complex issues and methodologies at the forefront of the subject or practice.	The work displays independent critical thought and a strong organised argument and is able to reflect on the limitations of theory and/or research.	Accurately supported by evidence derived from a wide range of source material including primary sources and current research. Materials are evaluated and their assumptions appraised and/or arguments challenged. Accurate use of academic conventions.	Excellent communication skills. Demonstrates the ability to interpret and/or data in a critical and constructive way.
60.69 %	Very good work demonstrating good understanding of issues, including some complex issues. Able to describe and examine a range of principles, much of which is at the forefront of the subject or practice.	A good and well organised argument and evaluation with the ability to critically evaluate competing arguments.	Accurately supported by an appropriate range of sources including primary sources and current research. Satisfactory use of academic conventions.	Very good communication skills. Organised, logical and coherent presentation.
50.59 %	Good working showing satisfactory grasp of main issues, sufficient awareness of the subject or practice. Shows a reasonable understanding of the major empirical and/or theoretical issues involved.	Argument identified and some analysis of key issues, but with limited critical judgement. Ability to begin to connect aspects of subject knowledge and, where appropriate their application.	Sufficient familiarity with a proportion of the basic reading but with minor errors and/or omissions of essential material. Generally satisfactory use of academic conventions, but may be some omissions or minor errors.	Good communication skills and generally coherent.

Generic Assessment Criteria Level 7				
	Knowledge understanding and application	Analysis and argument	Use of appropriate literature	Communications skills
40.49 %	Unsatisfactory work showing only limited grasp of some of the issues, poorly conceived and poorly directed to the question or task set, or with serious errors or omissions and limited awareness of the subject or practice. Work addresses only some of the outcomes and issues raised by the question, limited use of relevant material, or, weak appreciation of the subject or practice. Shows some awareness and understanding of the empirical or theoretical issues, but with little	Shows some evidence of planning, although irrelevant/unrelated material or arguments are included. Inadequate attention to structure and organisation. Shows limited or no critical judgement in analysing issues or presenting ideas. Limited attempt to connect aspects of subject knowledge.	Familiarity with a proportion of the basic reading but with errors and/or omissions of essential material. Limited use of examples and some views unsubstantiated. Academic conventions may be used weakly.	Basic presentation skills with significant deficiencies. Simplistic expression. Satisfactory communication skills but with some lapses in expression.
30.39 %	Unsatisfactory work, showing very limited grasp of some relevant issues and necessary material and/or skills, or with major errors, omissions or misconceptions, and with very limited awareness of the subject practice.	Insufficient attempt to identify argument with irrelevant/unrelated material or arguments included. Inadequate attention to structure and organisation.	Evidence of little reading appropriate for the level of study, and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Academic conventions used weakly.	Unlimited ability to communicate effectively in speech and/or writing. Limited use of specialist vocabulary. Demonstrates difficulties in communicating simple ideas. Poor presentational skills.
20.29 %	An attempt to answer the question or complete the task, but with little grasp of course material or awareness of the subject or practice. Little ability to connect subject knowledge to appropriate contexts.	Struggles to distinguish between assertion and argument. Little attempt to address question posed and/or opinions expressed purely on a subjective basis. Synthesis, analysis or evaluation of information is deficient.	Little or no evidence of reading. Views are unsupported and non-authoritative. Academic conventions largely are ignored.	Unlimited ability to communicate effectively in speech and/or writing. Limited or no use of specialist vocabulary. Demonstrates difficulties in communicating simple ideas. Very poor presentational skills.
10.19 %	Work that shows fragmentary evidence of familiarity with course material or awareness of the subject or practice. Very little/no ability to connect to appropriate contexts.	Unable to distinguish between assessment and argument. Fails to address question posed and/or opinions expressed purely on a subjective basis.	No evidence of reading. Views are unsupported and non-authoritative. Academic conventions largely are ignored.	Very limited ability to communicate in speech and/or writing. Very limited or no use of specialist vocabulary. Demonstrates difficulties in communicating simple ideas. Very poor presentational skills.
0.9%	No work offered, or work that is totally irrelevant to the question or task set, or fundamentally wrong.	No work offered; or work that is totally irrelevant to the question or task set, or fundamentally wrong.	No evidence of reading. Views are unsupported and non-authoritative. Academic conventions largely are ignored.	Extremely limited ability to communicate in speech and/or writing. Extremely limited or no use of specialist vocabulary. Demonstrates difficulties in communicating simple ideas. Extremely poor presentational skills.