- according to most people, **history** is "what really happened in the past"
 - but our understanding of history is often based on the testimony of witnesses
 - and different people see things different ways, so it's not always possible to determine what happened in the past
 - cf. the police report of an accident based the report of eye-witnesses

- people's memories are filled with bias, self-righteousness, pride, vanity, spinning, obfuscation and outright lies
 - anyone who writes or records history has an agenda
 - cf. the different meanings which have been given to Christ's crucifixion
- Would having a time machine help?
 - Probably not! cf. the Zapruder tape of Kennedy's assassination

- Is it impossible to find out what-really-happened-in-the past?
 - Probably! but by understanding certain things, we can get closer to the truth
 - nevertheless, not so much that everyone will agree
 - but discussion is good, especially in a democratic society
 - allowing no or limited discussion is an essential ingredient in tyranny!

- in fact, discussing and arguing about the past is one of the ways we discover who we are collectively
 - cf. the evolution vs. intelligent design debate today
 - it's an argument about our shared past and how one past or the other should affect our decision-making process today

- indeed, all "historical" debates are at heart arguments about the present and the future
 - often with specific goals relating to how people should think — and vote!
 - all the martyrs and revolutionaries who have fought for a cause have usually done so to endorse some belief about the past
- so, history is very "relevant"
- all in all, studying the past is the only way to steer a course into the future

- the best approach then is to do all we can to reconstruct as fully as possible our picture of the past
 - if we can't nail down the truth completely,
 we can approach and circumscribe it
- one big advantage: the liars of history are usually quite transparent

- for instance, the historian **Tacitus** (*The Annals of Imperial Rome*)
 - wrote about the *Pax Romana* (31 BCE 180 CE)
 - especially the early period: the reigns of the **emperors** Augustus to Nero (31 BCE 68 CE)
 - Tacitus laments the loss of the Romans' freedom in the "gilded cage" of the Empire

- for instance, the historian **Tacitus** (*The Annals of Imperial Rome*)
 - though he never says so directly, clearly he wants to shock the Romans into rejecting the very concept of having "emperors"
 - cf. his viciously negative picture of Nero
 - there can be no doubt about it: Tacitus' *Annals* are *great* history, but are they *good* history?

- cf. a very different historian who lived half a millennium later: **Procopius**
 - official court scribe of the Byzantine
 Emperor Justinian (r. 535-565 CE)
 - by day, he sang Justinian's praises
 - but by night, he wrote *The Anecdota* ("The Unpublished Accounts"), only discovered several centuries later
 - a scathing attack on Justinian
 - full of lies and scurrilous gossip
 - one historian can write two histories!

- from one perspective, all history is propaganda, distortions and lies
 - for the simple reason that it's been recorded by people who care
 - people who don't care don't write!
- but the lies of history are not all that hard to see through
 - especially, if there are external sources

Three Types of History

REMEMBERED HISTORY

- the collective memory of a living society
- "oral history" is primary evidence
- but memories are easily distorted
 - cf. the grandfather who doesn't want his grandchildren to know that he fled a battle
- also, various "grandfathers" remember an event in different ways, which leads a large and often irreconcilable body of data
- at heart, all history is "remembered"

Three Types of History

RECOVERED HISTORY

- forgotten "remembered history"
- today, the most visible form of "recovered history" is archaeology
 - but also library research, decipherment
- all in all, "recovered" data seem less biased because they haven't been tampered with, but what about context?
- how do we evaluate archaeological evidence?

Three Types of History

• RECOVERED HISTORY

- cf. **Pompeii**, destroyed in the eruption of **Mount Vesuvius** (79 CE)
- is this city representative of Rome in the day?
 - a beach community full of wealthy people, gambling and prostitution
- cf. Edward Bulwer-Lytton's The Last Days of Pompeii
 - full of 19th-century Protestant bias

Three Types of History

INVENTED HISTORY

- myths, fabrications, lies about the past

Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
To the last syllable of recorded time;
... it is a tale

Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, Signifying nothing.

(Shakespeare, Macbeth 5.5.19-28)

Three Types of History

• INVENTED HISTORY

- these sorts of historical distortion persist because people want to believe they're true
 - as such, invented histories are repeated often and in the process assume the force of truth
- in fact, what the "liars" are doing is satisfying a desperate need to see the past in a certain way
 - e.g., the Egyptian Captivity and the Hebrews' building the Pyramids

Three Types of History

• INVENTED HISTORY

- many examples from modern history, too
 - George Washington and the cherry tree
 - the "good ole days" of the American West
 - that simple, old-time religion in America
- but these "lies" do signify something
 - they show people's hearts or sense of humor
- all in all, however, they give insight into the liars' present, not their past

- Conclusion: What is History?
 - so, the point of history is not just to uncover what-really-happened but to put the past into context and give it meaning and force in modern life
 - in some ways, history is the study of the present by looking at the past
 - seen that way, all (in)famous figures
 who've ever lived are "historians" of a sort:
 St. Augustine, Karl Marx, Charles Darwin,
 Buddha, Mohammad, and even Hitler

- Conclusion: What is History?
 - the lesson is: if you control people's perception of the past, you control their path to the future!