

Historisk rättvisa förutsätter att man går bortom den politiska korrekthet som egentligen bara är en invertering av den gamla västerländska självcentreringen. Om den västerländska civilisationen förr sågs som grunden för allt framsteg, så ses den idag som roten till all orättvisa i världen. Men självförakt är inte bättre än självförhärligande. Och om vi vill vara rättvisa mot gångna tider, så måste vi åtminstone ha som utgångspunkt att förtryck, våld, slaveri och övergrepp av olika slag ska bedömas med samma måttstock oavsett vem som är förövare och vem som är offer.

*Linnéuniversitetet, Kalmar*

PER BAUHN

Rolf Torstendahl, *Den historiografiska revolutionen 1960–1990* (Studentlitteratur: Lund 2017). 206 s.

Emeritus professor of history Rolf Torstendahl devotes his new book to the revolution of the 1960s. But his is not the revolution brought about by the feminist movement, sexual liberation, or the emergence of a consumer society. Instead, he argues that a profound transformation changed the entire nature of historical scholarship, particularly historians' conception of historical research and of their profession.

Torstendahl argues that modern historiography developed in two successive phases. The first phase was consolidated between the mid-1830s and 1880s. It resulted in the dominance of political history, dealing with the state and its institutions, as well as domestic and foreign policy. Simultaneously, the method of source criticism (*Quellenkritik*) became the hallmark of professional historians. Although they disagreed on the criteria of reliable historical knowledge, they typically agreed that the critical scrutiny of archival documentary sources was the legitimate way to reach it.

In the second phase, during the historiographical revolution of the 1960s that continued over the next two decades, both political history and source criticism as *the* historical method lost their privileged position. The number of legitimate fields of inquiry expanded quickly as historians began to consider their professional practices in relation to the fruitfulness of their research. They no longer based new historical knowledge on new archival sources but on new perspectives that stimulated the detection of new phenomena. Moreover, these decades brought about a new way of organizing research and research training and large-scale projects. Together with computerization, a team of historians could now address more extensive research problems with more varied approaches than had been possible by a single scholar.

Despite profound changes, historians hardly noticed that the revolution happened. According to Torstendahl, this is partly because the revolution was so slow, and partly because it did not result in a new dominant perspective but in a number of parallel or rivalling ones. These include social history, gender history, global history (transnational or entangled history), and microhistory (including, for instance, new cultural history and history from below). In addition, a new political history emerged, which understands governance and power in a less state-centric way.

Torstendahl has written his book primarily as a general introduction to the history of historiography for Swedish history students. It is therefore understandable that he has painted a picture with a rather broad brush, focusing on issues that are of special importance to Sweden. As a historian who entered the academe in the 1980s and witnessed the influx of "new histories," I fully agree with him that a major change indeed took place during that era.

However, it is another question if the development of modern historiography can be illustrated only with the case of Sweden, albeit with a few references to the historiographical giants of France, Germany, and Great Britain. As a distinguished historian of historiography, Torstendahl is aware of the exclusiveness of his viewpoint of the topic. Anticipating criticism, he admits that already during the interwar period there existed some interest in social and cultural history in the French *Annales* School, as well as in Finland. According to him, these currents remained marginal if not fully exceptional, however, and did not undermine the dominance of political history.

Yet, one only has to look at Norway to find another exception to this rule. There social history became the dominant approach already in the 1920s. The founding of the Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture in Christiania (Oslo) in 1922 exemplifies this development, together with its extensive comparative project on European peasant societies, a field which the historian Edvard Bull Sr. largely invented.

On a European level it rather seems that the interwar years witnessed a relatively wide variation of historiographical perspectives, whereas the first two decades after the Second World War brought along a renewed interest in political history combined with anti-theoretical neo-empiricism. It is arguably against this background that we can justly describe the emergence of new perspectives in the 1960s as the beginning of the historiographical revolution. I do not intend to challenge Torstendahl's analysis of Sweden but rather suggest that we should be careful about drawing general conclusions from a single national paradigm.

While Torstendahl calls attention to the revolutionary nature of postwar "new histories," he simultaneously downplays the importance of diverse

“turns” in historiography. In particular, he is critical of scholars like Hayden White and Keith Jenkins, who have relocated historical writing to the aesthetic sphere, claiming that the only past reality is the “representation” of history. For Torstendahl, this position makes it impossible for historical research to reach new knowledge of the past. Thus, he emphasizes that the acceptance of multiple perspectives in historical research by no means results in relativism and subjectivism.

I agree with Torstendahl that the aestheticization of history is problematic for both epistemological and ethical reasons. But one does not have to be postmodernist to argue that the linguistic turn has shown that historical research has a substantial interpretive component, and thus involves the construction of the past. An elaborated example is Reinhart Koselleck’s work on conceptual history. It highlights the dependence of historical interpretation on the conceptual sources of those who live history and those who study it, yet without promoting aesthetic subjectivism or an “anything goes”-relativism.

At present, there is perhaps not yet enough research on the long-lasting effects of such reorientations as the linguistic turn. It is therefore too early to assess how the diverse epistemic cultures of the historical discipline have integrated or rejected these new theories of historical knowledge. A new historiographical revolution might be on the way, one that historians once again may fail to notice.

*University of Turku*

MARJA JALAVA

Karl Härter, Jörg Zapnik & Pär Frohnert (red.), *Kungariket Sverige och hertigdömena Pommern och Mecklenburg/Königreich Schweden und Herzogtümer Pommern und Mecklenburg: Repertorium der Policeyordnungen der Frühen Neuzeit*, Band 12.1 & 12.2 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann 2017). 1 019 s.

Då Gerhard Oestreich 1969 introducerade begreppet social disciplinering (*Sozialdisziplinierung*) i den akademiska debatten, utpekade han politistadgorna som den främsta källan för att utforska detta nyare tidens fenomen. Ända sedan högmedeltiden hade menigheten runtom i Europa överhopats med en alltmer tilltagande ström av förordningar, mandat, förbud, plakat, med mera som i detalj reglerade samhället och den enskildes liv från födseln till döden: dop, bröllop, begravning, kläder, mat, drycker, mynt, mått, vikt, bergsbruk, hantverk, handel, arbets- och lönevillkor, kredit, landsvägarnas