

Bedri MERMUTLU*

Value Matter and Objectivity in Historical Sciences

Abstract

According to Positivists, the History was the urgent interference area as it was one of the sciences which were the least constructed and so one of the most flexible and open disciplines. This critical point has been declared in some evaluations with disappointing speeches as it could be seen like a dilemma. It is clear that this trouble felt even dilemma is based on Positivist uniqueness. Unique science sample was compressing the History. Idea was forming item by adding it Mathematical relations system, but Historical sciences were giving meaning to the item by ascribing it to the values; for this reason it could make a selection or a clarification. Because of that each Historical expression would be rebuilding of previous experiences in a selective way. The unique legible History that the Positivist Historians' dream was necessitating us to reach the knowledge of the past covering its own. Yet, accepting the experienced one and its knowledge as the same things can't be even seen absent from a kind of plot.

Shouldn't be there a limitation for History writer's freedom of choice? The real problem is the History *being out of value*. The Historian doesn't have the right of violating the sense of objectivity in people with whom he will share his plot even if it will be his own subjective product. A truth concept which will be gotten by its active role in the information's coming out takes place of the truth concept that is devoted to only rational and formal criterians in the History.

Key Terms

Historian, Value, Being out of value, Subjectivity, Objectivity, Positivist Uniqueness.

Tarihsel Bilimlerde Değer Sorunu ve Nesnellik

Özet

Tarih, toplumsal bilimlerin en az yapılanmış, bu yüzden de en esnek ve açık disiplinlerinden biri olduğu için Pozitivistler açısından acil müdahale alanı olarak görülmektedir. Bu kritik nokta kimi değerlendirmelerde bir açmaz olarak

* Assist. Prof. Dr. at Uludağ University Faculty of Science and Literature Department of Sociology.

görülebilecek kadar umut kırıcı sözlerle ifade edilmiştir. Duyulan bu sıkıntının, hatta açmazın temelinde pozitivist tekçiliğin olduğu bellidir. Tek bilim modeli Tarihi sıkıştırmaktaydı. Matematiksel bilimlerde akıl maddeyi matematiksel bir ilişkiler sistemine katarak biçimlendiriyordu, ama tarihsel bilimler maddeyi değerlere mal ederek anlamlandırmaktaydı; bunun için maddede bir seçim ya da ayıklama yapabiliyordu. Dolayısıyla her tarihsel anlatım, geçmişte yaşananların seçmeli bir biçimde yeniden kuruluşu olacaktır. Pozitivist tarihçilerin hayal ettikleri tek okunuşlu tarih, geçmişin kendisiyle örtüşen bilgiye ulaşmayı gerektiriyordu. Oysa yaşanmış olanla onun bilgisini aynı şey kabul etmek bile aslında bir tür kurmacadan muaf sayılmaz.

Tarih yazarının seçme özgürlüğünün bir sınırı olmamalı mıdır? Asıl tehlike Tarihin *değersizleşmesidir*. Tarihinin kurmacası kendi öznel ürünü olsa bile onu paylaşacağı kişilerde nesnellik duygusunu ihlal etmeye hakkı yoktur. Tarihte sadece rasyonel ve formel ölçütlere bağlı kalan bir hakikat kavramının yerini, öznenin, bilginin meydana çıkmasındaki aktif rolüyle elde edilebilecek olan hakikat kavramı alır.

Anahtar Terimler

Tarihçi, Değer, Değersizleşme, Öznellik, Nesnellik, Pozitivist Tekçilik.

Hippolyte Taine says in an article he wrote in 1852 that: “I will make the History science by giving it physiology and anatomy like the one in the organic world”. This speech is like a summary of magnificent introduction he wrote in his magnificent work called “English Literature History” (A. Şuayp 1317:18-19). XIX. century Positivism was determined to add his own principles and methods to the History science. The reason impelling it to do this was both proving motive of philosophy strength and prestige in the most critic area and absolute necessity of making scientific programe and project. In positivist classification, Sociology was being accepted as the most reliable science of the society, because it was born directly as a positivist representation, however History’s condition was different. Although History was the oldest social science, its being so wasn’t an oldness that necessitates it to fall down by being out of term; the dynamic called social term was going on to produce the history. As the positivist will knew that only if it copes with this old information going on to produce itself every day and making it submit, it would taste its real triumph, the Positivist will didn’t behave towards tending to the History with a special importance and desire hesitantly. According to Positivists, the History was the urgent interference area as it was one of the sciences which were the least constructed and so one of the most flexsible and open disciplines (Braudel 1992:114). Scientific approch that had beeing formed since Galile and Bacon was insistent on defining itself with an “impersonal”condition. Historian had to get his identity done like a Physics scholar in order to access to scientific reality. On the other hand, the Positivist Historians was wishing to see the History as a common work that they would constitute by helping each other (A. Şuayp 1317: 84-86).

Ranke was yelling: “I’m a Historian firstly, than a Christian!”; and he was getting himself done absolutely in explaining the matters (Ibid.: 367). Neighbour had

taken lots of notes by travelling all over the Italy before he wrote *Rome's History*. He was the one who gave the most important sample of *résurrection historique* approach firstly. According to him, the History writer is a good Historian in the degree of he could show a lively description of goods and matters to the readers (Ibid.: 248-49). The realist point of view coming true in Flaubert's novels was excepting the same loyalty from the History writers who were interested in historical events. If the past's becoming like a science object became possible as its normal state, it would be hopeful that this approach was functional; however, since the facts which have no common specialities other than being formed in the past wouldn't become like a rational information's object without making any prior clarification (Bloch 1994:17), an additionaly procedure for these facts' becoming like "historical fact" in real meaning, would always be a necessity. This critical point has been declared in some evaluations with disappointing speeches as it could be seen like a dilemma. Sainte-Beuve's point of view that a real History would never be written because the History wouldn't a science is the extreme sample of this matter (A.Şuayp 1317: 100). Saint-Beuve doesn't see any problem in saying that calling a History article which would come out by being personalized as science unjustness since Historians doesn't have any way other than relying on his own preference and ability in the procedure of binding the facts each other and making than coherenced.

It is clear that this trouble felt even dilemma is based on Positivist uniqueness. Unique science sample was compressing the History. While Positivist daringness was hoping to make its legality definite, in a way it was disappointed by being defeated. Absolutely at this point, Rickert rescued Historical sciences from Positive or Mathematics sciences' yoke by reaching out to help. Idea was forming item by adding it mathematical relations system, but Historical sciences were giving meaning to the item by ascribing it to the values; for this reason it could make a selection or a clarification. According to the think that is defined as moral, aesthetic or political by Rickert and Weber, Historian would try to rebuild lives of previous people by making a selection between documents and facts. Because of that each Historical expression would be rebuilding of previous experiences in a selective way (Aron 1986: 490).

The set of the documents and facts which have come to us have already made their clarification or their previous selection. Even if it is thought that all documents are ready, these can only constitute one part of experienced facts, furthermore just a small part, maybe. It is also clear that, as we look through the past, previous years, since the facts reached are reduced, our selection chance relevant to those years will be reduced, naturally. It is only possible in such special conditions that approximately all documents can be functional as accepted data. However, as the document's variety increase, the Historian's selection ability together with his selection chance will be effective on data he will write as an important factor.

It isn't wrong that having an idea from Parsons, defining the science as "a system of a selectional scientific tendencies to the reality", the Historian is especially and obligatorily selective (Carr 1996: 17). If the historical facts' specialities had been already known it wouldn't have been necessity for the Historian to make a selection; however, since the previous facts are showing an easy posture by being just the candidate to the historical facts, they get the speciality of historical fact by Historian's

selection. Any fact becomes historical fact if it is discriminated that it is relevant to the Historian's general frame and meaningful (Ibid.: 121). It is the Historian again, who decides to the place of facts in which order or coherence. (Ibid.: 16) While the facts have no meaning by being untreated states of simple proposings which are related to the proofs, they gain meaning when they are used by the Historian; they are established relations with each other and made Historical by being placed to a context (Munslow 2000: 19). The History writer's studying on which section, term or fact comes out when term or culture he live in or personal interest or tendencies point out. At this subject, the past's facts don't have an important diagnostic role on their own. The facts' places on scale are determined by the History writer. The crucial point of being History writer is also here. The History writer has the change of being able to write a really new History with a few or some facts between innocent and silent facts group. Bloch's works called "The Royal Touch " and "French Rural History " are bright samples of this. So, a comments system each of which can't be thought without selective values system and each of which is selective again instead of a hypothesized deduction system (Aron 1986: 490).

Fort this reason, Historical chronics aren't History in real and they can only be accepted as productive materials for the History. Historical chronic writer is the person who writes today, not the past. Even if, the History writer move from today, he looks for the past or today in the past; in each condition, the History is a dialogue between today and past. The think, the chronic Historian tries to do, is a dialogue which is been tried to make between today and unknown future. While the Historian is making selection between previous facts the chronic writer is making selection between actual facts. Though, the Historian benefits from chronics, the chronic writer doesn't need to the History. He accepts himself the future's history even while he begins the job. Although, the chronic writers are placed as the History writer to most people's opinions in a wrong way, their functions mostly look like the day's Sociologists' function. This function can be observed more clearly especially for the Historians who have the strength of binding actual facts to each other and making comment Ahmet Cevdet Pasha's *Tezahir* is one of the successful samples of these type.

The past and History which is knowledge of the past aren't same. While the past is a data that happened once and can't be changed anymore, the past's knowledge is a think that in a constant state of changing and developing (Bloch,1994:44) and for this reason it is a constructive. Because of its being constructive, is approach to the past is obstinater (Munslow 2000: 77). Because, humane evens can be famous for their today evidences as general (Bloch 1997: 44). While the Historian is constituting the History, he builds it with today's materials anymore, not with the past stones. While the past is being read with today's concepts, classifications and perceptions, it live its first state of being past. As reading the past with *mother tongue* cause to trouble even by the people who live in those times, achieving this for the following people would become much more impossible. Because of that, the past should always be an article that we will read by translating to our native language, if we want to understand.

The unique legible History that the Positivist Historians' dream was necessitating us to reach the knowledge of the past covering its own. They followed this impossibility. Yet, accepting the experienced one and its knowledge as the same things

can't be even seen absent from a kind of plot. Bloch who is insistent on the idea that there is only one human science in time context and he constantly make this during the inspecting the deads together with the inspection of livelies, indicates that on the contrary to *today's* knowledge, the *past's* knowledge would be indirect as a necessity. Furthermore, even today's knowledge isn't absolutely direct (Bloch 1994: 35-37). The History is a knowledge that is constituted not in the past or from the past to today, instead from today through the past. The Historian is free to benefit as he wants from the documents and facts with the condition of staying in their frames again or to play with them in a way. And for this reason he has even the freedom of constituting supplementary stories in a Historical conscious line by using his strength of imagination in order to complete the lackness of these documents and facts. In addition, the Historian can write his History with more general ambitions. Besides, the History can be written in order to sublimate, criticize or defined the past or even to make it forgotten (Tekeli1998: 74).

The adventure experienced by the set of his documents which are left by Güstav Stresemann first in the publishing made by Bernhard and then by Sutton (Carr 1996: 22-24) is one of the unlimited samples of historical option. Another sample of Historian's this behaviour is that some Historians who are interested in this term pretend not to see the event that Sir Osman killed his uncle who had the love of being master by the shooting an arrow, though the event indicated by the Historians such as Neşri and İbn-i Kemal (Divitçioğlu 1996: 63).

Shoudn't be there a limitation for History writer's freedom of choice? Because wouldn't be Histories as much as the value systems usable to choose, if each rebuilding was selective and it was being managed by a value system? (Aron 1986: 490). By the way, real problem is the History *being out of value* together with its being a science whose being written wouldn't be finished, really. Values are our corporations that surround us and our moral environment, since we had the change to understand and explain the past thanks to this objective sensation and we haven't use this change as abundant as being thought.

Although a subjectivity walked by the values is a vital strength and wealth method for the History, when a subjectivity absent from values system is closed, the crucial danger for the History will be started. Constructs are built with thoughts forced by ideological forms which are constricted by the values and world view by confiscating the freedom of them instead of the ability which has freedom itself and which makes the subject stronger by decorating it and the thing these constructs would provide to the History is not the objectivity, in fact, it is a suggestion breaking the History that will be constituted in the real understanding. The Historian trying to understand can be compared with the swimmer who fights against the sea and waves and moves by relying on his own swimming strength; on the other hand the Historian who moves from prejudices and ideologies can be compared with the machinist who use the freight train above the rails placed. As the place to be arrived has been planned before the machinist has no thing to do other than increasing or reducing the vehicle's speed. All kinds of factors constricting the subject's free and active speed on its own cause no result other than reflecting the History by frustrating it. If the person can reflects his inner strengths together with his culturel world's values to the past's facts

without any barrier, he will use the freedom as a vehicle and acquire the objectivity as an information that could comprehend the truth. Much as the objectivity can be discussed about its possibility, it shouldn't be chased to be by becoming like absolutely out of side in the History writer's expressions. The Historian doesn't have the right of violating the sense of objectivity in people with whom he will share his plot even if it will be his own subjective product; otherwise the think planned may be a Historical novel but can't be the History. The History changes its way through to be another thing in the point where it will be the convict of apriory hypothesis (Munslow 2000: 78) that may be deny the Historian's objectivity.

General-validity's not being discussed in Historical sciences doesn't cause to the denial of objectivity. An objectivity which means to the suitability of the information for its object is truth itself here, at the same time. A truth concept which will be gotten by its active role in the information's coming out takes place of the truth concept that is devoted to only rational and formal criterians in the History. The special and unique information that will be come out by this reality investigation in which the subject join personal but with whole inner strengths of him (Dilthey), even with his existence (Jaspers) and by taking the suitability for its being just and once human act of the fact which is the subject of Historical information under consideration, won't be subjective but objective.

According to Bolnow, as we agree with the information with a sincere passion, we can do it subjective, the subjectivity can be provided by the help of a component that will make the worth easier like inspiration or by the subject's making the reality possible for opening and coming out as an active and constructive component. All of these are profitable, necessary and positive subjectivities. Here, the method's subjectivity don't necessiate the subjectivity of the information reached. Yet, if the subjectivity has come to a said opened to the unlimited and uncommitted arbitrarinesses and haphazardly arbitrarinesses or prejudices, under these conditions the possibility of the subject's being comprehended will chase to be. Such a subjectivity hinders the relativity's coming out by upsetting the real connection between the subject and matter world. As the form used by Dilthey, even though it is a necessity for the possibility of all kinds of informations by being a shopping basement and a corporative life style which are present in all humans, the prejudices and subjectivities which aren't based on in the frame of the world view connection interest people just from one side and they can change every moment, they prevent the objectivities coming through that the science wishes to be (Birand 1998: 25-41). The objectivity which is the essential for the experiment related to the moral sciences is accepted with the higher expression like this; it penetrates the object with the help of the soul's powers and becomes exactly alike that. However, we can say by relying on the invention of Spranger that we should never squeeze into other people's inner life as much as we can see the world with their inner side. The others live and we can just evaluate their lives' meaning much better than them. For this reason an objective view distinct which will provide a moderate distance between the one understand and the one being understood will always be presented (Ibid.: 48-49).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ŞUAYP, Ahmet (1317) *Hayat ve Kitaplar (Life and Books)*, Edebiyat-ı Cedide Library, İstanbul.
- ARON, Raymond (1986) *Sosyolojik Düşüncenin Evreleri [Phases of Sociological Thought]*, Trans. Korkmaz Alemdar, Türkiye İş Bankası Culture Publications, Ankara.
- BİRAND, Kâmiran (1998) *Manevi İlimler Metodu Olarak Anlama [Understanding as Moral Sciences Method]*, Akçağ Publications, Ankara.
- BLOCH, Marc (1994) *Tarihin Savunusu Ya da Tarihçilik Mesleği [The History's Defense or Historian Job]*, Trans. M.Ali Kılıçbay, Second pres, Gece Publications, Ankara.
- BRAUDEL, Fernand (1992) *Tarih Üzerine Yazılar [Writings Over the History]*, Trans. M.Ali Kılıçbay, Imge Press, Ankara.
- CARR, Edward H. (1996) *Tarih Nedir? [What is History?]*, Trans. M Güzin Gürtürk, 5th pres, İletişim Publications, İstanbul.
- DİVİTÇİOĞLU, Sencer (1996) *Osmanlı Beyliğinin Kuruluşu [The Foundation of Ottoman Empire]*, Eren Publications, İstanbul.
- MUNSLOW, Alun (2000) *Tarihin Yapısökümü [Deconstructing History]*, Trans. Abdullah Yılmaz, Ayrıntı Publications, İstanbul.