

## **POLITICIZATION OF HISTORY: TERMS, METHODS, SIGNIFICANCE**

**Yaremchuk V. P.**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The current state of the world historical thought is remarkable for an unusual coexistence of the high professional standards with a still significant influence on the history writing of the political force field in its different facets and manifestations, which prevents historians from achieving their “noble dream” (as Piter Novik would say). Moreover, the presence of politics in modern historiography is seen not only in obvious things, e.g. its involvement in historical politics, discussed in the tiniest details, but also in reputable historical doctrines and directions which represent “pure science” (“critical”, “research” etc), and which, according to the critics, hide (and sometimes directly declare) some pragmatic interests behind apparent scientism. Modernization theory, oriented towards the support of Western liberal democracy, academically reputable German *Alltagsgeschichte* and Italian *Microstoria*, designed to promote democratic values and carry out a specific liberation mission of historical research, let alone post-colonial studies and history of women and gender which some respectable scientists do not consider a science but rather an ideological product<sup>1</sup>, comprise a list of influential in the world historiography methods of learning the past, which are accused of being politically engaged. Among them, there is still dominant in the world historiography (in the sense of the number of scientists and amount of resources) national history, which, according to Stefan Berger, rose like a phoenix in some Western countries<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Janowski M. Postmodernizm przed modernizmem. *Historia - dziś. Teoretyczne problemy wiedzy o przeszłości*. Kraków, 2014. S. 38.

<sup>2</sup> Berger S. Rising Like a Phoenix... The Renaissance of National History Writing in Germany and Britain since the 1980s. *Nationalizing the Past: Historians as Nation Builders in Modern Europe*. New York, 2010. P. 426–451. According to the German historian, even in the epoch of globalization the national narratives “continue to provide a relevant framework and importance for building identities” (Ibid., p. 451). Following such a respectable modern researcher of the history of historiography, by the term “national history” we understand a specific form of historical representation, which is aimed at forming national countries and accompanies the formation of national countries or strives to influence the existent self-determination of national c of national (Baár M. *Historians and Nationalism. East-Central Europe in Nineteenth Century*. New York, 2010. P. 2). For modern trends of national history writing, see: Иггерс Г., Ван Э. Глобальная история современной историографии. Москва, 2012. С. 411–420.

Such problems as methods of political influence on the professional history writing, methods of adaptation to the political pressure and the feedback effect of historiography and historians on the political sphere are at the center of researchers' interests. For the last decades, special attention has been paid to the significant role of professional historiography in the process of shaping the politics of memory and politics of identity, particularly creating images of the national past. It is acknowledged that the intervention of politics in historiography has many dimensions and aspects, from mixed signals from authorities who are in the process of seeking an acceptable image of the past for themselves ("the ways of which are mysterious", according to the sarcastic remark of the Russian historian Pavlo Uvarov<sup>3</sup> about the Soviet style of the historical science management) to the explicit directives and direct participation of "masters of possible" in the writing of historical texts as in cases with Joseph Stalin, Turgut Ozal or Saddam Hussein<sup>4</sup>. The historians' activity may also vary – from voluntary and overwhelming support of ruling regimes, direct participation in writing political programmes and shaping practical politics (it is common knowledge that the historians were, for instance, among the architects in the majority of nations-countries, created in the 19th-the beginning of the 20th centuries in Europe) to the opposition activity, in which the historical publications are used as means of fight and resistance (such examples are of course rare).

Irrespective of the forms and manifestations of the interaction between politics and professional historiography, a direct contact point of these "spheres" is a historical text as a product of creative work of a professional historian and, at the same time, a result of such "cooperation". As a matter of fact, in this article, by the term "politicization of history" we understand politicization of texts, written by professional historians, and by "politicized history" – the politicized texts of the same professional historians of the past. With a small number of empirical studies on the respective subject, there are not enough reflections about the historical representations that should be considered "politicized history" in space and

---

<sup>3</sup> Свобода у историков пока есть. Во всяком случае – есть от чего бежать: беседа Кирилла Кобринина с Павлом Уваровым. URL: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2007/55/sb5.htm> (access date May 16, 2019).

<sup>4</sup> J. Stalin is famous as an actual co-author of a "too long" "Short Course History of the CPSU(B)" (1938). Several essays in a book under a distinctive title "On How to Write the History" (1979) belong to S. Hussein, and the head of the Turkish government and shortly after the President of Turkey wrote the "research" "Turkey in Europe" (1988), in which he was persuading readers that his country was a true motherland of European civilization.

time. From our perspective, such a gap contributes to a rather blurry and sometimes unreasonable arbitrary understanding of this term regardless of the terms, which are used to signify it (“[politically] engaged history”, “[politically] tendentious history” etc.). The issue of the attitude towards the politicized history writing also demands special attention: does the usage of professional historiography to serve the politics only harm the historical knowledge and should we speak about more ambivalent implications? And one more problem that deserves a special contemplation is whether history writing can be free from politics and if yes, then under what circumstances; if not, then why? Doubtless, the above-mentioned thoughts do not claim to be in possession of the “absolute truth” – to think differently in conditions of a significant complexity of the problem would be at least a demonstration of intellectual disabilities or naive self-confidence.

### **1. Politicized History: An Attempt to Define the Term**

In our opinion, the term “politicized history” has several meanings. It should be considered in the context of its dependence on both the subjective intentions of the historian and the socio-political situation of his works and perception of their result – the historical text. The most obvious meaning of this category is in the practice of writing the texts that justify the existing political order or, on the contrary, try to change it and substantiate the benefits of another, “better” and more desirable. In other words, the point of issue is the direct support of existing political regimes through historical representations or the nomination of their opponents for governmental positions. Such a direct intrusion of political order into the “scientific” research is a result of either coercive pressure of the government on the historians or voluntary service to the politicians’ interests, or a combination of the first and second factors. The phenomenon of historiography, which is often called “court” due to its overt service to the interests of high profile officials, appeared in China at the end of the 2 century B.C., when the historians became public servants. It was successfully tested in the European monarchies of the Middle Ages and new times, justified in the works of the representatives of “Prussian” school of historiography, the historians of the Third Reich and the Soviet Union (let’s recollect the notoriously famous “principle of party membership”) and survived to this day.

The other form of politicized history has a more complex nature. The historical representation may not only fuel by the historical arguments and legitimize the existing or alternative power but also drive changes of social, gender, religious and ethno-national order. In turn, such a change indirectly affects the change of political order. For instance, the historians, who work in the field of the so-called subordinate classes or oppressed minority groups (women, ethnic minorities, gays and lesbians, etc.) and for whom the history writing is a kind of oppositional political activity (Eva Domanska calls such historiography “rebellious”<sup>5</sup>), indirectly contribute to the improvement of their social standing, acquisition of real political rights and incorporation of these groups of society into authority. The political role of such type of professional historiography manifests itself in the close connection between national history and nation project. It is common knowledge that the so-called scientific historiography came into existence being greatly dependent on the creation of state-nation, and nowadays the research/teaching of history was and, to a large extent, remains the research/teaching of the history of nations<sup>6</sup>.

The historical work can work for a particular political project or its undermining in the form of the so-called replaced knowledge. In such a case, a historian with an intention to promote the achievement of a political aim persuades the reader by drawing historical parallels or making historical allusions to a real and desired political project, about which the historian does not speak directly. The peculiarity of the replaced knowledge lies in the complexity of its “capture”: determining its presence is practically impossible as the author’s political aspirations are not stated overtly in the text. Thus, the historian may not do it subjectively, and such an intention will be credited to him post factum by himself or the readers and researchers of his works; and vice versa, such type of politicized historiography may be overlooked, even if its creator strove for a completely opposite effect. The fact of a similar type of utilitarian usage of historical analogies is considered to be paradigmatic by Johann Gustav Droysen: striving for German reunification under the auspices of Prussia, the famous scientist criticized the political particularism of Greek city-states, with a view to politically fragmented Germany, and approved the centralized course of the Macedonian kings Philip II and Alexander the

---

<sup>5</sup> Е. Доманська. Історія та сучасна гуманітаристика. Київ, 2012. С. 96–97.

<sup>6</sup> The many faces of Clío: cross-cultural approaches to historiography, essays in honor of Georg G. Iggers. New York, 2007. P. 74.

Great, trying to present them as a model for imitation and a prototype of the unifying politics of contemporary for him Prussian state, in his works on history of Hellenism<sup>7</sup>. Some researchers, for instance, believe that this replaced knowledge was practiced by a number of historians in the Soviet times<sup>8</sup>. Notably, it is argued that in his research on the politics of terror of Ivan the Terrible, a famous scientist Stepan Veselovskyi discredited not only detrimental politics of this apologized by Stalin's propaganda Russian monarch but also Stalinist purges<sup>9</sup>.

A thesis about the bias of any professional historian, determined by psychological peculiarities of his work, has already been trivial for a long time. Since the beginning of his work – choice of subject and line of research, till its end – implementation of a certain method of historical representation (rhetorical devices, style, etc.), the historian is entangled in a thick combination of extrascientific dependencies: on his world-view (including political convictions), psychological attributes and specific psychological state, expectations of readers and society as well as people in power in general. At the same time, the majority of professionals accept the idea that the absolute elimination of the influence of a historian's social and cultural “horizon” on his work is a desirable but impossible ideal. “Any history is tendentious, and if it were not tendentious, then no one would write it”, spoke ironically about the historical subjectivity Robin G. Collingwood<sup>10</sup>. Karl Popper emphasized the fact that a true historian must not deceive himself, trying to avoid “a selective point of view” (as it is impossible) but “clearly see the relevance to accept any point of view; in order to express it openly and always realize that it is one of the many”<sup>11</sup>.

Can the “imposition” of historian's political beliefs on the historical “material”, which serves as a basis for his text, be regarded as a demonstration of politicized history writing? We believe that the answer is no because in such a case, it is not about wholehearted support of any political power or actions in the present/future but about cognitive patterns

---

<sup>7</sup> Бугай Д. Иоганн Густав Дройзен: открытие эллинизма в немецкой науке об античности. Дройзен И. Г. *История эллинизма. История Александра Великого*. Москва, 2011. С. 11.

<sup>8</sup> Бухараев В.М., Жигунин В. Д. «Замещенное» познание: историческая мысль против моноидеологии (60–80-е гг. XX в.). *Россия в XX веке: судьба исторической науки*. Москва, 1996. С. 552–563.

<sup>9</sup> Дубровский А. Историк и власть: историческая наука в СССР и концепция истории феодальной России в контексте политики и идеологии (1930-е – 1950-е гг.). Брянск, 2005. С. 770.

<sup>10</sup> Коллингвуд Р. Дж. *Идея історії*. Київ, 1996. С. 495.

<sup>11</sup> Поппер К. *Злиденність історизму*. Київ, 1994. С. 169.

of the historical topics, interpretations and evaluations, including world-view. Even the most objective historian is not usually free from filling his research with his own political beliefs as at least two research operations – the choice of subject and the selection of facts, which will constitute the outline of events of his narrative, – involve selection that is activated by historical representations about important/unimportant, good/bad, which, in turn, are rooted in his system of values, including political. Thus, the best historical research, which fulfills the requirements for scientificity (as it is known, there is no absolute agreement on the canons of scientificity in historical science) – representative source bases, empirically and logically argued conclusions, thoroughly organized references to the sources of information, etc – can contain the author’s political proclivities and antipathies. However, accusing such a text of being politicized is baseless because in such case, we must consider almost all historiography as politicized!

Doubtless, the above-mentioned conclusions on what should be regarded and what should not be regarded as “politicized history” partake, to a certain extent, of the ideal model. Often the researcher himself cannot understand where he writes “scientific” history and where – historical politics. Moreover, it is difficult (both for the author and for his readers) to draw a borderline between a consciously tendentious interpretation of the past for the sake of modern political aims and unconscious approval/disapproval of activism of the actors of the past and emotional connection with them (we will repeat one more time that such unconscious peculiarities of research activity are inherent and cannot be eliminated).

## **2. How to Treat Politically Engaged Texts of Professional Historians?**

The answer to this question seems obvious, especially to the historian, who has working experience in the context of Soviet historiography. Nonetheless, even in the academic segment, there has not been a unanimous world historical opinion about the attitude towards the political instrumentalization of historiography. A tradition, the representatives of which see sense and purpose of professional historiography in serving the “good”, “progressive” political regimes and projects, is long-established and it is not going to leave the agenda of history writing. Respectively, the support of particular political power or political ideology is expressed openly. An interesting thing is, that such an approach was justified at the

same time when the academic standards of history writing were established – in the “age of history”. The famous historians of the 19th century did not avoid defending certain political interests and creating the history of their countries respectively via their works. Illustrative in this regard was an example of France, where the historians François Guizot, Alexis de Tocqueville, Louis-Adolphe Thiers were the key figures of the political arena, who via historical texts advertised their political beliefs and ideological platforms of those political powers, to which they belonged. As it was already mentioned, the classic example of overtly politically engaged history writing was “Prussian” school of historiography, which ideologically supported Lesser Germany. An exponential expression regarding the political dimension of history belongs to Heinrich von Schtreyke, one of its representatives: “As the world goes, during the turbulent years of his existence, the historian has always been called politically uncommitted only in one case: when he was laying in the grave”<sup>12</sup>. Another representative Heinrich von Sybel once stated that he had four seventh of a politician and the rest – of a professor<sup>13</sup>. This is how early Soviet historiography looked like, when novices at the historical profession, who called themselves Marxists, considered the usage of history for the justification of current politics to be a normal practice. For instance, in Ukraine, a direction of “national and communist” history writing led by Matvii Yavorskyi appeared. Some of his advocates sincerely stated that the historical facts must be regarded from the point of view of “contemporary revolutionary task”<sup>14</sup>. Later Soviet historiography did not demonstrate its political orientation so openly but emphasized its supposedly unshadowed scientificity. Ironically, in the historical science of the USSR in 1930–1980s, whose official methodology was “Marxism-Leninism”, there were few ideological supporters of K. Marx, F. Engels, and V. Lenin as well as historians, who deeply knew and understood the sense of “eternal teaching”. A factual ideological basis of historical texts was a political order on behalf of Kremlin’s rulers, who were giving corresponding signals. The “court” historians wrapped them in a “Marxist-Leninist” paper and sent the messages to the rest of professional historians

---

<sup>12</sup> Зашкільняк Л. Сучасна світова історіографія. Львів, 2007. С. 29.

<sup>13</sup> Ваár М. *Op. cit.* P. 6.

<sup>14</sup> Яремчук В. «Націонал-комуністичні» концепції в професійній історичній думці радянської України. *Історія – ментальність – ідентичність. Випуск IV: Історична пам'ять українців і поляків у період формування національної свідомості в ХІХ – першій половині ХХ століття : колективна монографія.* Львів, 2011. С. 322–329.

and the general public. For this reason, the main keynote of the Soviet historiography about the histories of non-Russian people of the USSR was a thesis about the exceptional meaning of Russian people and their states in their historical destiny, which is absent in both K. Marx and F. Engels, and V. Lenin, but which provided integrative Russian politics of Kremlin in the constituent republics with historical arguments.

Some contemporary historians of other ideological orientations hold similar views on the positive meaning of “ideologically correct” historiography. In particular, according to Franklin Rudolf Ankersmit, “the most persuasive historical works are replete [...] with the best political ideals and values”<sup>15</sup>. As the Dutch philosopher claims, it will be enough to provide examples of works of such authors as Jacob Talmon, Isaiah Berlin or Karl Friedrich, imbued with the ideals of liberal democracy and outspoken criticism of totalitarian regime, to understand that the subjectivity should not necessarily mean the major flaw of history writing in every situation<sup>16</sup>. Another well-known thinker sees the positive influence of political stands of historians on historiography in the fact that they “can align generated knowledge according to its importance and, at the same time, criticize specific to their profession arbitrariness of scientific research”<sup>17</sup>.

However, the consciousness of probably the major part of the guild relies on the maxim of valuable neutrality, which was formulated in the works of Leopold von Ranke and Max Weber<sup>18</sup>. One of the “fathers” of professional historiography not only declared a well-known method of writing history “as it happened”, but according to Benedetto Croce, “has never deviated from this method and because of this, achieved resounding triumphs: a committed Lutheran, he writes the history of the papacy in the period of Counter-Reformation, and it is favorably accepted by all the Catholic countries; a German, he writes the history of France and does not breed resentment among the French”<sup>19</sup>. Being an inveterate German nationalist, who regarded history as a struggle for national survival<sup>20</sup>, M. Weber left behind works, which are an example of scientific logic and

---

<sup>15</sup> Анкерсмит Ф. Политическая репрезентация. Москва, 2012. С. 7.

<sup>16</sup> Ankersmit F. Pochwała subiektywności. *Pamięć, etyka i historia: Anglo-Amerykańska teoria historiografii lat dziewięćdziesiątych (Antologia przekładów)*. Poznań, 2002. S. 80.

<sup>17</sup> Рюзен Й. Нові шляхи історичного мислення. Львів, 2010. С. 138.

<sup>18</sup> Иггерс Г., Ван Э. Ор. cit. С. 143, 193–195.

<sup>19</sup> Кроче Б. Теория и история историографии. Москва, 1998. С. 174.

<sup>20</sup> Иггерс Г., Ван Э. Ор. cit. С. 195.



impartiality. In a concentrated form, the reasons for imperception of the politicized history writing were explained by one of the authors of a recent collective research of famous European scientists on the political usage of history and its misuse: “[...] the relationships between history and politics can turn into a fatal friendship, which offers a reward of public attention and moral dignity; at the same time, a complete independence of historical research and its aspiration for reinterpretation of the past are eliminated”<sup>21</sup>.

Unlike proponents of politicized history, its opponents defend not only the need but also the ability to write texts, which are not connected with the political orders and acquire relatively true historical knowledge. However, a bigger or smaller impact of political agenda on authors, who write historical texts, is not rejected. The historians may successfully resist it due to the made by academic historiography rules and procedures and close control over the history writing on behalf of professionals. For example, Georg Iggers argues, “I understand such a high level, in which history writing comprises ideology, but I believe that it also includes an attempt to refer to the past [...]. The fact that an ideological element is included in every historical perception does not exclude a possibility to reconstruct reality the best possible on the basis of evidence”<sup>22</sup>.

Speaking about the attitude towards politically partial historiography, an American theorist of history writing Allan Megill, who insists on the relevance and possibility of only free from any interference of today’s tasks, including political situation, “critical” historiography, based on a “methodologically justified research” and opposed to a “non-scientific” in a manner of speaking presentist (“affirmative”) and directed at the guidance of (“didactic”) historiography, adopts a refined Purist stance<sup>23</sup>. He argues that “one of the functions of the historical profession is its constant opposition to political topicality and retrospective research, conducted carefully and thoroughly, disregarding the possible consequences”<sup>24</sup>. Therefore, the above-mentioned historians advocate for the ability of their profession to create independent from political orders knowledge as well as their need to distance from the current political interests of those groups, which they belong to.

---

<sup>21</sup>Sabrow M. The Use of History to Legitimise Political Power: The Case of Germany. *Politics of the Past: The Use and Abuse of History*. Brussels, 2009. P. 103.

<sup>22</sup> Доманска Э. Философия истории после постмодернизма. Москва, 2010. С. 151, 153.

<sup>23</sup> Мегилл А. Историческая эпистемология. Москва, 2007. С. 102–103, 109, 111, 131.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. С. 109.

In the world historiography, there is a specific interpretation of the problem of attitude towards politicized history and the ability of historians to resist the politicization of their research. Philosophers and historians, who fall into the category of the intellectual movement, known as postmodernism, believed (believe) that the historical knowledge a priori contains an ideological component and is an instrument of power. Some of them draw this conclusion from the very nature of the historical text. In the mid-1970s, Michel de Certeau proved that historical narrative has two dimensions: performative and narrative (in other words, it contains the story about the past reality): “[...] historical writing [...], playing on two boards, agreement and signature, performative writing and mirror writing at the same time, [...] acquires the status of “the creator of history” along with “the narrator of stories”. In other words, it imposes limitations on behalf of power and [at the same time] provides gaps”<sup>25</sup>. The others insist on the social dependence of politicized history writing. Pretty much the most passionate advocate of such views, a “killing machine of history” (as he was called by one British researcher), another British Keith Jenkins argues that historians write history only in order to promote some immediate practical and political interests. In his opinion, the history by professional historians, who are deeply integrated into the social reality, is a stamp of a ruling or one of numerous radical or subversive ideologies of this reality, and all these ideologies are rooted in contemporary politics in the same manner. The texts of historians, who work in official scientific institutions, express their specific financial interests (job positions and good income). “The maxim of judgment”, inherent in the ethos of the professional environment, which proves its aspiration for objectivity in scientific research, according to K. Jenkins, in fact, means implicit agreement with the existing regime<sup>26</sup>. For this reason, as this theorist of history writing states, both “big history” (or metanarrative history) and “small history” (in other words, professional, academic) are ideologized and engaged equally, which means that “the history always serves someone”. Thus, it is worth “forgetting history”, “letting it go” and learning to live new ways of time synchronization<sup>27</sup>.

---

<sup>25</sup> Серто М. де. Историографическая процедура. Письмо. URL: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2014/3> (access date May 16, 2019).

<sup>26</sup> For the explanation of views of Keith Jenkins, see: Заярнюк А. Постмодернізм про істориків, encore. Український гуманітарний огляд. Київ, 2010. Вип. 15. С. 24–44.

<sup>27</sup> Jenkins K. Życie w czasie, lecz poza historią; życie w moralności, lecz poza etyką. *Pamięć, etyka i historia: Anglo-Amerykańska teoria historiografii lat dziewięćdziesiątych (Antologia przekładów)*. Poznań, 2002. S. 235–236.

Published in 1990–2000s, the works of K. Jenkins provoked sharp polemic, where not only scientific arguments but also defamatory accusations against this scientist of boundless individualism, left-wing posturing and solipsism were mentioned. A reply of another British Richard Evans to the postmodernist skepticism regarding the profession of “traditional” historians was rather persuasive. In response to the philippics of K. Jenkins, R. Evans showed groundlessness of the thesis of his vis-a-vis that academic historians are a type of ruling elite by providing specific examples in a hit-hitting book “In Defense of History”. He also ridiculed another Jenkins’s thesis on the compulsory determinism of historians’ views (“ideology”) by their social standing. Whatever the truth, according to the ironic remark of R. Evans, white historians-males must have been writing only about dead white males; historians who write about vagabonds would be vagabonds themselves, and those who write about criminals would be criminals<sup>28</sup>.

In western historiography, there is another extreme, very optimistic for now, view on the problem of the presence of a political component in the professional history writing, represented, for instance, by a French historian Paul Veyne. He refutes an immanently presentist character of professional historiography, believing that “the ideas [of historians] stem from anything: topicality, fashion, chance, reading of a book in the ivory tower; even more often, they originate from one another and studying of the subject”, and the absolute priority of presentism “signifies a simplified view on the intellectual life”<sup>29</sup>. Therefore, as if refuting the famous adage of Paul Valéry about history as “the safest product, which is manufactured by the chemistry of intellect”, he states the following, “History is one of the least harmful products that have ever been manufactured by the chemistry of intellect; it neutralizes the values and passions not because it arrives at the truth instead of biased fallacies but because the truth is always disappointing and the history of our Motherland, as well as history of other nations, turn out to be boring very quickly”<sup>30</sup>.

Let’s draw preliminary conclusions. The history of world historiography shows different forms and manifestations of the politicization of historical texts as well as different attitudes to the political instrumentalization of historian’s works. Thus, there is a need for more

---

<sup>28</sup> Еванс Р. Дж. На захист історії. Львів, 2008. С. 163–165, 221.

<sup>29</sup> Вен П. Как пишут историю. Опыт эпистемологии. Москва, 2003. С. 104.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. С. 105.

discrete intelligibility of the term “politicized history”. The level of historian’s distortions and differences between the representations of the past and the past itself depends on how much politicization is understood, deep, direct or indirect, forced or voluntary. It is impossible to correct the reality in favor of certain political regimes, programs or projects as well as announce the same verdict regarding the political tendentiousness without grounds. The devil, as usual, hides in details.

We tried to show that every form of politicized history described above is characterized by a different level of distortion of the past, thus having a different scientific level and importance in historiography (if regard history writing as a cumulative process of accumulating knowledge about the past). The first form – direct politicization (which was and remains the main flaw of professional history writing in virtually all authoritarian and totalitarian countries) should be rejected in its affiliation with science without any second thoughts. The major drawback of history writing about class, ethnos, nation, race, gender, confession, etc. is a focus only on these phenomena. At the same time, this drawback is a certain advantage as it predetermines deep (but one-way, without considering contexts and their relationships!) study of these phenomena. However, we believe that it is groundless to deny scientificity to such historiography on these grounds as any history writing cannot cover all past reality, thus presenting its bigger or smaller fragment. Finally, the phenomenon of replaced knowledge is interesting because it contains historian’s political intentions, does not interfere in the research process and does not contradict the established standards of scientificity as the historical parallels or allusions themselves do not misinterpret the past.

### **3. (Im)possibility of “Non-Politicized” History Writing**

One of the theses that the author tried to prove above is as follows, non-politicized history writing is not only “theoretically” possible but also the most acceptable/complimentary in the contemporary historical thought and practice of professional historiography. However, we consider the idea of the possibility of the transcendent historical science existence with an apolitical figure of a historian to be an impossible ideal, some kind of scientific illusion. The reason for such skepticism is rather evident: even if they had not been subjectively programmed to achieve certain political aims, historical texts *bring political senses irrespective of the author’s will*.

In other words, even though non-politicized history writing is a rather ordinary for the historical science thing, historians cannot avoid politicization of their texts by their “audience”. A knowledgeable and clever reader will notice a similarity to the ideas of apostles of deconstructionism about the independence of the text from the author and limitless possibilities of its interpretations here. However, unlike Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida and Yuliia Kristeva, we do not claim a) correctness of such a state of things but just its objective presence and b) absence of a fixed sense, implied by the author, and relevance of all his interpretations in a particular text.

In this connection, first of all, we will mention that if required, the political component can be attributed to virtually any historical text or be ignored in it. In other words, irrespective of the author’s subjective intentions, his reader can find a reference to the topical political interests in his work. Here, a need to “activate” “hidden” political senses, in the absence of which the text cannot be considered politically engaged, is fundamental. Attribution of political compulsions becomes especially mundane in times of the rule of instrumentalist ethos in the global culture, which (rule) is diagnosed by the contemporary sociologists<sup>31</sup>. We have a social reality, in which human intellectual and cultural activity is perceived, first of all, in the light of its practical, including political, value, and it is unlikely that something can be done about it! Apart from that, if to talk only about the Ukrainian situation, quite a few intellectuals point out at the seriousness of political stakes in the Ukrainian history, which, from our perspective, trigger its utilitarian interpretation.

Evidently, it is more difficult to see political interest in those works, which research microprocesses. This is much easier to do, first of all, in the summaries of national histories and histories of regions or parts of the world, which contain certain explanatory schemes and judgments that can be interpreted as directed at the support of this or that world order (for example, Eurocentrism, world communist revolution, globalism etc.). Besides, the higher level of conceptualization of historical material is, the easier it is to accuse such broad historical structures of political bias. For this reason, if “new imperial history” is an adequate instrument for explaining heterogeneity and ambivalence of imperial formations of the past for some historians, it is an instrument for fueling ambitions of the

---

<sup>31</sup> Furedi F. *Gdzie się podziiali wszyscy intelektualiści?* Lublin, 2008. S. 8–9.

world superpower, supporting neocolonialism and neo-imperialism for the others. “Transnational history” not only challenges the drawbacks of national history, especially its exclusive and homogenized interpretation but also creates a “scientific” basis for such a “western” in its core phenomenon as globalization as well as provides supranational political formations (European Union in particular) with a common image of history. Likewise, the proponents of post-colonial theory see in it a thoroughly analyzed critique and deconstruction of western stereotypes about “the East”, while critical researchers see only an ideological product, used as a basis for politics of multiculturalism, which contains a new, now “Eastern”, stereotype of “the West” and, in this way, does not differ from a western “model”. Furthermore, continental history writing itself (with a rational methodology and anthropocentrism) can be interpreted as a political instrument, invented by “the West” to colonize nations that do not regard history as their way of treating the past. However, in case of appropriate attention even to the “microhistorical” or “anthropologically oriented” texts, whose methodology is based on the refutation of metanarratives as the means of legitimization, it is possible (although quite difficult and usually groundless) to find a useful for “connecting hearts” idea. For example, in the character of a country intellectual and a self-taught heretic, Menocchio from “The Cheese and the Worms” of Carlo Ginzburg – a classic microhistorical and “anthropological” work – a nationally worried Italian can see a worthy son of the Italian land, a proof of chief virtues of his fellow countrymen even in the common people far back in the mists of ancient time.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Therefore, we regard the politicized history as such historical representation, which has a purpose of supporting (voluntarily or forcefully, directly or indirectly) actual or desired political order. Insertion of historians’ political proclivities in their texts without a clear sense of purpose “to correct” today’s world or the future order cannot be considered politicization of history for several reasons. Firstly, the insertion of the Author’s values (including political) in the text depends on the nature of the research process itself. Secondly, in this case, the meaning of the term “politicized history” is lost.

Among the majority of professionals, there is an unwritten agreement on the prohibition of submission of history to the political tasks. However, there are some solid refusals of the positive role of the political component of the historian's consciousness and the historical knowledge for the inspiration of socially responsible (or useful to the society) texts and formation of just social order. Extreme views on the connection between professional historiography and politics also rely on certain arguments: the postmodernist vision of it as an ideological in its essence discourse, directed at the support of ruling or oppressed political powers, and denial of significant dependence of historiography on the present day and today's tasks. When it comes to the key in this regard thesis of this article, it states that there are different forms of politicized history and they have different relations to the historiography, which is commonly believed to be scientific. The politicization of the historical text itself does not necessarily confirm the loss of connection between such a text and science.

Among the proponents of history as a free from political tasks knowledge, the certainty of the ability to exclude the political ideals of the historians themselves as well as completely eliminate the current politics from historical texts prevails. However, as unfortunate as it is, the historian's abilities to keep control over texts of the past, which he produces and which are free from civil interests of the present day, are limited, as the results of his work come into the view of not only scientific but also political broadcast as well as political actions and projects without his permission, thus becoming politically engaged. It makes historians particularly attentive to the subjective moments of their own works and, at the same time, open to criticism, including both tactless and inadequate criticism. They, as usual, should strive for the Truth. However, for this, they should not only control their own political ideals and proclivities towards existing political powers but also be aware that their works will not be necessarily interpreted the way they want it. If the historian wants his text to be read absolutely correctly, he should not hide his political beliefs or claim his political neutrality but make them open to the public. It will not only give an opportunity to determine the level of the author's engagement but also "save" his creation from political interpretations, which were not subjectively included by the author.

## SUMMARY

The article is dedicated to the problem of politicization of professional history writing. Through the lens of the world historiographic tradition, such components of the problem as the definition of the category “politicized history”, methods and meanings of politicization of history writing, the possibilities and obstructions of history writing from the non-political perspective, were analyzed. In the author’s opinion, the politicized history should be regarded as such historical representation, which has a purpose of supporting (voluntarily or forcefully, directly or indirectly) actual or desired political order. Insertion of historians’ political proclivities in the historical representations without a clear sense of purpose “to correct” the today’s world or the future order cannot be considered politicization of history as the historians’ values are incorporated in the research process itself, and in this case, any professional historiography should be considered politicized. The article showed that there are various forms of politicized history and that they have different relations to historiography, which is commonly believed to be scientific. The politicization of the historical text itself does not necessarily confirm the loss of its connection with science. The author proves that historians are capable of excluding their political ideals and eliminating the current politics from historical research. On the other hand, the historians’ abilities to keep control over texts of the past, free from civil interests of the present day, are limited as the results of their professional work (scientific texts) come into the view of not only scientific but also political broadcast as well as political actions and projects without their permission, thus becoming politically engaged. With this respect, non-politicized history writing is impossible.

## REFERENCES

1. Ankersmit F. Pochwała subiektywności. *Pamięć, etyka i historia: Anglo-Amerykańska teoria historiografii lat dziewięćdziesiątych (Antologia przekładów)*. Poznań, 2002. S. 55–84.
2. Baár M. *Historians and Nationalism. East-Central Europe in Nineteenth Century*. New York, 2010. 353 p.
3. Berger S. Rising Like a Phoenix...The Renaissance of National History Writing in Germany and Britain since the 1980s. *Nationalizing the Past: Historians as Nation Builders in Modern Europe*. New York, 2010. P. 426–451.



4. Furedi F. *Gdzie się podziiali wszyscy intelektualiści?* Lublin, 2008. 167 s.
5. Janowski M. Postmodernizm przed modernizmem. *Historia – dziś. Teoretyczne problemy wiedzy o przeszłości.* Kraków, 2014. S. 37–57.
6. Jenkins K. *Życie w czasie, lecz poza historią; życie w moralności, lecz poza etyką. Pamięć, etyka i historia: Anglo-Amerykańska teoria historiografii lat dziewięćdziesiątych (Antologia przekładów).* Poznań, 2002. S. 235–284.
7. Sabrow M. The Use of History to Legitimise Political Power: The Case of Germany. *Politics of the Past: The Use and Abuse of History.* Brussels, 2009. P. 97–103.
8. The many faces of Clio : cross-cultural approaches to historiography, essays in honor of Georg G. Iggers. New York, 2007. 484 p.
9. Анкерсмит Ф. Политическая репрезентация. Москва, 2012. 288 с.
10. Бугай Д. Иоганн Густав Дройзен: открытие эллинизма в немецкой науке об античности. *Дройзен И. Г. История эллинизма. История Александра Великого.* Москва, 2011. С. 5–16.
11. Бухараев В.М., Жигунин В. Д. «Замещенное» познание: историческая мысль против моноидеологии (60–80-е гг. XX в.). *Россия в XX веке: судьба исторической науки.* Москва, 1996. С. 552–563.
12. Вен П. Как пишут историю. Опыт эпистемологии. Москва, 2003. 394 с.
13. Доманска Э. Философия истории после постмодернизма. Москва, 2010. 400 с.
14. Доманська Е. Історія та сучасна гуманітаристика. Київ, 2012. 264 с.
15. Дубровский А. Историк и власть: историческая наука в СССР и концепция истории феодальной России в контексте политики и идеологии (1930-е – 1950-е гг.). Брянск, 2005. 800 с.
16. Еванс Р. Дж. На захист історії. Львів, 2008. 296 с.
17. Зашкільняк Л. Сучасна світова історіографія. Львів, 2007. 312 с.
18. Заярнюк А. Постмодернізм про істориків, епсоре. *Український гуманітарний огляд.* Київ, 2010. Вип. 15. С. 24–44.

19. Иггерс Г., Ван Э. Глобальная история современной историографии. Москва, 2012. 432 с.
20. Колінгвуд Р. Дж. Ідея історії. Київ, 1996. 615 с.
21. Кроче Б. Теория и история историографии. Москва, 1998. 192 с.
22. Мегилл А. Историческая эпистемология. Москва, 2007. 480 с.
23. Поппер К. Злиденність історизму. Київ, 1994. 192 с.
24. Рюзен Й. Нові шляхи історичного мислення. Львів, 2010. 358 с.
25. Свобода у историков пока есть. Во всяком случае – есть от чего бежать: беседа Кирилла Кобриня с Павлом Уваровым. URL: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2007/55/sb5.htm> (access date May 16, 2019).
26. Серто М. де. Историографическая процедура. Письмо. URL: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2014/3> (access date May 16, 2019).
27. Яремчук В. «Націонал-комуністичні» концепції в професійній історичній думці радянської України. *Історія – ментальність – ідентичність. Випуск IV: Історична пам'ять українців і поляків у період формування національної свідомості в ХІХ – першій половині ХХ століття : колективна монографія.* Львів, 2011. С. 322–329.

**Information about the author:**

**Yaremchuk V. P.,**

Ph.D hab. (History), Professor,

Professor at the Department of History,

The National University of Ostroh Academy

2, Seminarska St., Ostroh, Rivne Oblast, 35800, Ukraine