

History in a New Millennium

As the year 2000 approached, historians joined journalists and others in pondering the significance of the end of a millennium and the imminent beginning of another. There was a flurry of conferences and publications about what the world had been like in the year 1000 and a good deal of discussion about why human beings attach so much meaning to the ends and beginnings of centuries, considering that the calendar is basically an arbitrary human device for marking the passage of time. The fact that this debate spanned the globe reflected one profound historical change that made the world of 2000 very different from that of the year 1000: as a result of the spread of European civilization, a calendar originally rooted in the beliefs of the Christian religion had become the common framework for the dating of events for almost all of humanity. In the year 1000, and for many centuries thereafter, this would not have been the case: at that time, the Mayans and Aztecs in Central America, the inhabitants of the Muslim world, and the populations of the Chinese Empire all counted the years according to entirely different systems. The kind of universal calendar posited by the philosopher Paul Ricoeur as one of the necessary conditions for the recognition of historical narratives as distinct from other kinds of stories did not yet exist.

A Historical Controversy to End the Millennium

From the point of view of historians in the Western world, the year 2000 was marked particularly by an unusual public courtroom case in



which the issue of whether the methods of professional historical scholarship are in fact adequate to establish the truth about the past became a central issue. Judges are rarely called upon to decide controversies about historical claims, but this was an exception. The trial centered around the question of the historical evidence for the occurrence of the Holocaust. Even as documented evidence of the magnitude of the effort to exterminate the Jews of Europe has mounted over the decades, a determined band of neo-Nazi sympathizers has persistently tried to minimize or deny altogether the crimes committed by Hitler and his followers. To justify their efforts, Holocaust negationists have revived skeptical arguments about the unreliability of eyewitnesses that were used in the nineteenth century by the author of *Historic Doubts Relative to Napoleon Buonaparte*, and they have sometimes seized on the assertions about the impossibility of achieving absolute truth in history put forward by postmodernist historical theorists such as Hayden White. The coded language used by the Nazis themselves in documents concerning “the Final Solution” has served the negationists’ purposes as well: few of these sources explicitly describe what happened at Auschwitz. In effect, one characteristic of genocidal episodes is that their perpetrators, if they are successful, are in a position to cover up or deny their actions, as the Turkish government has done for nearly a century with regard to the massacre of its Armenian population in 1915. As one scholar has pointed out, what is unusual about the Nazi Holocaust is not that some people try to deny that it happened, but that so many acknowledge that it did take place.¹

Even before the David Irving trial in 2000, the debate about the status of historical knowledge launched by Hayden White in the early 1970s and the highly politicized “history wars” controversies of the earlier part of the 1990s had lost much of their energy. During the 1990s, a number of historians proposed middle positions between a sweeping postmodern rejection of the whole notion of historical truth and an indefensible positivist assumption that the facts about the past, if properly regarded, would speak for themselves. In a jointly written volume, *Telling the Truth about History* (1994), Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob outlined a position that they called “practical realism” and “qualified objectivity,” meant to counter what they saw as the exaggerated skepticism about the possibility of achieving genuine knowledge of the past. Absolutely valid conclusions might be beyond the reach of the historian, they conceded, but this did not mean



that any story about the past was as good as any other. Documents and other forms of evidence “constrain those who seek to find out what once took place,” they insisted, as did the necessity for historians to follow rules of interpretation shared by their professional community. They did not deny that historians have to reconstruct the past through language, but they argued that language itself is a human invention generated by “contact with the world.”²

In 1997, Richard J. Evans made a stronger defense of the notion that historical research can produce demonstrably true conclusions. “Objective history in the last analysis is history that is researched and written within the limits placed on the historical imagination by the facts of history and the sources which reveal them, and by the historian’s desire to produce a true, fair, and adequate account of the subject under consideration,” he wrote in the conclusion to his 1997 book, *In Defense of History*. Evans, writing before the Irving trial, at which he appeared as an expert witness for the defense, already cited the Holocaust as one issue on which historians could not afford to accept postmodernist positions about the impossibility of arriving at objective conclusions about the past. He undoubtedly spoke for most practicing academic historians when he wrote that “history is an empirical discipline, and it is concerned with the content of knowledge rather than its nature.”³ In 1998, perhaps sensing that the tide was turning against postmodernist positions, Keith Jenkins, one of Hayden White’s leading disciples, responded by proposing to simply “wave goodbye to history.” “There is no reason why . . . postmodernism need drag modernity’s very particular and peculiar habits of historicizing time with it,” he contended.⁴

The 2000 trial reaffirmed most historians’ conviction that the search for historical truth was too important to be abandoned, as Jenkins proposed. The trial resulted from a lawsuit brought by a British author, David Irving, who had built up a certain reputation as a popular historian of the Hitler era, against an American university professor, Deborah Lipstadt. Irving claimed that Lipstadt had libeled him by labeling him a Holocaust denier in her 1993 book, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*. In her book, Lipstadt had argued that postmodernists, by making it “difficult to talk about the objective truth of a text, legal concept, or even an event,” were opening the way to distortions of the past.⁵ Lipstadt had also specifically identified Irving as an author who pretended to be an objective



scholar while in fact putting forward timeworn negationist arguments. In response to Irving's libel suit, Lipstadt and her publisher assembled a defense team that included many of the leading experts on the history of the Holocaust. On the witness stand and in the lengthy written documents they submitted, these historians showed exactly how scholars interpret historical evidence and demonstrated that it proved the truth of claims Irving had disputed. The trial, which brought out Irving's long-standing association with unsavory neo-Nazi groups, ended with a resounding judgment in favor of Lipstadt: the court came down firmly in support of the proposition that the procedures of historical scholarship could establish dependable knowledge about the past.⁶ After decades of dispute among themselves and in various public forums, academic historians breathed a sigh of relief at knowing that they had successfully convinced a respected judge to rule that their professional methods could produce convincing accounts of past events.

Testimony at the Irving trial showed that Irving hardly deserved to be considered a historian. Several other widely publicized scandals in the early 2000s showed that even well-regarded members of the profession had violated its ethical rules. Among the cases that received such publicity in recent decades was that of Michael Bellesiles, accused of inaccurately describing or possibly inventing data to support his argument about the historical origins of the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Bellesiles's book was withdrawn by its publisher and he lost his academic position. Two prominent popular historians, Stephen Ambrose and Doris Kearns Goodwin, were blamed for plagiarism—copying passages from other historians' work without giving them proper credit. Another popular historian, Joseph Ellis, who also holds an academic position, ran into trouble for telling invented stories about his personal past to his students: he falsely claimed, for example, to have served in the U.S. military during the Vietnam War.⁷ To outsiders, such outrage among historians about what may seem like minor sins—the presence or absence of quotation marks around a sentence, for instance—may seem excessive. To most professional historians, however, misrepresentation of sources and plagiarism are grave matters. Despite the peer review system, the edifice of scholarly research depends heavily on the integrity of its practitioners. If violators are not severely chastised, our discipline's claim to produce reliable knowledge about the past will be undermined, and all historians will be affected. The strong response among historians to these ethical lapses was an



affirmation of their shared belief that members of the profession have an obligation to follow its guidelines.

The verdict in the Irving trial reassured historians that postmodern critiques had not in fact undermined their discipline's ability to establish certain truths about the past, and methodological disputes shifted to other areas. The idea that humankind might have reached "the end of history," as Francis Fukuyama had predicted after 1989, soon gave way to questions about how history should be written in the face of the new conflicts and crises that beset the world after the turn of the millennium. The spectacular terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, the steady rise of China as an economic and military power, the world economic crisis of 2008, and the "Arab Spring" of 2011 and its violent aftermath all demonstrated that there was still no worldwide consensus on Western-style democracy and capitalism. The election of an African American president in the United States in 2008 and the rapidly developing movement for gay rights, on the other hand, showed that democracy itself was still capable of producing historical surprises. Increasing concern about the global effects of climate change led some historians, such as Dipesh Chakrabarty, to argue that, far from having reached a stable state, humanity had plunged the planet into an entirely new and dangerous "Anthropocene Epoch," in which human activity has come to be the dominant influence on the environment, and that historians needed to react by focusing on this problem, even if it means turning away from issues such as the legacy of colonialism. Chakrabarty has called for scholarship that would "put global histories of capital in conversation with the species history of humans."⁸

History in the Internet Era

The most significant historiographical developments in the years since 2000 have not been shifts in the balance between the various forms of history, but rather a new awareness of the importance of changes in the ways in which historical knowledge is communicated. No new methodological approach to historical research has as much impact on history in the past two decades as the development of the Internet. Many of the liveliest historiographical debates of recent years have had to do not with history as it is recorded in books and scholarly articles, but with the status of history on film, the representation of the past in



museums, and the potentialities of other media, such as interactive video games, for changing the way we understand the past. Together, these developments are changing every aspect of history: methods of research, ways of teaching, and the connection between historical specialists and the general public.

The rapidity with which the availability of personal computers and the growth of the Internet have transformed historians' practices is undoubtedly difficult to appreciate for those who have grown up, like today's students, surrounded by digital devices. Scholars of my own generation, who began our careers taking notes on index cards, writing on typewriters, and communicating via letters, are more conscious of having lived through a continuous process of change, one that shows no sign of slowing down. The possibility of communication from one computer to another began to change historians' worlds toward the end of the 1980s, with the development of email. Suddenly, it was possible to exchange ideas with distant colleagues in "real time," instead of relying on the postal service. The possibility of sending the same message instantly to many people led to the creation of discussion lists for scholars with common interests. Today, H-Net, based at Michigan State University, maintains over a hundred such lists for historians in different fields, some of which have thousands of subscribers. On them, participants can share new ideas with colleagues, announce publications, organize conferences, and post questions in the hope that someone else on the list will know the answer. (www.h-net.org/) Many historians' lists post and archive book reviews; H-France, the list for French historians, goes further by organizing "forums" with multiple reviews of particularly important new publications, reviewing films of historical interest, and even posting podcasts of sessions at professional conferences (www.h-france.net/).⁹

Over the course of the 1990s, the Internet became steadily more versatile and more and more important in the lives of historians. In 1993, the World Wide Web, previously accessible only to a small number of scientists, was opened to the general public. Scholars soon realized that it was now possible to post source documents online, where they could be accessed by anyone else with a computer connection. By bringing together documents from different locations, websites can even create "archives" that do not exist outside of cyberspace. One example is the "Papers of the War Department" virtual archive: as its creators explain, the files of the U.S. War Department for its early years



were destroyed in a fire in 1800. By bringing together 55,000 documents scattered in libraries and archives all over the country, this website strives to recreate an equivalent for this lost body of sources (<http://wardepartmentpapers.org/>). Early websites could only store text files, not images, and it took the development of web browsers to make it possible to find information easily. Other developments have followed in a steady cascade, so that today it is easily possible to access not only textual documents and images but also sound recordings and video clips, integrate them into a single presentation, and share the results with an audience all over the world. It is also now possible, thanks to the development of the “smartphone,” to access information anywhere and at any time. Increased access to online information raises problems and also creates new possibilities. Plagiarism, for example, can now be accomplished by simply copying and pasting text found on line, although sophisticated search programs also make it easier for teachers to detect. Teachers giving examinations now have to ask themselves whether they can really be sure that students are not able to access information from outside.

Computers and the Internet have already changed every aspect of how historians do their work, and there is no doubt that even more changes lie ahead of us. Compiling a bibliography on a research topic used to mean hours of paging through printed subject indexes; now it means plugging a few keywords into a search engine. Many of the rare books that historians could only find in major research libraries can now be accessed online and read in the convenience of one’s favorite armchair. Historians used to take notes on small index cards. Cards could be easily sorted by subject when one was ready to start writing, but they were hard to carry around and difficult to duplicate. Now, the smart historical researcher uses a note-taking program and stores the results in the “cloud,” where they can be accessed on multiple devices. Research notes and drafts of writing can easily be shared with collaborators, making joint projects much more feasible than they used to be. Some older historians still find it easier to write first drafts by hand, but with the arrival of a new generation of students who did not learn cursive handwriting as children, almost all historical writing is now done directly on computers.

The scholarly journals in which academic historians publish their specialized research still exist, but many of the smaller ones have already stopped publishing on paper and appear only in online form. This



has made the experience of reading articles different from what it used to be. Nowadays, most readers go directly to specific items that interest them; they no longer flip through a whole issue or volume of a journal, perhaps stopping to read something they hadn't originally been looking for. Computerized indexing makes it easier to find scattered articles on one's specific topic in many different journals, but when they are read piecemeal in this fashion, periodicals no longer function to create scholarly communities of readers with shared interests. Monographs, too, are increasingly available as "e-books" rather than in physical form. Although the Internet has the potential to make research more accessible, these changes raise serious questions about how the costly processes of peer review and editing can be financed if journals can no longer depend on income from subscriptions and publishers can no longer count on selling substantial numbers of their titles.

Computers and the Internet are transforming history teaching just as rapidly as they are changing research and publication. It is the rare history teacher who heads to class nowadays without a PowerPoint presentation; the old days of putting up a lecture outline on a chalkboard are gone, along with the chalk. With the development of online courses and "flipped" classrooms, even the notion of "heading to class" is being transformed. Students expect class information, assignments, and grades to be posted online, and when they are given research exercises, they automatically look for information on the Web rather than in the library. In classrooms equipped with screens, instructors can tap into a vast range of materials and integrate them directly into discussions. Like instructors in other disciplines, historians are experimenting with various kinds of online teaching methods. Lectures may be recorded as podcasts, so that students can listen to them at their own convenience, and in-person discussion classes may be augmented with or even replaced by online "chat" sessions. Faculty anxiously speculate about whether their courses will be replaced by MOOCs, "massive open online courses" transmitted over the Internet. Such courses might allow students from many campuses to learn about subjects not offered at their own schools, but they also raise the prospect of a world in which one star professor becomes the only authority on subjects such as the French Revolution or the Meiji Restoration, with students turning in essays to be graded by poorly paid adjuncts or even by computers. Like colleagues in other humanities fields, most historians continue to believe that there is something irreplaceable about the direct



contact between teacher and students that occurs in the traditional classroom. In a world in which students can easily surf the Web during classes, however, instructors must find creative ways to keep them actively engaged.

Although history instructors do worry about losing students' attention in class, the teaching resources available on the Internet are too valuable to be ignored. The ubiquitous, "crowd-sourced" Wikipedia has largely replaced printed reference works; professors have come to rely on it as heavily as students, and comparisons with traditional encyclopedias show that it is generally at least as reliable, although its bias in favor of "the conventional and accepted wisdom on a topic" means that it often fails to reflect new research findings.¹⁰ Students can be assigned to use the sources posted online on sites such as "Valley of the Shadow," a trove of information on the Civil War created by Edward Ayers and his collaborators that includes letters and diaries, newspaper articles, data from census and tax records, maps, and images, as well as a variety of tools for manipulating the data (www.valley.lib.virginia.edu). The Center for History and New Media at George Mason University in Virginia has been a pioneer in exploring the possibilities of Web-based teaching and research. Founded in 1994, its purpose is to use "digital media and computer technology to democratize history—to incorporate multiple voices, reach diverse audiences, and encourage popular participation in presenting and preserving the past." The Center, whose website receives 20 million visitors a year, has created online resources of its own and also gives users links to other sites and online resources (www.chnm.gmu.edu). Major research libraries and history museums have created their own online libraries and archives. Among those frequently used by students, teachers, and scholars are the Library of Congress's "American Memory" website, which offers direct access to such resources as the George Washington papers and "Voices from the Days of Slavery," audio interviews with former slaves conducted in the twentieth century (memory.loc.gov), and the site of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum (www.ushmm.org).

In *Digital History: A Guide to Gathering, Preserving, and Presenting the Past on the Web* (2005), Daniel J. Cohen and Roy Rosenzweig, two of the creators of the Center for History and New Media, list the advantages of the Web as "accessibility, flexibility, diversity, manipulability, interactivity, and hypertextuality (or nonlinearity)." Capacity is the ability to store enormous amounts of data cheaply. By flexibility, the



authors mean possibilities such as linking together various kinds of information about documents posted online. The Web has made it possible for many more people to contribute to historical discussions; as they note, “the number of authors of history web pages is likely greater than the number of authors of history books,” and no special credentials are required to create a webpage. The Web facilitates new ways of using or manipulating historical data, such as word searches, and hypertextuality, the capability of “moving through narratives or data in undirected and multiple ways” and providing links that allow users to explore alternative possibilities, theoretically enabling historians to approach the past in entirely new ways.¹¹

History has benefitted greatly from the new capabilities created by computers and the Internet. More people have more access to more historical information than ever before. Nevertheless, there are also some costs associated with the discipline’s entry into this brave new world. At the same time as the Web facilitates the work of professional historians, it also has the potential to undermine the elaborate system of assessment and peer review on which academic historical scholarship has depended since the time of Ranke. Identifying herself as a “neo-Luddite,” a critic of radical change, Gertrude Himmelfarb warned in 1996 that “the Internet does not distinguish between the true and the false, the important and the trivial, the enduring and the ephemeral . . . Every source appearing on the screen has the same weight and credibility as every other; no authority is ‘privileged’ over any other.”¹² Another scholar who compared her own work with sources about her subject available on the Web noted that “professional historians . . . write history that contributes to a larger body of knowledge. Each article and monograph must clarify how it adds to the developing narrative patterns. By contrast, amateur historians write about isolated topics” and do not feel obliged to acknowledge other perspectives on their subject.¹³ Sometimes, materials posted on the Web as historical are not only lacking in context but also completely false or misleading. Negationist groups that deny the reality of the Holocaust, for example, have created numerous webpages, and historians teaching the subject must warn students against making uncritical use of such materials, which may not be immediately recognizable as neo-Nazi propaganda.

Another concern about online historical materials is that of access. Electronic versions of scholarly journals and many invaluable data bases, such as the Readex “Early American Newspapers” collection,



require expensive subscriptions. In practice, many of these materials are only available to users affiliated with major research universities, creating a two-class system in which some students and scholars have research opportunities from which others are shut out.

Whatever the pros and cons of the move to the Internet may be, however, there is no doubt that its existence has already changed historical practices in fundamental ways. Historians are notoriously bad at predicting the future, and it is difficult to guess which of the innovations of the past two decades will turn out to be the most significant. It is certain, however, that the historians of the future will research, communicate their findings, and teach in very different ways from their predecessors and that these changes in practices are bound to have an influence on the ways we understand the past.

History beyond the Printed Page

The development of the Internet has changed history in many ways. Nevertheless, the majority of the material about history available on the Web is still presented in the form of text, and it is by no means certain that Internet users looking for historical information have really abandoned the habit of reading in a linear fashion for the eager pursuit of hyperlinks. One of the major developments in history at the beginning of the twenty-first century, however, is the increasing prominence of nontextual representations of the past. Historical museums, historical films, graphic art, and even video games with historical settings are now being taken seriously as ways of communicating knowledge about the past and not merely as forms of amusement. As the historiographical debates that dominated discussions of written history from the 1970s to the 1990s have petered out, some of the energy that fueled them has migrated to thinking about nontextual forms of history.

Robert Rosenstone's exploration of the theoretical issues raised by the presentation of history through film are often relevant to these other media as well. What Rosenstone says about visual representations of history, in film and on television, namely that "to leave them out of the equation when we think of the meaning of the past is to condemn ourselves to ignore the way a huge segment of the population has come to understand the events and people that comprise history," certainly applies as well to museums and video games. So does his insistence that other media cannot be evaluated in the same way as



traditional printed texts. History on film, he argues, must be judged on its own terms. “This visual form of historical thinking should not and cannot be judged by the criteria we apply to the history that is produced on the page.”¹⁴ Taking film versions of history seriously, Rosenstone recognizes, represents a major change in thinking for academic historians. He likes to quote a letter written in 1935 by a distinguished university professor of history to the president of the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer film company, complaining about the historical inaccuracies in its productions and urging that “no picture of a historical nature ought to be offered to the public until a reputable historian has had a chance to criticize and revise it.”¹⁵

In Rosenstone’s view, this type of criticism, still common among scholars, is misguided, and literal accuracy cannot be the principal criterion for evaluating historical films. “The camera’s need to fill out the specifics of a particular historical scene, or to create a coherent (and moving) visual sequence, will always ensure large doses of invention in the historical film,” he writes. “All films will include fictional people or invented elements of character.” Incidents also have to be invented, “to keep the story moving, to maintain intensity of feeling, to simplify complexity of events into plausible dramatic structure that will fit within filmic time constraints.” Summing up his argument, he concludes that “on the screen, history must be fictional in order to be true!”¹⁶ Nevertheless, he insists, not only can history be represented on film, but also film can communicate some aspects of the past in ways that prose cannot. “This new historical past on film is potentially much more complex than any written text, for on the screen, several things can occur simultaneously—image, sound, language, even text—elements that support and work against each other to render a realm of meaning as different from written history as written was from oral history,” Rosenstone argues. History on film is “so different that it allows us to speculate that the visual media may represent a major shift in consciousness about how we think about the past.”¹⁷ Not surprisingly, Rosenstone identifies himself as a postmodernist historian, often citing the arguments of Hayden White. Indeed, in the context of discussions of film, White’s emphasis on the underlying narrative structures in historical accounts has a plausibility that is not always so evident with respect to written texts.

Rosenstone’s essays have done much to make historians take film seriously as a medium for the communication of knowledge about



the past, but his eagerness to embrace even movies that flagrantly contradict established facts as “historical” bothers many scholars. Directors of recent blockbuster films such as Steven Spielberg’s “Lincoln” (2012) and Ava Duvernay’s “Selma” (2014), both of which won major awards, have defended their decisions to alter certain historical episodes to heighten their stories’ intensity or to emphasize what they regard as the essence of the past. Natalie Davis, who served as historical advisor in the making of a highly regarded film about life in sixteenth-century France, “The Return of Martin Guerre,” has argued that filmmakers should help viewers understand the difficulties of depicting the truth about the past, rather than simply creating narratives that seem to be beyond contestation. “Films can do much more to pose questions to their viewers about history-making and history-knowing” she writes. She suggests several ways in which filmmakers can let their audiences understand what sources they have drawn on, what liberties they may have taken with them, and what alternative ways of interpreting the stories they tell exist, without interrupting the flow of their story or putting a solemn “talking head” on screen to bestow an official seal of historical approval.¹⁸

Presentations of history on television share some characteristics with historical films, but there are significant differences between the two media as well. Documentary television miniseries, shown in episodes, can be much longer and comprehensive than films meant to be shown in theaters, and there are some techniques, such as the zeroing in on details of still photographs and the presentation of commentaries by scholars, that are frequent on television but rarely used in films. Film scholar Pierre Sorlin has written that the “fixedness” of photographs “and the time necessary to fully explore them are at odds with the permanent mobility characteristic of moving pictures.”¹⁹ Few professional historians have had anything positive to say about the ubiquitous History Channel, sometimes derided as the “Hitler Channel” because of its endless reruns of old documentaries on World War II. Nevertheless, its programs are undoubtedly one of the main ways in which general audiences and especially young Americans now encounter stories about the past.

Two dominant figures in the presentation of serious history on television in recent decades are the American documentary-maker Ken Burns and the transatlantic historian and media personality Simon Schama. Burns’s ten-hour series on the Civil War, aired on



public television in 1990, was an enormous success: the first two episodes alone attracted 23 million viewers. His subsequent projects, including “Baseball” and “Jazz,” led one academic scholar to call Burns “the most famous historian in the country.” Burns has enlisted professors to help in planning his projects and has featured them, along with prominent popular historians such as David McCullough and Shelby Foote, on the screen, but he is not intimidated by their authority. He told one interviewer that he was proud of his role in “breaking the stranglehold the academicians exercised over this discipline for the last hundred years.” The impact of his projects has been amplified by the sale of books and DVDs of his productions, and his concern with reaching a broad audience has led him to speak in the language of commercial marketing. An academic who worked as an advisor on one of Burns’s projects remembered being put off by “the presence of high-velocity words like *agony* and *horror* and *gargantuan* and *fantastic* and *colossal*” in the script, although he was impressed by the emotional force of the final result.²⁰

Unlike Burns, Simon Schama is a professional scholar who has held positions at Harvard and Columbia University. From an early stage in his career, however, Schama has been interested in testing the limits of academic history and reaching out to broader audiences. Whereas other historians, in the wake of Hayden White’s challenge, debated whether history shared the characteristics of fiction, in 1991 Schama produced a book, *Dead Certainties (Unwarranted Speculations)*, in which he deliberately introduced made-up dialogue and incidents into his reconstruction of the past.²¹ This particular venture was not well received by Schama’s academic peers, but he has been more successful as the narrator of a number of television documentaries, including “A History of Britain” in 2000 and “The Story of the Jews,” aired in 2014, while also authoring a number of successful books. Like Burns, Schama has been criticized for oversimplifying complex historical issues; like Burns also, he has unquestionably succeeded in bringing the past to life for audiences of a size that ordinary scholars can never hope to reach. Schama makes no secret of the fact that his programs convey a highly personal view of his subjects: unlike Burns, he appears on screen in his documentaries, and in the first episode of his series on Jewish history, he is shown presiding over his own Passover Seder. As one critic has written, although Schama has certainly demonstrated the potential of television for creating public interest in



history, he and other program hosts have also made themselves into “culturally- and economically-constructed human commodities” who are “famous for their fame as much as for their profession.”²² Like David Hume in the 1700s, Schama’s success has made him “opulent,” but it also raises questions about when considerations of marketing can begin to overwhelm other issues in the presentation of the past.

The historical museum is another medium for the representation of the past that has increasingly become a focus of historiographical debates. If films give viewers the impression of watching past events unfold before their eyes, museums give them the opportunity to view objects that embody the past. In their most traditional form, historical museums may simply put these objects on display, with identifying labels, and leave it to visitors to decide for themselves what meaning they convey. For many years, for example, the Smithsonian Museum of American History in Washington, D.C., exhibited gowns owned by presidents’ wives in its First Ladies exhibit, telling viewers only the year in which each dress had been made and who wore it. Increasingly, however, museum curators have seen it as their function to integrate their museum’s treasures into meaningful historical narratives. In its current arrangement, the Smithsonian First Ladies exhibition informs visitors about the ways in which each of these women influenced public life during her husband’s administration; it also comments on how changes in women’s clothing have reflected changing styles of art and design.

Because they are usually public institutions, museums are often at the center of conflicts about how controversial aspects of the past should be represented, as the highly politicized dispute over the Air and Space Museum’s Hiroshima exhibition in 1994 shows. Sometimes these are arguments between museum professionals who want to convey the findings of academic scholarship to the public and interest groups defending their particular vision of the past, but sometimes they are clashes between rival groups of experts. Museum curators, for example, are divided about whether historical museums should feature exhibits that try to reconstruct whole environments from the past, such as pioneer cabins, even if this means mixing authentic artifacts from the past with modern replicas, or whether they should display only historic objects, emphasizing that the incompleteness of the historical record is part of its “pastness” and challenging viewers to use their imaginations to fill in the missing context. Despite controversies such as that over the Hiroshima exhibit, museums in Western



countries have become more willing to present visitors with alternative interpretations of the past; indeed, one criticism of the Smithsonian's Museum of American History is that it offers so many conflicting perspectives on the past that visitors have a hard time extracting any coherent message at all from the exhibits. Elsewhere, however, museum exhibits often insist on guiding viewers to conclusions that clearly serve political purposes, even if those purposes have changed over time. In China, where the main historical museums in the capital city of Beijing have been redesigned numerous times to coincide with shifting political winds since the death of Mao Zedong in 1976, the one constant, according to a Western scholar, has been the insistence that each version presents "the one and true account of China's modern past."²³

A major milestone in the design of historical museums was the creation of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, also located in Washington, which opened to the public in 1993. Historians' understanding of the complexities involved in museum and exhibit design has been greatly advanced by Edward Linenthal's *Preserving Memory: The Struggle to Create America's Holocaust Museum* (2001), a detailed account of the many questions that had to be addressed in the institution's creation. As Linenthal shows, every decision, from the location of the museum just off the Washington Mall, the center of American historical memory, to the design of the building and the choice of which objects and photographs should be on display, had consequences for the way in which visitors experience the story of the Holocaust. As *Preserving Memory* demonstrates, the design of the museum involved many people other than professional historians. Architects, curators, and exhibition specialists, politicians and representatives of various interest groups, and above all, Holocaust survivors, represented by Elie Wiesel, among others, had their own points of view and concerns that had to be taken into account. The museum exhibit that viewers see is the result of long and involved debates that brought profound historiographical issues to the surface.

The Holocaust Museum has some unique features, but the issues raised in Linenthal's book are also pertinent to other historical museums, many of which have also been the subject of major controversies. Museums devoted to Native American history and culture have been major sites of contestation in recent decades. "Museums can be very painful sites for Native peoples, as they are intimately tied to the colonization process," one recent scholar has written.²⁴ Sometimes created



more than a century ago by whites who wanted to preserve the memory of what they regarded as a “vanishing race,” such museums now seek to play a positive role in communicating the fact that Native Americans are very much a part of present-day American life. Older exhibits that included human remains have disappeared, and Native American groups have been given a much greater role in drafting text for displays. At the same time, however, to attract visitors, these museums feel pressure to offer displays that may reflect older stereotypes about Indians, even if they try to educate viewers on their significance as seen by the people who created them.

Native Americans are certainly not the only group for whom historical museums have become an important way of preserving and communicating their own past, both as a way of defining a group identity and as a way of claiming a place in larger national historical narratives. Almost every American city has at least one “house museum,” often located in the former home of a historically significant resident. The Rhode Island Historical Society’s Museum of Work and Culture in Woonsocket, Rhode Island, stands out for its presentation of the experiences of the region’s factory workers, most of them French-speaking immigrants from the Canadian province of Quebec, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. At a time when labor and social history has been somewhat in eclipse in academic scholarship, this museum, like the more ambitious People’s History Museum in Manchester, England, has tried to counter this trend. Another example of a historical museum that serves as a show-window for a group whose experiences have received little scholarly attention is the U.S. Army Women’s Museum in Fort Lee, Virginia, which combines a traditional museum function—the memorialization of military service to the country—with an innovative focus on gender as it traces the participation of women in the American military, from the cases of soldiers who concealed their sex to serve in the Revolutionary War and the Civil War through the history of the Army Women’s Corps in the early twentieth century and the progressive integration of women into the army in more recent decades. Like many historical museums dedicated to rarely studied groups, the Army Women’s Museum has become a depository for artifacts and documents, most of them donated by former women soldiers, and it encourages scholars to make use of its resources.



Visitors come to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum expecting a serious educational experience, and specialized museums such as the Museum of Work and Culture and the Army Women's Museum make no secret of their pedagogical intentions. Historical theme parks that mix entertainment with information raise other questions, especially if they are run as money-making enterprises. In the United States, one of the most important of these theme parks is Colonial Williamsburg, which occupies an entire district of Williamsburg, Virginia, and is vital to the city's economy. Originally established in the 1930s by John D. Rockefeller Jr., a millionaire with a passion for historical preservation, Colonial Williamsburg at first openly celebrated the values of Virginia's eighteenth-century planter elite. Originally, the exhibits said nothing about the slaves who had made up half of the city's population in that era. In the Cold War years, its supporters saw Colonial Williamsburg as a way of teaching visitors patriotic values. In the 1970s, "slavery was discovered at Williamsburg," as one scholar has put it, and the presentation of the past offered to visitors was changed, but only up to a point: "Slave culture was one thing, slave revolts were another."²⁵ In more recent years, Colonial Williamsburg has tried to make its treatment of slavery more comprehensive, but these efforts have often encountered obstacles. A reenactment of a slave auction set off protests, and scenes in which actors playing slaves are mistreated sometimes provoke visitors to interfere. The museum has not always been able to find black actors willing to perform the roles of slaves. "You interview people, and they'll say: 'I just can't do it. I can't put on that costume,'" a museum official told a reporter in 2013.²⁶

Whereas historical films and historical museums have been around for some time, video games with historical settings are a more recent development. As in the case of film, postmodernism has made it easier for some scholars to envisage this medium as a way of communicating certain truths about history. Just as Robert Rosenstone has argued that filmmakers necessarily have to take certain liberties with the past to produce representations that work as films, enthusiasts for historical games have emphasized that games do have to be fun to play if they are going to succeed and that the historical accuracy of their settings and narrative structure may take second place to engaging their users. The most important historical lesson that games can play, according to their advocates, is "the potential to understand history as



a process.” As one of their supporters puts it, “by constructing a virtual past and granting the player agency within it, video games have become the ideal medium for teaching the lesson of contingency.”²⁷ Players of games such as “Civilization” are able to experiment with different decisions and see what the consequences of their actions are. Instead of being passive consumers of representations of the past, like book readers and film viewers, video-game players take an active role in constructing notions of the past.

Although most of the new ways of presenting history that have affected historiographical discussion in recent years have abandoned the printed page, comic art has shown that there are new possibilities even in the traditional format of the book. No work in this form has had more impact on history, as well as on several other fields, than Art Spiegelman’s *Maus*, originally published in 1992. *Maus* uses comic-art techniques to tell the story of Spiegelman’s father’s ordeal during the Holocaust and simultaneously the story of how Spiegelman was affected by his father’s narrative. It may seem odd to consider a book in which the Jewish victims of the Holocaust are depicted as cartoon mice and the Germans as cats as a serious effort at representing history. Spiegelman’s intentions are serious, however, and he has used the comic medium as a way of conveying a historical story in ways that words alone cannot do, as he has explained in his own commentary on his work, *MetaMaus*. His approach “allowed me to approach otherwise unsayable things,” he writes. “What makes *Maus* thorny is actually what allows it to be useful as a real ‘teaching tool.’”²⁸ The special power of comic art is that its panels simultaneously communicate through words and pictures, and the interplay between the two is often more expressive than either one on its own. Although Spiegelman’s use of cartoon-style animals takes his work out of the realm of realism, it has come to be recognized as a powerful evocation of the Holocaust and is frequently used as a reading in courses on the subject.

Larry Gonick is another comic artist who has employed that medium for historical purposes. His *Cartoon History of the Universe* and similar books about American and world history remind “serious” historians that humor can be an effective way of communicating historical ideas. Although his books are meant to be entertaining—“How come it’s OK for a teacher to be funny, but it’s not OK for a textbook to be funny?” he asks—they are also a serious project, which took him some thirty years to complete. His narrative begins with the creation of



the universe, thus connecting natural and human history, and goes to the present. The historical volumes present a global history, deftly integrating Asia, Africa, and Latin America into the narrative. Gonick sees comic art as having some unique qualities that enable it to communicate aspects of history that conventional prose cannot. “Cartoons can put badly-needed life back into history,” he told an interviewer. “There’s no getting around it: historical figures are mostly dead. And traditional textbooks mostly leave them that way . . . Comics can restore our identification with past actors as living, feeling beings like ourselves.” He has also argued that drawings can show “a wealth of historical graphic detail such as costumes, landscape, and architecture that isn’t readily conveyed in text or even a normal illustrated book.”²⁹ Academic historians can become irritated with the many minor errors of fact that litter Gonick’s visual narrative, but he has something to teach us about getting readers interested in the drama of the past. Some academic historians are now starting to collaborate with professional graphic artists to exploit the medium’s possibilities for engaging readers. In recent years, three scholars—Trevor Getz, Rafe Blaufarb, and Ronald Schechter—have worked with the artist Liz Clarke to produce “graphic histories” that combine historical narrative, illustrations, and selections from archival documents. Getz’s *Abina and the Important Men* (2011), a micro-history based on the court case brought by an African woman seeking her freedom in 1876, has won widespread praise.

New Directions in Historical Scholarship

Even in a digital age in which history now comes to us in many other forms, it is still a dizzying experience to visit the book exhibit at a major historical convention, such as the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, and see the hundreds of new scholarly publications that have appeared in a single year. Just as there is much concern about the future of traditional employment in universities, there is much anxiety among historians about the future of the system of peer-reviewed scholarly publication on which academic history has come to depend, but for the moment, there is little indication that the rate at which new history books are appearing has diminished. Historians continue to practice all of the many varieties of scholarship we have discussed in earlier chapters, including political, economic, social, and cultural history. The bicentennial of the outbreak of World War I in



2014 has revived interest in diplomatic and military history, with a number of new monographs on the sequence of events that led to the start of hostilities and on the many ways in which the conflict affected the populations of the countries that were drawn into it.

The years since 2000 have not been marked by any transformations of history as profound or controversial as those that resulted from the linguistic and cultural turns of the 1970, the rise of feminism, and the challenge of postcolonialism, but the discipline continues to absorb new perspectives. One important tendency has certainly been an increased emphasis on history with a “world” or “global” perspective. Patrick Manning, one of the leading American proponents of this development, defines world history as “studies of the past working from the postulate of connection rather than the postulate of autonomy.” What this means continues to be debated. Is a work of history “global” because it deals with phenomena that affect the entire planet, such as climate change, the spread of diseases, or trade networks? Does global history necessarily require the mastery of historical data from different countries or continents, or can it mean focusing on the history of one nation’s relations with other parts of the world? Is the historical era we now live in unique because of the degree to which different parts of the world are now linked together, or does history suggest that such linkages were already important in previous epochs? This is a point Manning emphasizes when he says that the distinctive contribution historians can make to the understanding of globalization is to show that its present-day manifestations are “less . . . a radical disjuncture than . . . a set of recent nuances in a global pattern of fluctuations and gradual transformations.”³⁰

Global history remains a challenging field. Global historians often have difficulty fitting themselves into the paradigm of scholarly historical research, going back to Ranke’s day, that dictates that the historian should work directly with archival sources. Few historians have the command of multiple languages or the time and energy that would be necessary to truly do such research in more than a few countries. Global history is thus more of a teaching field, especially at the undergraduate level, than a domain for original research, and many of the books published under this rubric are collections of articles by scholars working on different parts of the world. Nevertheless, some ambitious scholars have made efforts to treat significant aspects of the global past, although they necessarily must rely heavily on other historians’ more



specialized work. C. A. Bayly's *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1914*, published in 2004, has been one influential example. Bayly has explicitly challenged the postmodern aversion to grand narratives, arguing that they are necessary if a historian is to make sense of so much data and render it comprehensible to readers. Timothy Brook's *Vermeer's Hat* (2008), on the other hand, has demonstrated that the microhistorical approach can be adapted to global history. Tracing the origins of objects depicted in one of Dutch artist Jan Vermeer's detailed paintings from the seventeenth century, Brook shows that the world in that era was already tightly interconnected.³¹ Even historiography has taken a global turn, with Daniel Woolf's *A Global History of History* (2011), which brings a global perspective to the subject, setting the Greek and Roman heritage that led eventually to modern Western history-writing in the context of other traditions of writing about the past.³²

Global history is closely related to transnational history, another way of challenging the hegemony of national frameworks in studying the past. Transnational historical projects stress the interaction between events in two or more countries, but do not necessarily focus on issues that can be studied on a planetary scale. A transnational historical project may even treat events in the interior of a single nation if they have clear links to other societies. Thus Patricia Nelson Limerick, a leading exponent of the “new western history,” which has overturned old assumptions about the history of the western United States, sees her work as adding a transnational dimension to regional history by emphasizing that the American West was not just the edge of white settlement spreading from the east, but “one of the great meeting zones of the planet,” where whites, Hispanics, Native Americans, and African Americans came together to create a new society.³³ Her work exemplifies another American historian's call for “rethinking and deprovincializing the narrative of American history” to “integrate the stories of American history with other, larger stories from which, with a kind of continental self-sufficiency, the United States has isolated itself.”³⁴ Perhaps the most successful example of transnational history in recent decades has been the field of Atlantic history, which one scholar has defined as the study of “the creation, destruction, and recreation of communities as a result of the movement, across and around the Atlantic basin, of people, commodities, cultural practices, and values.”³⁵ Bringing together the history of Europe, the Americas, and

Africa, giving a central position to the history of slavery, and crossing the borders between the different European empires, Atlantic history has also been highly interdisciplinary, attracting practitioners of every variety of scholarship, from economic history to cultural studies. Courses on Atlantic history have become standard at most American colleges and universities.

Although global history stresses interconnections between civilizations but usually accepts the notion that history begins only with the emergence of written records, Daniel Smail and his collaborators have challenged historians to think in terms of what he calls “deep history,” which means extending our sense of the historical past to include much earlier periods of human existence that are normally labeled “prehistory.” According to Smail, when scholars broke away from a chronology of the past based on the Bible and accepted the idea that the world and human beings had come into existence many thousands or millions of years ago, a development he calls the “time revolution” of the mid-nineteenth century, historians nevertheless continued to define their domain as covering only the six thousand or so years since the development of the first civilizations that used writing. He sees this tendency as a disguised survival of an essentially religious worldview, one that still wants to deny that “humans are part of nature, and that human systems are natural systems.”³⁶ Aspects of the deep history approach can also be found in the movement for “big history,” a label popularized by David Christian, author of *Maps of Time: An Introduction to Big History*. The proponents of “big history” want to present the human past as part of a larger “unifying narrative of life on earth,” and even as part of the history of the cosmos. This idea has attracted the support of the billionaire Bill Gates, who is trying to persuade American schools to introduce the approach in their curricula.³⁷

To practice deep history, Smail acknowledges, we will have to give up the insistence that historical narratives must be able to give the events they cover precise dates and that we must be able to identify specific individuals as historical actors in the past. “The study of deep history emphasizes trends and processes more than events and persons.” Historians must also broaden their notion of what constitutes historical evidence and be willing to rely on archeological data and findings from some of the other natural sciences. “History can be written from every type of trace, from the memoir to the bone fragment

and the blood type,” he insists.³⁸ In addition to enriching our picture of the distant human past, the advocates of deep history contend that it gives us a broader perspective on the history of more recent periods. Two examples in the volume Smail co-edited with Andrew Shryock in 2011 are the sections on food, which uses biological and archeological evidence to point to the importance of meat protein in the human diet from the origin of our species to the present, and the chapter on human migration, which shows that a phenomenon often considered part of modern history can in fact be traced back thousands of years. Many of these findings reflect the use of DNA evidence, which has only become available in the past few decades. This is allowing scholars to give a much more detailed account of when and how the practice of agriculture spread from the ancient Middle East to the continent of Europe, for example, and has challenged the notion that this process involved the displacement of hunter-gatherers by settlers from outside, as opposed to the adoption of new methods by members of existing populations.

Evidence from DNA has had an impact on the understanding of more modern history as well; probably the most widely known example is the use of genetic testing to establish with near certainty that Thomas Jefferson had children with one of his slaves, Sally Hemings, a story that circulated during Jefferson’s lifetime but that historians and biographers had long rejected. Annette Gordon-Reed’s publications on this subject have led to a considerable change in how historians write about Jefferson’s relations with blacks and slavery. Among other things, Gordon-Reed’s work is an example of a third new historiographical development that has flourished since 2000: the “biographic turn” in historical studies. Biography and history have coexisted since the time of Plutarch, but academic historians have usually treated the chronicling of individual lives as a lesser form of scholarship, one that they were willing to leave to nonspecialists. Now, in the guise of the “new biography,” historians have begun to use life stories to illuminate the connections between individual experience and broader historical themes. With the decline of historical grand narratives, Barbara Caine has written, “biography can be seen as the archetypal ‘contingent narrative’ and the one best able to show the great importance of particular locations and circumstances and the multiple layers of historical change and experience.”³⁹

The new biography offers the possibility of combining a traditional form of narrative with new theoretical insights. In her introduction to a volume entitled *The New Biography: Performing Femininity in Nineteenth-Century France* (2000), Jo Burr Margadant makes the notion of self-fashioning central to the new biographical approach and shows how it draws on ideas articulated by the literary scholar Stephen Greenblatt and the feminist theorist Judith Butler. The new biography posits “a method of analysis that recognizes the constructed nature of our conscious selves and views of others,” she writes.⁴⁰ In his introduction to a forum devoted to “History and Biography,” published in the *American Historical Review* in 2009, another scholar and biographer, David Nasaw, expanded on the potentialities of the genre. “It allows, even encourages, us to move beyond the strictures of identity politics without having to abandon its every-expanding and often useful categories,” he wrote, adding that “it offers a way of transcending the theoretical divide between empiricist social history and linguistic-turn cultural history.”⁴¹

Historiography itself has taken on a new tone in the years since 2000. Long concerned almost exclusively with the historical work of academic scholars, scholars of the subject now recognize, as written by the editors of the most comprehensive treatment of the subject published in recent years, the French two-volume collection *Historiographies: Concepts et Débats* (“Historiographies: Concepts and Debates”), that “professional historians have never had a monopoly on the writing of history” and insist on the necessity of taking into account the many ways in which history is transmitted to the public. The polemical tone of the historiographical debates in the second half of the twentieth century has faded; the editors of *Historiographies* emphasize instead history’s “pluralism” of approaches.⁴² The 126 articles in their collection no longer highlight only the contributions of French scholars, even those of the influential Annales school. Instead, they mention the work of historians from all over the world. The three-volume work of the American historian of historiography Donald R. Kelley, *Faces of History: Historical Inquiry from Herodotus to Herder* (1998), *Fortunes of History: Historical Inquiry from Herder to Huizinga* (2003), and *Frontiers of History: Historical Inquiry in the Twentieth Century* (2006), the most detailed account of historical writing in recent decades, confines itself to the tradition of history-writing in the Western world, but it, too, represents a broadening of perspectives. Rather than seeing the



rise of Rankean “scientific” history in the nineteenth century as a sharp break with everything that came before, Kelley emphasizes continuity and urges a greater appreciation of the achievements of the historical writers of antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance.

As the examples of global history, deep history, and the new biography demonstrate, historians continue to identify new approaches to their subject. Other new directions in historical research in recent years have included the history of the emotions and the history of material culture, the first taking research into the domain of psychology and the second involving historians with technology and the decorative arts. Major world events since the turn of the millennium have given historians opportunities to underline the continuing relevance of our discipline, as policy makers and journalists have turned to scholars to provide perspective on topics ranging from crises in the Middle East to the “Great Recession” of 2008. The historically-minded economist Thomas Piketty’s *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, for example, uses data spanning several centuries to argue that capitalist economies have an inherent tendency to increase social inequality. Critics immediately recognized that Piketty’s presentation of history is highly relevant to current debates about public policy.⁴³

The history of memory has turned out to have practical present-day significance as historians from countries with long histories of conflict have come together to try to agree on guidelines for school textbooks that will present clashing perspectives on the past in ways that can promote reconciliation. These initiatives, which have often been launched by high-school teachers rather than university scholars, have resulted in the publication of a jointly written book on French-German relations and in the publication of document readers for classes on Asian history taught in Korea, Japan, and China, where disputes about the Second World War remain burning issues.⁴⁴ Historians have taken advantage of the 150th anniversary of the American Civil War, from 2011 to 2015, and the 100th anniversary of World War I to share new perspectives with a broader public, stressing the role of blacks in the American conflict and the global dimensions of the “Great War.” Intellectually speaking, there is no question that history remains a vital and creative discipline and that historiographic analysis continues to have a vital role to play. The future of history is not only a matter of intellectual activity, however; it also depends on there being professional employment opportunities for historians and on young people



wanting to make careers in the history field. The next chapter looks at what is involved in becoming a professional historian, either as a university teacher or in some other career.

Notes

1. Cathérine Coquio, "À propos d'un nihilisme contemporain: négation, déni, témoignage," in Cathérine Coquio, ed., *L'Histoire trouée. Négation et témoignage* (Nantes: L'Atalante, 2003), 23–89.
2. Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob, *Telling the Truth about History* (New York: Norton, 1994), 247, 259, 255, 248. For dissents from their "pragmatic" position, see Perez Zagorin, "History, the Referent, and Narrative," *History and Theory* 38 (1999), 1–24, opposing any concession to the "linguistic turn," and F. R. Ankersmit, "In Praise of Objectivity," in David Carr et al., eds., *The Ethics of History* (complete reference), 1–22, defending a position close to that of Hayden White.
3. Richard J. Evans, *In Defense of History* (New York: Norton, 1997), 220, 217.
4. Keith Jenkins, "'After' History," in Alun Munslow, ed., *Authoring the Past: Writing and Rethinking History* (London: Routledge, 2013 (orig. 1998)), 28.
5. Deborah Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* (New York: Plume, 1993), 18.
6. Lipstadt has recounted the trial from her point of view in *History on Trial: My Day in Court with a Holocaust Denier* (New York: Ecco, 2005). Another of the expert witnesses who testified on her behalf has also published a book on the trial: Richard J. Evans, *Lying about Hitler: History, the Holocaust, and the David Irving Trial* (New York: Basic Books, 2001). In *The Case for Auschwitz: Evidence from the Irving Trial*, a published version of the brief he submitted at the trial, architecture historian Robert Jan van Pelt has explained the documentary basis for our knowledge that gas chambers were used at Auschwitz, the central issue Irving had raised (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.)
7. The Bellesiles, Ambrose, Goodwin, and Ellis affairs are described at length in Peter Charles Hoffer, *Past Imperfect: Facts, Fictions, Frauds—American History from Bancroft and Parkman to*



- Ambrose, Bellsiles, Ellis, and Goodwin* (New York: Public Affairs, 2007), 141–229.
8. Dipesh Chakrabarty, “The Climate of History: Four Theses,” *Critical Inquiry* 35 (2009), 208.
 9. H-France is not affiliated with H-Net.
 10. Roy Rosenzweig, *Clio Wired: The Future of the Past in the Digital Age* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 55.
 11. Daniel J. Cohen and Roy Rosenzweig, *Digital History: A Guide to Gathering, Preserving, and Presenting the Past on the Web* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), accessed online via the Center for History and New Media website.
 12. Gertrude Himmelfarb, “A Neo-Luddite Reflects on the Internet,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Nov. 1, 1996, cited in Cohen and Rosenzweig, *Digital History*.
 13. Renée M. Sentilles, “Toiling in the Archives of Cyberspace,” in Antoinette Burton, ed., *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 140.
 14. Robert A. Rosenstone, *History on Film/Film on History* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2006), 4, 37.
 15. Louis Gottschalk to president of MGY, cited in Rosenstone, *History on Film*, 20.
 16. Robert A. Rosenstone, *Visions of the Past: The Challenge of Film to Our Idea of History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 68, 70.
 17. Rosenstone, *Visions*, 15.
 18. Natalie Zemon Davis, *Slaves on Screen: Film and Historical Vision* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 131–36.
 19. Pierre Sorlin, “Television and Our Understanding of History: A Distant Conversation,” in Tony Barta, ed., *Screening the Past: Film and the Representation of History* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998), 213.
 20. David Harlan, “Ken Burns and the Coming Crisis of Academic History,” *Rethinking History* 7 (2003), 169; Gary R. Edgerton, *Ken Burns’s America* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 17; Samuel Hynes, “At War with Ken Burns,” *Sewanee Review* 118 (Spring 2010), 261, 264.
 21. Simon Schama, *Dead Certainties (Unwarranted Speculations)* (New York: Vintage Books, 1992 (orig. 1991)).



22. Jerome de Groot, *Consuming History: Historians and Heritage in Contemporary Popular Culture* (London: Routledge, 2009), 19–20.
23. Kirk A. Denton, *Historical Memory and the Politics of Museums in Postsocialist China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014), 74.
24. Amy Lonetree, *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 1.
25. Mike Wallace, *Mickey Mouse History and Other Essays on American Memory* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996), 23.
26. J. Freedom du Lac, "Learning How to Portray a Slave at Colonial Williamsburg Is a Psychological Challenge," *Washington Post* "Style section," Mar. 9, 2013.
27. Harry Brown, cited in Andrew B. R. Elliott and Matthew Wilhelm Kapell, "Introduction: To Build a Past That Will 'Stand the Test of Time'—Discovering Historical Facts, Assembling Historical Narratives," in Andrew Wilhelm Kapell and Andrew B. R. Elliott, eds., *Playing with the Past: Digital Games and the Simulation of History* (New York: Bloomsburg, 2013), 11.
28. Art Spiegelman, *MetaMaus: A Look Inside a Modern Classic* (New York: Random House, 2011), 127.
29. Larry Gonick, interview with Matthew Johnson, "Media Smarts," Oct. 13, 2009.
30. Patrick Manning, *Navigating World History: Historians Create a Global Past* (New York: Palgrave, 2003), 116, 167.
31. C. A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004); Timothy Brook, *Vermeer's Hat: The Seventeenth Century and the Dawn of the Global World* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2008).
32. Daniel Woolf, *A Global History of History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
33. Patricia Nelson Limerick, "The American West: From Exceptionalism to Internationalism," in Melvyn Stokes, ed., *The State of U.S. History* (New York: Berg, 2002), 289.
34. Thomas Bender, "Introduction," in Thomas Bender, ed., *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 5–6.
35. John Elliott, cited in Jack P. Greene and Philip D. Morgan, eds., *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 3.



36. Andrew Shryock and Daniel Lord Smail, eds., *Deep History: The Architecture of Past and Present* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), xiii, 8.
37. David Christian, *Maps of Time: An Introduction to Big History* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011); Andrew Ross Sorkin, "Everything Is Illuminated," *New York Times Magazine*, Sept. 7, 2014, p. 32.
38. Shryock and Smail, eds., *Deep History*, 14, 13.
39. Barbara Caine, *Biography and History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 2.
40. Jo Burr Margadant, "Introduction," in Jo Burr Margadant, ed., *The New Biography: Performing Femininity in Nineteenth-Century France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 8.
41. David Nasaw, "Historians and Biography: Introduction," *American Historical Review* 114 (June 2009), 576, 577.
42. Christian Delacroix, François Dosse, Patrick Garcia, and Nicolas Offenstadt, eds., *Historiographies. Concepts et Débats* (Paris: Gallimard, 2010), 1:13.
43. Thomas Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014).
44. On joint textbook projects, see Katerina V. Korostelina and Simone Lässig, *History Education and Post-Conflict Reconciliation: Reconsidering Joint Textbook Projects* (New York: Routledge, 2013).

