

# FORUM

## Open Access Publishing

We want to hear from you!

**We want to hear from you!**

**September 23, 2014 at 2:07 PM**

The History Manifesto is available as Open Access because we want to get the word out. What criteria would you use when deciding which books should be made available as Open Access?

**Re: We want to hear from you!**

**September 24, 2014 at 4:02 AM**

What are you trying to do with Open Access? Get the widest possible audience for a particular book?

It is a very opened ended question.

I think I get why the authors of "History Manifesto" want their book to be Open Access, but I'm less sure of why "The Myth of Piers the Plowman" would be.

*By rnsulentia*

**Re: We want to hear from you!**

**September 29, 2014 at 7:06 PM**

David and Jo's blog post from the 24th, "Why Open Access Publication for The History Manifesto?" addresses the reasons behind why OA for their book is important to them, but it also notes some of the reasons why we at CUP are publishing the book as Open Access. The mission of the Press is to disseminate knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest levels of excellence, and it's crucial for us to explore new and different models for different kinds of books, see what's sustainable, and to know what our readers want. In opening up this forum topic, we hope to get a a range of opinion and good conversation going on the issue. So please keep contributing!

*By The History Manifesto*

**Re: We want to hear from you!**

**October 9, 2014 at 1:35 PM**

I would like to use the open access PDF to create an online reading session/discussion on 'The History Manifesto' using eMargin (collaborative annotation software).

I was at the LSE talk last night and thought the call to action was really inspiring. Obviously I now have to read the Manifesto (!) but I don't want to do that as a lone reader in isolation.

If anyone is interested in participating, let me know.

*By natbbk*

**Re: We want to hear from you!**

**October 12, 2014 at 5:30 PM**

Happy to read your "Manifesto" as I answered your call to arms before you issued it. Sharing with Cambridge, my "Struggle for the Eurasian Borderlands. From the Rise of Early Modern Empires to the End of the first World War" is a comparative analysis of the engagement of five multicultural empires: Habsburg, Ottoman Russian, Iranian (Safavid-Qajar) and Ching with one another along their contested frontiers and with the peoples they subjugated and attempted to assimilate. Alfred J. Rieber

*By riebera*

## The History Manifesto

### Welcome

**Welcome**

**September 23, 2014 at 9:26 AM**

Welcome to the forum for 'The History Manifesto'! My name is Liz Friend-Smith, the book's Editor, and I hope you'll use this forum to say exactly what you make of the book, whether you agree with every word or think that the authors, Jo Guldi and David Armitage, have missed the point entirely. We'll be publishing on 3rd October, both in print and as an Open Access publication, and you'll be able to read and comment on the whole book directly on this site then. In the meantime, please do look around and let us have your view of long-term history, and Open Access publishing. Why does history matter to you - or do you think it's irrelevant in modern society? And what would you put in your own 'History Manifesto'? New users will need to register in order to comment, but you can find out what everyone else thinks without registration. So please, come on - Join the Debate!

*By Liz Friend-Smith - Cambridge University Press*

**Re: Welcome**

**November 21, 2014 at 10:08 PM**

Thank you!

Today, I had the honor and pleasure of attending Jo and David's 'defense'/discussion of this potentially paradigm shifting text. I am incredibly excited about diving into The History Manifesto. As an aspiring doctoral candidate of Public Health with increasing interest in Applied Medical Anthropology and the History of Science, I am eager to discuss the ways in which the field of Public Health can interface and be enriched by borrowing the tools offered in this revitalized approach to improving health of marginalized populations today. Would love to connect with other interested in engaging this framework with the health sciences.

*By asr05008*

## New Media And Public History?

### **New Media And Public History?**

**September 25, 2014 at 10:47 PM**

I was wondering if it might be time to think of alternative ways of presenting history to the public? Academic history has only a few acceptable venues—the conference, the article, the book, the roundtable. The landscape of new media on the other hand has been vibrant: wikis and podcasts have become incredibly influential sources of historical knowledge; the askhistorians forum on reddit sustains a vibrant back-and-forth between historical experts and laymen; amateur historians publish blog posts on everything from 18th Century haircare to the social networks of the American Revolution. Can academic historians jam the subtleties of long term history into the micro-second attention spans of our computer screens? Should we? Is it more important for academic history to be written for other historians—with all its complexity, subtlety, and difficulty? Or is there a space for pitching these new historical narratives to the wider public?

*By bmackie*

### **Re: New Media And Public History?**

**November 10, 2014 at 3:46 AM**

Prof. David Armitage and Prof. Jo Guldi's book, *The History Manifesto*, pronounces a new social role that historians should take. As a history graduate student, probably I should thank them for potentially creating more job opportunities in the future, e.g. a consultant of the White House or U.N. But, my sense of "conservativeness" hinders me from embracing their new proposal—there are big dangers behind the historian's new role as a public speaker, or a data specialist. There are mainly two problems.

First, instead of jumping outside the highly specialized "profession" of being a historian, these two historians are seducing other historians and university education into a deeper trap of professionalization and specialization. As soon as historians identifying themselves as "data specialists," with high possibility, they will turn themselves into slaves of diagrams, big data, and huge amount of statistics; records containing human feelings and emotions will be discarded into the trash, since such records will be difficult to "digitalize." Even if we will be able to find various key words in various documents, as the authors suggested by using fancy visualization tools, story lines and deeper meanings behind these "words" will be lost. The two historians' proposal that historians can be critic of the big data will be too idealistic to be realized.

The second "danger" embedded in their proposal worry me more. As the last chapter indicate, what they appeal is a publicly active role for historians. But, once become "public speakers," can historians still criticize the government, the reality and speak for the "public"? Once belong to one of the prestigious institutions, such as White House and U.N. can historians still be able to

jump out of the entrenched interests and stand aloof to reject the "institutionalization" of themselves? Once publicly taking the role as a representative of "public" or as an interpreter who claim to "read behind the data," I highly doubt that a historian could offer objective, humanistic, and more neutral opinions. Probably, instead of appealing historians to take on more active public roles, these authors (together with other people who are interested in this topic) should be more self-reflective and self-conscious, criticizing themselves before speaking for the "public." As far as I can think, it may be independent individuals who reject any form of "institutionalization," and "publicity," that can remain most clearheaded in the face of the vast changes happening around us. Therefore, rather than becoming a "technic," historians should learn more from philosophers and litterateurs to listen to the "deep emotions" of human beings.

*By Yolanda*

### **Re: New Media And Public History?**

**September 15, 2015 at 7:01 PM**

The proposals put forward by Prof. David Armitage and Prof. Jo Guldi are well worth acknowledging in regard to the role that historians can and sometimes should play in today's society. That they should be taken as definitive answers is another thing.

The text itself does leave some clues about various possibilities and outcomes, particularly when it talks about multiple causalities and different futures. In other words, what they propose is only their suggestions and opening the debate is a way of listening to other ideas and refocusing the objectives for our profession's future through dialogue; including with other social scientists, philosophers and literature critics/experts.

In regards to your concerns about deeper professionalization and losing credibility through "institutionalization", they are both well-founded and not well dealt by the authors, but I don't think they are insurmountable:

New technologies have definitely opened new ways for historians to work and even to redefine themselves in new roles like "data specialists". But in order to avoid becoming dependent on big data and its results, we must learn from the mistakes of the quantitative school of the 1970's and (as you rightly point out) not discard those records containing human feelings and emotions. Big data is very helpful but it cannot solve everything; we just need know to use it without sacrificing other historical methodologies for its own sake.

As for the issue of historians losing their ability of being "public speakers" upon working with a prestigious institution or government, the problem stems from the lack of trust many of them have suffered over the last 20 years. While the presence of historians in their ranks won't necessarily improve things in immediate future, there has to be a changing of the guard. That it will take some time and may cost the position of certain academics as objective, humanistic and neutral observers is right, but the sacrifice has to be made for the long-term good the profession and the public at large. For the time being, remaining independent is the way to go in order to stay clearheaded and neutral, but eventually we need to start infiltrating these institutions and begin transforming them anew if we want a better future.

*By JOSCR05*

## Political Economy

### **Political Economy**

**May 14, 2015 at 7:00 PM**

The major three topics of global governance, climate change and inequality have already been dealt with by political economy, so the role Guldi & Armitage assign to history is misplaced.

See my report on the session at KNAW Amsterdam May 12

2015:<http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/05/13/the-end-of-the-histo...>

*By Colignatus*

## Exchange in the American Historical Review, 120, no. 2 (Apr. 2015)

### **Exchange in the American Historical Review, 120, no. 2 (Apr. 2015)**

**April 10, 2015 at 9:41 PM**

Deborah Cohen and Peter Mandler have published a powerful critique of The History Manifesto in the latest issue of the American Historical Review. What do people think of it and Guldi and Armitage's reply?

I've summarized the AHR Exchange and offered my thoughts on it here.

*By trrenaud*

## The Anthropocene Era

The Anthropocene Era  
December 11, 2014 at 2:43 PM

Paul Dukes, Emeritus Professor, University of Aberdeen:

Asked how he would rule over a country, Confucius said: 'First of all things must be properly named.... If things are not properly named, then what you say about them cannot be right.'

The proper name for today and the previous two hundred and fifty years or so is the Anthropocene, the confluence of historical and geological time, and a paradigm for all academic sciences, humane, social and natural. The discussion on this subject has been significantly advanced by The History Manifesto.

There is a wealth of learning in its Notes, to which I would like to add Minutes to Midnight: History and the Anthropocene Era since 1763, (Anthem, 2011). Beginning with the achievements of the Scottish Enlightenment, in particular James Watt's steam engine, Adam Smith's The Wealth of Nations and Adam Ferguson's An Essay on the History of Civil Society, the book goes on to narrate successive stages in the evolution of the Anthropocene accompanied by a summary of concurrent development in the sciences, especially history.[i][i]

By The History Manifesto

## Specialization Versus The Longue-Duree and its Effect on Equality

Specialization Versus The Longue-Duree and its Effect on Equality  
September 23, 2014 at 2:06 PM

Thomas Piketty, author of Capital in the Twenty-First Century, says of The History Manifesto:

"For too long, we have seen increasing specialization within historical research and between the disciplines of social sciences. Armitage and Guldi rightly plead for a return of the 'longue durée.' They call for more global, long-run and transdisciplinary approaches to big questions, including climate change, inequality and the future of capitalism. Their book will be an important milestone in this direction."

Do you agree? In what ways do you think that inequality in the world – for example – is best addressed when we think in the long-term? Does short-term thinking have its place?

By The History Manifesto

**Re: Specialization Versus The Longue-Duree and its Effect on Equality**  
**September 24, 2014 at 3:56 AM**

Short term thinking always has a place. If you are talking about history, then you are talking about government or governments or governing, and there is always something that is a problem that needs to be addressed RIGHT NOW. Like the Ebola epidemic or those ISIS people getting bombed as I type this.

As to "Inequality" what happened to poverty? I'm fascinated here with the use of language, and what that implies about what is being talked about.

By rnsulentic

**Re: Specialization Versus The Longue-Duree and its Effect on Equality**  
**September 24, 2014 at 7:56 AM**

I think most research areas can benefit from an anthropological point of view that includes cultural psychology. The importance of looking at things long term is not simple to apply more time (more narrative), but to broaden the scope of understanding of relationships between "things" - relationships that form and change identities, institutions, behaviours, preferences etc. I think Braudel was getting at this with his interpretation of temporal structures. Recent evolutionary theory suggests that only by understanding relationships can we understand the momentary convergences we call a thing or an event or even a process. Democracy, for example, has a complex history because we apply the term to so many different forms of political arrangement over a few thousand years of history. We do this, of course, because our outlooks have in turn been shaped by the institutions we are analyzing. Without understanding the dynamics of such a concept, it is very very difficult to obtain a useful understanding of how it applies to any more specific context. I shall have to read this book! I also suggest Eric Beinhocker and Terence Deacon (to avoid a lengthy bibliography).

By petercullen

## Politics, History and The Long-Term

Politics, History and The Long-Term  
September 23, 2014 at 2:04 PM

Thomas Bender of New York University notes that “David Armitage and Jo Guldi have produced a rich history of the discipline as the foundation of a compelling plea for bringing forth more bigger and better histories into our civic life.”

We hear of President Obama gathering presidential historians at his dinner table to discuss his predecessors. Do you think civic leaders would do well to hold discussions with historians who think in the long-term, or are politics an insurmountable obstacle to thinking beyond the short-term?

Tags: the history manifesto, long-term, short-term, politics, history, thomas bender, david armitage, jo guldi

By The History Manifesto