

## *Re-Writing Press History*

E.M. Palmegiano  
History Department, Saint Peter's University

### **Abstract**

Historians of the press have not sufficiently demonstrated its pivotal position in society. They have pillaged it for evidence on other subjects or privileged its personnel and publications to the exclusion of context. These emphases on particulars have inhibited understanding of how the press affects its own and other milieus, thereby portraying it as a cultural onlooker rather than a player. Rethinking how scholars construct time and place, utilize discourses, define authenticity, and pen narratives would help to broaden the record and relocate the press more centrally in it.

### *Introduction*

Press history too often does not serve the press well.<sup>1</sup> Although David Paul Nord recognized decades ago that public communication is the centerpiece of culture, few historians do much to confirm this prominence.<sup>2</sup> Despite living in a media-saturated century, mainstream historians use the press as an archive to buttress their inquiries of “legitimate” areas, such as politics, economics, society, and diplomacy.<sup>3</sup> Press specialists abet such marginalization by choosing narrow topics and engaging in research that prioritizes facts ahead of interpretation, overlooks nuances of language, and culminates in unconvincing narratives. This paper shows how such habits developed and suggests how to alter them to make press history coherent with press reality – as a major social institution.

Why has this incongruence between the press and its historians persisted? Ann Parry answered in 1988 “that media scholarship lacked generally accepted investigative procedures to connect the press to social and political structures.”<sup>4</sup> Perhaps because of this vacuum, Brian Maidment conjectured in 1990 that practitioners ignored the generic

and concentrated on the specific in periodicals.<sup>5</sup> Shortly after, Richard B. Kielbowicz deplored this “internalist” history and encouraged press historians to familiarize themselves with the perspectives of other disciplines, a plea echoed by Hazel Dickenson-Garcia in 2008.<sup>6</sup> However, outreach thereafter still occurred so rarely that Michelle Tusan in 2010 characterized press history as “a myopic analysis of the form and function of communication.”<sup>7</sup>

These remarks indicate that press historians must change their *modus operandi*. This paper discusses four ways to do so: reconstructing time and place, borrowing discourses, considering historical authenticity, and revising the narrative. The reason for choosing these approaches among the myriad available was that they are fundamental to the crafting of history.

### ***Reconstructing Time and Place***

All historians acknowledge that time and place are essential to their work because these admittedly orthodox denominations establish some sense of context wherein the historian “constitutes objects...and peoples.”<sup>8</sup> From antiquity to the late nineteenth century, a meta-narrative of Christianity and thence a grand narrative of Christian, white, European men conveyed irrefutable authority.<sup>9</sup> The demise of these sequential designs forced twentieth-century historians to rethink how to verify time and place. Sure that any and every determination of time and place made discernible a segment of the infinite, historians nevertheless held that these conventions were inextricably shaped by the moment when they cut into the before now.<sup>10</sup>

The ongoing dilemma was how evidentiary shards morphed into historical overviews. In the 1960s Isaiah Berlin speculated that historians could shuffle time and

place if they assumed values common to the “normal human.”<sup>11</sup> More recently, John Lewis Gaddis, troubled like Edward Hallett Carr previously, tried to reconcile what he named “contingencies” and “continuities,” the moments in individuals’ lives and the trends in historians’ iterations of them.<sup>12</sup> Gaddis defended manipulations of time and place as legitimate tools to zoom in and out of lives and ages in order to discern the ties between the micro and the macro in the same age and to compare ideas and circumstances in different ages.<sup>13</sup>

This thesis was hardly original. Historians before and after Gaddis refused to impose a rigid chronology on random, concrete phenomena.<sup>14</sup> For example, before World War II, the French *annalistes* substituted the “long durée” for the “century” that did not correlate with their sources.<sup>15</sup> And in the twenty-first century “long turn” historians who explore the human body and the cosmos since the “Big Bang” have liberated time from all of its usual spans.<sup>16</sup>

While Nord contended almost twenty years ago that any “date” had the potential for contingency, most press historians have eschewed inventiveness.<sup>17</sup> If unwilling to lengthen time, some have lately widened it. Betty Houchin Winfield’s *Journalism, 1908: Birth of a Profession* and W. Joseph Campbell’s *The Year That Defined American Journalism: 1897 and the Clash of Paradigms* exemplify simultaneous rather than consecutive chronology.<sup>18</sup> Chris Daly proposed another reformulation for his scrutiny of business development, saying that time should be of “some duration when something worth measuring is stable.”<sup>19</sup> Along similar lines, this author opined that labels, as the term “Victorian,” might have divergent connotations when applied to American and British journalism in the nineteenth century or might be altogether inappropriate.<sup>20</sup>

Whatever their theme, press historians need to decide whether typical calendar or era demarcations accurately situate the press *qua* press.

As with time, many press historians have restricted place too literally whereas their peers in other arenas have reconceived it physically *and* culturally. Abandoning the atlas, they have shifted from traditional referents of location to transnational ones, such as the Atlantic world and the earth's environment.<sup>21</sup> As Caroline W. Bynum noticed, historians have passed from accenting "borders, boundaries, and breaks" to accenting "connections and transitions."<sup>22</sup> And studies of race, class, and gender have revealed that collective identities – whether natural or normative – tend to blur spatial boundaries.<sup>23</sup>

Although all press historians grasp that journalists, equipment, and opinions of journalism traveled, many have clung to linear outlines more apt for the novel than lateral ones corroborating how the press disregarded actual and ideological borders.<sup>24</sup> Happily, exemplars of cross-fertilization have begun to appear. Among them are *Anglo-American Media Interactions, 1850-2000*, edited by Joel H. Wiener and Mark Hampton, and *Communication and Empire: Media, Markets, and Globalization, 1860-1930* by Dwayne R. Winseck and Robert M. Pike.<sup>25</sup> The Wiener-Hampton collection offers a trans-Atlantic panorama of motifs, from war and sports reporting to press illustrations and technology as a manifestation of speed in journalism.<sup>26</sup> Winseck and Pike delineate how the tendrils of international enterprises, with the aid of technology, dominated information delivery across the planet. Even a simple relational model, such as *The Rise of Western Journalism, 1815-1914*, magnifies space.<sup>27</sup> By juxtaposing press activities and responses to them in Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, this

volume yields data heretofore compartmentalized that elevates the press from bystander to agent in those pedestrian spheres, power and money.

Works more limited in scope likewise innovatively extend the terrain of press history. David R. Spencer's "The 'Art' of Politics: Victorian Canadian Political Cartoonists Look at Canada-U.S. Relations" has a familiar geographic scene but draws the less familiar cartoon into it.<sup>28</sup> Binding power to caricature this commentary validates intellectual experimentation and, not incidental, press influence as does Ulf Jonas Bjork's "Have Gun, Will Travel: Swedish Television and American Westerns, 1959-1969."<sup>29</sup> By conjoining Scandinavian video and Hollywood film, Bjork provides multiple spatial vistas. Gregory A. Borchard's "Revolutions Incomplete: Horace Greeley and the Forty-eighters at Home and Abroad," which details how a national press transmitted ideas to American and European audiences, additionally stars a frequently forgotten and fragile group – readers.<sup>30</sup>

Historians outside North America have also breached the geographic barrier in press history. For instance, Lenore O'Boyle's "The Image of the Journalist in France, Germany, and England, 1815-1848," probes perceptions of press personnel in Western Europe between the end of the Napoleonic wars and the onset of the revolutions of 1848.<sup>31</sup> Settling journalists in the calm between two cataclysmic international crises O'Boyle tethers journalists in dissimilar territories. Ranging farther still, Simon J. Potter's *News and the British World: The Emergence of an Imperial Press System* examines the technology that transformed the production and distribution of news in the British Empire of Victoria and her successors.<sup>32</sup> This overlay illuminates how a homogeneous and static press superseded an earlier diverse and dynamic one.<sup>33</sup> And

Christopher Hilliard's "The Provincial Press and the Imperial Traffic in Fiction, 1870s-1930" summarizes why newspaper readers on the "peripheries" of the Anglophonic domain relished syndicated fiction.<sup>34</sup> By aligning the decisions of publishers in the British local press and audiences overseas who scanned the syndicated fiction they circulated, this article confirms the reach of the press.

Initially chary about dispensing with geography, press researchers were even more tentative about handling more than one culture. Only after the pioneering books of Patrick S. Washburn and Maurine H. Beasley did investigations of race and gender burgeon.<sup>35</sup> Yet, irrespective of these landmarks, much of the subsequent output has adhered to antiquated parameters. Nor have studies ventured far into internal bi-sector comparison, e.g., how race, class, and gender may have intersected within and beyond national confines. One exception is the 2009 essay of Margot Opdycke Lamme, Jacquie l'Etang, and Burton St. John, III, on public relations.<sup>36</sup> They concluded that global contextualization, notably for regions with a colonial or imperial encounter, exposed how identity operated in sundry locales.<sup>37</sup> This blending has intriguing possibilities. To keep one foot in Canada and one beyond, the historian might ask whether journalists along the frontiers of the Rockies and the Russian steppes or printers in Hudson's Bay and Botany Bay had analogous status and experiences, or how women journalists interacted with men in European and non-European states. And these sorts of queries, whose numbers are endless, do not take into account what Bynum discerned, a nether realm of cultural entanglements below boundaries where historians' mediated demarcations apply as much as to the realm above.<sup>38</sup> This otherworld has enormous potential for press historians

because so much of this reporting brings the reporter into contact with diasporas and subalterns.

### *Borrowing Discourses*

The readiness of press historians to appropriate without hesitation outmoded frames of time and place is peculiar given their reluctance to accommodate alternative discourses. Accommodation does not necessitate wholesale adoption but does require openness to adaptation. Taking techniques useful for press history from without can be beneficial. As Kielbowicz noted, press historians can learn from a variety of fields, such as historical geography that could help chart patterns of news flow.<sup>39</sup>

Among the discourses available, the literary is preeminent. Albeit disagreement about its parentage flourishes, its tie to the press is neither unhistorical nor illogical.<sup>40</sup> Since Gibbons Merle first mused in 1833 that journalism was “a good name for...the intercommunication of opinion and intelligence...by means of journals,” his progeny have attempted to secure or break its bond with literature.<sup>41</sup> And as journalism involves the “linguistic and rhetorical,”<sup>42</sup> ruminating about recasting content should be as vital to press history as pondering the expansion of time and place.

Delving into available language usage can amplify the voices of journalists and their audiences.<sup>43</sup> In the agora of the press, the words of both blocs are inextricably bound: therefore, as Nord reasoned, literary discourse analysis can assist in penetrating the web enveloping the printed word and those who used it.<sup>44</sup> The strategies of readers to assimilate news and the outcomes of such assimilation should concern all press historians, not simply those in literary journalism.<sup>45</sup> Literary discourse, moreover, suits the multi-faceted character of the press so can position its record nearer to press reality.

Those trained in the social sciences can use it to integrate data smoothly. Those trained in the humanities can raise the level of sophistication by close perusal of texts and awareness of linguistic flexibility.<sup>46</sup> True, caution must prevail in borrowing this or any discourse. For instance, the preference of the literary for tropes and its introduction of reflections on facts may not always pass evidentiary muster.<sup>47</sup> Thus, before trying new discourses, press historians should review how they authenticate history.

### *Considering Historical Authenticity*

How the historian defines evidence and ultimately truth is the linchpin of history.<sup>48</sup> Because engagements with the residue of earlier communities rarely result in intellectual unanimity, the consequent disharmony of their tellings implies that history is untruthful. Hence, how historians validate evidence, which press scholars customarily address, and why historians differ in reading it, which they customarily do not address, are crucial to comprehend how they know what they claim to know.<sup>49</sup>

R.G. Collinwood supposed that “[e]vidence is evidence only when someone contemplates it historically.”<sup>50</sup> To press historians schooled in data management, evidence resembles the facts of the scientist and mandates objectivity. Herein lie two flaws. First, the choice of historical data is not mathematical. Because past snippets survive by chance and historians juggle them at will, the case study does not inevitably reveal typicality.<sup>51</sup> Privileging the empirical disserves the press by spotlighting its “superabundance of jumbled, disparate and mainly trivial details”<sup>52</sup> and subordinating or discounting myths and emotions.<sup>53</sup> It bars from the conversation such matters as how cutting-edge digital sources change the structure of information<sup>54</sup> and how historians’ acculturation, chiefly in language, perennially molds investigation.<sup>55</sup> And it pretends that

the sources are not in flux, that they do not have many voices but do have a voice in the shaping of the past.<sup>56</sup> Second, devotion to the idol of objectivity is obsolete. This standard for reporting emerged in the late nineteenth century, synchronous with the birth of photojournalism and the heyday of positivism.<sup>57</sup> Rooted in the natural sciences, positivism emphasized neutrality and determinacy, not the actions of those who assumed they were free.<sup>58</sup> While history clearly locates persons in groups, it stresses their distinctiveness.<sup>59</sup> Patrons of objectivity – who presumed that historians could divest themselves of their own surroundings and could link the external “thing” to the internal idea – preached a gospel of impartiality.<sup>60</sup> By World War I, this criterion was under attack, rated worthless except where a dominant ideology or social homogeneity reigned and documents covered every aspect of life.<sup>61</sup>

Since then historians have wrestled with the tension this ancestry fueled. They continue to endorse an evidentiary base akin to that of natural and social scientists but attest that they do not generalize first, indeed are wary of theory as constraining questions raised by the sources.<sup>62</sup> They distinguish themselves from humanists in literature by declaring that, though they resort to metaphors, they do not fictionalize.<sup>63</sup> Whether they now see themselves as a hybrid caste or allied to a disciplinary cluster, they agree that objectivity delineated as detached observation is impossible. They have replaced it with consensus among peers who understand that every work is partial and its conclusions are arbitrary.<sup>64</sup>

Proponents hold that as no two people are alike, historians can and usually do clash about the merits of the same sources.<sup>65</sup> They argue that the milieu, biases, and linguistic conventions of each historian preclude his or her objectivity and defy

professional measurement.<sup>66</sup> Press history, as other specialties, substantiates one part of this argument by legions of publications on the same theme with divergent outcomes. But press historians have tended to overlook the nexus between what the historian brings to the research and how the research affects the historian despite Marc Bloch's reminder of this interplay.<sup>67</sup> Some dismiss the self-revelation as researcher, reader, and theorist that Dominick La Capra recommends.<sup>68</sup> Some amend this approach. To ensure that the now does not pervert the before now to meet the needs of contemporary society, these historians aspire to be equitable, to be "ethically responsible as they reinvent the past."<sup>69</sup> But advocates who expect historians to probe any subject of "ongoing importance"<sup>70</sup> do not clarify the place of the "moral" evaluation approved by Gaddis.<sup>71</sup> Because press history encompasses key issues of principle, from the generic role and control of the press in a democracy to the specific role of the correspondent in a democracy at war, it follows that press historians can and should participate more actively in deliberations of historical authenticity.

Coupled with self-revelation are the use and misuse of imagination. In its least controversial sense, it can mean a mechanism to reconcile conflicting evidence, to utilize conjectural, and to cement fragmentary.<sup>72</sup> Imagination can signify the quasi-intuitive judgments that beget organization of the past even though patterning is obviously an act of intellect,<sup>73</sup> what Bloch called the "glorious victory of mind over material."<sup>74</sup> Imagination can also justify stepping into another's life where categories are entangled, relics are tainted, and an individual's motives are confused.<sup>75</sup> The common component in these definitions is the distancing from the sources – from archives to memories – that anchor imagination.<sup>76</sup> Those who extol it affirm that history would be unachievable

without it, downgraded as it were to mere chronicle.<sup>77</sup> They do not disdain imagination's imprecision and pluralism, which raise history above "mere journalism" and invite discussion that enlarges or rectifies the record.<sup>78</sup>

Recognizing the repercussions of preconception and learned memory, historians today are remapping the historical sphere to accord with their conviction that they represent, but not "re-present" the past. Rather, they are pragmatic. They accept that from initial hypotheses to final assertions, even absent prioritizing or excluding evidence, they cannot guarantee certitude.<sup>79</sup> But they disavow relativism in which all perspectives have equal weight.<sup>80</sup> Surmising that language corresponds to reality, that imaginative interpretation corresponds to findings, they insist that their slicings into the past produce some, but never the whole truth, the plausible substituting for the absolute.<sup>81</sup>

Press historians do not exhibit a willingness to admit that they create history, or more precisely historiography as they selectively pluck from ephemera constantly shifting, arrange the chosen capriciously, and spin them into contradictory cloth. Yet they assign value within a construct that the next generation has to identify before it can broadcast its own depiction of the before now. Anointing the objectivity of researchers and trusting that research yields unimpeachable truth echo the Newtonian universe long renounced by physicists and latterly by historians.<sup>82</sup> To cling to this mindset lowers the stature of the press in the past but sustains the favorite mode of disseminating its history, the narrative.

### *Revising the Narrative*

Historians have long acknowledged, Lawrence Stone notwithstanding,<sup>83</sup> that "grand" and "master" narrative are dead."<sup>84</sup> Grand narrative could not fly once historians

decided that their stories had “an arbitrarily imposed ending.”<sup>85</sup> Even before it faded in the *fin de siècle*, master narratives of nations on both sides of the Atlantic had eclipsed it.<sup>86</sup> They confined press history to local institutions and personnel, omitting alien ideologies and technologies.<sup>87</sup>

After 1919 the master narrative, handicapped by its exclusion of “Others,” lost prestige once the French *annalistes* set up shop.<sup>88</sup> Their emphases on quantification and social scaffolding, preference for explanation over summary, extension of time frames, concern for emotions and collective attitudes, and focus on ‘representations’ in words and images, undermined the traditional narrative scheme.<sup>89</sup> Additionally, their look at ordinary folk contrasted sharply with the tales of great men and, not incidental, with the lifeless work in social science.<sup>90</sup> But the *annalistes* catalyzed a stylistic trend away from storytelling that spawned later-century volumes effectively excluding non-historian readers, leaving them to “journalists, popularizers, or hacks.”<sup>91</sup>

Concurrent with this drift, narrative garnered more attention, originally because of questions about its suitability for topics once deemed peripheral and then because of the postmodernist assault on language and its ramification for authenticity.<sup>92</sup> Although Berlin had underscored that history was “inevitably shot through with words of evaluative force,” historians neglected its linguistic aspect until postmodernism.<sup>93</sup> The linguistic “turn” reoriented history from its scientific to its literary side.<sup>94</sup> Buttressed by the postulates of Michel Foucault and his heirs, postmodernists maintained that since language is symbolic, it is susceptible to multiple meanings.<sup>95</sup>

This conclusion extinguished any hope of truth in the manner of grand and master narrative but did not destroy narration. Historians after postmodernism expressed kindred

reasons to retain it as those who published before this “turn.” Most regarded it as a handy, if flawed vehicle for the historian to assemble and assess sources. H. Stuart Hughes, who warned about the hazards of symbol before the postmodernists, accepted chronology as the organizational backbone of narrative but alerted that it could conceal narrators’ ignorance and illogic.<sup>96</sup> He likewise listed narrative’s limitations: the predominance of “great scenes” gauged by their relevance to contemporary mores; the difficulty of holding together developments over time while highlighting simultaneous activities in time; the juggling between the how and why of past lives with all their uncertainties and a historian certain of the finale.<sup>97</sup> But a cadre of historians reckoned that embedding intentions and deeds in a story did not preclude the explanation rooted in critical thinking.<sup>98</sup> As long as description was plausible, it could anchor synthesis.<sup>99</sup>

Confounding the issue further was Gaddis’ point that narratives did not permit historians to fill in sparsely documented gaps and to disclose historians’ motives for selecting and rejecting methodology.<sup>100</sup> Giovanni Levi disagreed, supposing that narrative could demonstrate the nexus between a system and individual reactions to it thereby accommodating pliable constructs and historical procedures.<sup>101</sup> And Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob believed that the interaction in narrative between historian and subject, whereby historians crafted endings pertinent to their own generation, was appropriate.<sup>102</sup> Elizabeth Clark concurred with Hughes that narrative brought a degree of coherence to incoherent sources but appended that historians’ endings entitled their own methodologies and explications.<sup>103</sup>

The fate of narrative directly affects press history because its scholarship routinely conforms to Thomas Bender’s premise that history is a story of parts in relation

to parts, particulars rendered comprehensible by linkages.<sup>104</sup> Fans still aver that narrative fulfills the historian's primary and hardest assignment, to impart what it was like to be there.<sup>105</sup> They do not deal with the other matters examined here, such as how fixing time and place and a writer's language choices impact not only the flow of narration but its precursors, the decisions about how to deal with vestiges of the before now.<sup>106</sup> Nor do they elucidate how the narrative's reliance on metaphor to convey how something past is like something present avoids the pitfall of presentism.<sup>107</sup> Instead, press historians either resurrect the master narrative or, if grounded in quantification, squeeze theory-driven cases into an uncongenial hybrid narrative. The first portrays a nation's press as unique, a press whose progress replicated or advanced that of the country. Because of its linear and national blinders, this treatment misses changes in external societies that influenced its media. The second surfaces as micro-studies deprived of context, studies that invariably feature unimportant profiles unrelated to each other, much less to the larger cultural tapestry of a nation or beyond. Both designs depreciate the press in the world, or worse, at home.

### *Conclusion*

To move the press from the shadows, press historians must be pro-active. At a moment when "neither orthodoxies nor heresies" prevail in history,<sup>108</sup> specialists must rescue their field from the secondhand axioms and styles that have captured it. They must, in this digital and multicultural age inviting tabulation, rethink their configurations of time and space, their utilization of language, their perception and reception of sources, and their reliance on narrative. If they engage in "more nuanced and more creative" work,<sup>109</sup> they can install the press high in the pantheon of history where it belongs.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Douglas B. Ward and Jerome J. Gillen for their helpful editing of this manuscript.
- <sup>2</sup> David Paul Nord, "Intellectual History, Social History, Cultural History...and Our History," *Journalism Quarterly* 67 (1990): 645.
- <sup>3</sup> Chris Daly, "The Historiography of Journalism History: Part 1: An Overview," *American Journalism* 26 (2009): 141; Michael Schudson, "Public spheres, imagined communities, and the underdeveloped historical understanding of journalism," *Explorations in Communication and History*, ed. Barbie Zelizer (London: Routledge, 2008), 181.
- <sup>4</sup> Ann Parry, "The Intellectuals and the Middle Class Periodical Press," *Journal of Newspaper and Periodical History* 4 (1988): 18.
- <sup>5</sup> Brian Maidment, "Victorian Periodicals and Academic Discourse," in *Investigating Victorian Journalism*, ed. Laurel Brake, Aled Jones, and Lionel Madden (London: Macmillan, 1990), 153.
- <sup>6</sup> Richard B. Kielbowicz, "Making Connections with Outside Subfields," *American Journalism* 10 (1993): 31-32; Hazel Dicken-Garcia, "Reminiscing about Thirty Years of Journalism History," *Clio* (fall 2008): 2-3, 9.
- <sup>7</sup> Michelle Tusan, "Media History: Where To?" Review of *Narrating Media History*, ed. Michael Bailey (Oxford: Routledge, 2008), *H-Albion*, 23 December 2009.
- <sup>8</sup> John Lewis Gaddis, *The Landscape of History: How Historians Map the Past* (Oxford: University Press, reprint ed. 2004), 27; Robert S. Nelson, "The Map of Art History Author(s)," *The Art Bulletin* 79 (1997):28.
- <sup>9</sup> Georg C. Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, reprint ed. 2005), 7.
- <sup>10</sup> Gaddis 27, 32; Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob, *Telling the Truth about History* (New York: Norton, reprint ed. 2005), 262.
- <sup>11</sup> Isaiah Berlin, *Four Essays on Liberty* (Oxford: University Press, 1969), xxxiii.
- <sup>12</sup> Edward Hallett Carr, *What Is History?* (New York: Vintage, reprint ed. 1967), 54, 62; Gaddis, 31.
- <sup>13</sup> Gaddis, 23-25.
- <sup>14</sup> Henk Wesseling, "Overseas History," in *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, ed. Peter Burke (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 2001), 92; Chris Ward, "Impressions of the Somme: An experiment," in *Experiments in Rethinking History*, ed. Alun Munslow and Robert A. Rosenstone (London: Routledge, 2004), 112.
- <sup>15</sup> The most often cited is Fernand Braudel's 1949 *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*; Iggers, 55-56.
- <sup>16</sup> Iggers, 55; Appleby, 205; Roy Porter, "History of the Body Reconsidered," in *New Perspectives*, 233-60; Carolin W. Bynum, "Perspectives, connections and objects: what's happening in history now?" *Daedalus* (winter 2009): 77. For examples of other "turns," among them the cultural, imperial, and generational, see "AHR Forum: Historiographic 'Turns' in Critical Perspective," *American Historical Review* 117 (2012): 698-813.
- <sup>17</sup> David Paul Nord, "A Diverse Field Needs a Diversity of Approaches," *American Journalism* 10 (1993): 27.
- <sup>18</sup> Betty Houchin Winfield, *Journalism, 1908: Birth of a Profession* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008); W. Joseph Campbell, *The Year That Defined American Journalism: 1897 and the Clash of Paradigms* (New York: Routledge, 2006).
- <sup>19</sup> Chris Daly, "The Historiography of Journalism History: Part 2: 'Toward a New Theory,'" *American Journalism* 26 (2009): 150-51.
- <sup>20</sup> E.M. Palmegiano, "Re-constructing Media History," *American Journalism* 22 (2005): 134.
- <sup>21</sup> See for example the work of Bernard Bailyn on the Atlantic World and of Richard H. Grove on the environment.
- <sup>22</sup> Bynum, 80.
- <sup>23</sup> See for example the work of Eugene D. Genovese, E.P. Thompson, and Joan Wallach Scott on race, class, and gender respectively. See Joan Wallach Scott, "Women's History," in *New Perspectives*, 45, on collective identity.
- <sup>24</sup> John Nerone, "Network, technology, and cultural form, 1837-1920," in *Explorations*, 142-43.
- <sup>25</sup> Joel H. Wiener and Mark Hampton, ed., *Anglo-American Media Interactions, 1850-2000* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Dwayne R. Winseck and Robert M. Pike, *Communication and Empire: Media, Markets, and Globalization, 1860-1930* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007).

- <sup>26</sup> Richard D. Fulton, "Sensational War Reporting and the Quality Press of Late Victorian Britain and America," in *Anglo-American Media*, 11-31; Matt McIntire, "Embracing Sporting News in England and America: Nineteenth-Century Cricket and Baseball News," in *Anglo-American Media*, 32-47; Christopher Kent, "Matt Morgan and Transatlantic Illustrated Journalism," 1850-1890," in *Anglo-American Media*, 69-92; Joel H. Wiener, "'Get the News!, Get the News!'" in *Anglo-American Media*, 48-66.
- <sup>27</sup> Ross F. Collins and E.M. Palmegiano, ed., *The Rise of Western Journalism, 1815-1914* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 2007).
- <sup>28</sup> David R. Spencer, "The 'Art' of Politics: Victorian Canadian Political Cartoonists Look at Canada-U.S. Relations," *Media History Monographs* 6 (2003): entire number.
- <sup>29</sup> Ulf Jonas Bjork, "Have Gun, Will Travel: Swedish Television and American Westerns, 1959-1969," *Historical Journal of Film, Radio, and Television* 21 (2001): 309-21.
- <sup>30</sup> Gregory A. Borchar, "Revolutions Incomplete: Horace Greeley and the Forty-eighters at Home and Abroad," *American Journalism* 27 (2010): 7-36.
- <sup>31</sup> Lenore O'Boyle, "The Image of the Journalist in France, Germany, and England, 1815-1848," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 10 (1968): 290-317.
- <sup>32</sup> Simon J. Potter, *News and the British World: The Emergence of an Imperial Press System* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003); see also his "Webs, Networks, and Systems: Globalization and the Mass Media in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007): 621-46.
- <sup>33</sup> Potter, "Webs," 634.
- <sup>34</sup> Christopher Hilliard, "The Provincial Press and the Imperial Traffic in Fiction, 1870s-1930," *Journal of British Studies* 48 (2009): 653-73.
- <sup>35</sup> Patrick S. Washburn, *A Question of Sedition: The Federal Government's Investigation of the Black Press During World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Maurine H. Beasley, *Taking Their Place: A Documentary History of Women and Journalism* (State College, PA: Strata Publishing, 2002).
- <sup>36</sup> Margot Opdycke Lamme, Jacquie l'Etang, and Burton St. John, III, "The State of Public Relations History," *American Journalism* 26 (2009): 156-59.
- <sup>37</sup> Lamme, 159.
- <sup>38</sup> Bynum, 82.
- <sup>39</sup> Kielbowicz, 35-36.
- <sup>40</sup> Maidment, 143; Dallas Liddle, *The Dynamics of Genre: Journalism and the Practice of Literature in Mid-Victorian Britain* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009), 188.
- <sup>41</sup> Gibbons Merle, "Journalism," *Westminster Review* 18 (1833): 195.
- <sup>42</sup> John Raymond, "The History of Newspapers and the History of Journalism: two disciplines or one?" *Media History* 5 (1999): 230.
- <sup>43</sup> Dallas Liddle, "Who Invented the 'Leading Article'?: reconstructing the history and prehistory of a Victorian newspaper genre," *Media History* 5 (1999): 11.
- <sup>44</sup> David Paul Nord, "The history of journalism and the history of the book," in *Explorations*, 171, 174.
- <sup>45</sup> S. Elizabeth Bird, "Seeking the historical audience: Interdisciplinary lessons in the recovery of media practices," in *Explorations*, 95, 97.
- <sup>46</sup> Joan Wallach Scott, "History in Crisis? The Others' Side of the Story," *American Historical Review* 94 (1989): 691.
- <sup>47</sup> Keith Jenkins, *Refiguring History: New thoughts on an old discipline* (London: Routledge, 2003), 46; Bynum, 76; Susan J. Douglas, "Does textual analysis tell us anything about past audiences?" in *Explorations*, 69-70; David Harlan, "Intellectual History and the Return of Literature," *American Historical Review* 94 (1989): 582-83; Gertrude Himmelfarb, "Some Reflections on the New History," *American Historical Review* 94 (1989): 665-67.
- <sup>48</sup> Among the classic answers to this question are Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft* (New York: Vintage, reprint ed. 1953); Carr; G.R. Elton, *The Practice of History* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1967). Among recent volumes are Richard J. Evans, *In Defense of History* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1999); Gaddis; Allan Megill, *Historical Knowledge, Historical Error* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007); Peter Charles Hoffer, *The Historian's Paradox: The Study of History in Our Own Time* (New York: New York University Press, 2008).
- <sup>49</sup> Singular exceptions are Nord and Zelizer. Nord urged press historians to heed how historical knowledge is forged in Nord, "Diverse," 28. Zelizer challenged them to ruminate about whether forays into other

---

disciplinary methodologies, the “how we know,” affects the “what we know” in Barbie Zelizer, “When disciplines engage,” in *Explorations*, 2, 7.

<sup>50</sup> R.G. Collingwood’s *The Idea of History*, ed. Jan Ven Der Dussen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, reprint ed. 2005), 247.

<sup>51</sup> Jenkins, 39; Bernard Semmel, “H.T. Buckle: the liberal faith and the science of history,” *British Journal of Sociology* 27 (1976): 379; Paul K. Conklin and Roland Stromberg, *The Heritage and Challenge of History* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1971), 113-14; E.P. Thompson, “Review article: On history, sociology and historical relevance,” *British Journal of Sociology* 27 (1976): 393.

<sup>52</sup> Allan Nevins, “American Journalism and Its Historical Treatment,” *Journalism Quarterly* 36 (1959): 413.

<sup>53</sup> Alun Munslow, “Introduction: Theory and Practice,” in *Experiments*, 7; William H. McNeill, “Mythistory, or Truth, Myth, History, and Historians,” *American Historical Review* 91 (1986): 3; Paul Rock, “Some problems of interpretive historiography,” *British Journal of Sociology* 27 (1976): 356-67.

<sup>54</sup> Ivan Gaskell, “Visual History,” in *New Perspectives*, 189.

<sup>55</sup> Appleby, 16, 75-76.

<sup>56</sup> Jenkins, 3; McNeill, 4; Appleby, 256; Jim Sharpe, “History from Below,” in *New Perspectives*, 30-31.

<sup>57</sup> Elizabeth A. Clark, *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 97.

<sup>58</sup> H. Stuart Hughes, *History as Art and Science: Two Vistas on the Past* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Midway Reprint 1975), 9; Berlin, xii, xv.

<sup>59</sup> Hughes, 63-64.

<sup>60</sup> Clark, 14; Megill, 109.

<sup>61</sup> Clark, 20; Hughes, 93.

<sup>62</sup> James D. Startt and Wm. David Sloan, *Historical Methods in Mass Communication* (Northport, AL: Vision Press, revised ed. 2003), 207; Thompson, 390; Sharp, 37.

<sup>63</sup> Anna Green and Kathleen Troup, ed., *The House of History: A critical reader in twentieth-century history and theory* (Manchester: University Press, 1999), 207.

<sup>64</sup> Megill, 109, 117; Gaddis, 39.

<sup>65</sup> Gaddis, 125; Appleby, 262.

<sup>66</sup> Bloch, 194-95; Conklin and Stromberg, 197, 203-07; Jenkins, 5.

<sup>67</sup> Bloch, 43.

<sup>68</sup> Dominick La Capra, “History, Language, and Reading: Waiting for Crillon,” *American Historical Review* 100 (1995): 805.

<sup>69</sup> Berlin, xxviii; Startt and Sloan, 56; Harlan, 607.

<sup>70</sup> Startt and Sloan, 56.

<sup>71</sup> Gaddis, 122-23.

<sup>72</sup> Hughes, 47-48.

<sup>73</sup> Gaddis, 51; McNeill, 1.

<sup>74</sup> See Hughes, 20, on Benedetto Croce as emblematic of this exercise; Bloch, 64.

<sup>75</sup> Berlin, 59, 73, 85, 94.

<sup>76</sup> Gaddis, 41, 43; Iggers, 75.

<sup>77</sup> Startt and Sloan, xi; Hughes, 6-7.

<sup>78</sup> Hughes, 100; Gaddis, 10-11; Bynum, 85.

<sup>79</sup> Clark, 41; Appleby, 285.

<sup>80</sup> Appleby, 7.

<sup>81</sup> Appleby, 248-49; Clark, 211: note #146; Iggers, 145: note #12.

<sup>82</sup> Gaddis, 91.

<sup>83</sup> Lawrence Stone, “The Revival of Narrative: Reflections on a New Old History,” *Past and Present* 85 (1979): 3-24.

<sup>84</sup> Nerone, 136.

<sup>85</sup> Bynum, 85.

<sup>86</sup> Megill, 31.

<sup>87</sup> Jeffrey Patterson, “Challenging the Raj: Robert Knight in India.” Review of *Robert Knight: Reforming Editor in Victorian India*, by Edwin Hirschmann (Oxford: University Press, 2008), *Jhistory*, 19 May 2010; Jeanette McVicker, “Next Stop Lisbon (or London or Lahore): A History of Foreign Correspondents.”

---

Review of *Journalism's Roving Eye: A History of American Foreign Correspondents*, by John Maxwell Hamilton (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009), *Jhistory*, 24 May 2010.

<sup>88</sup> Scott, "History," 689-90.

<sup>89</sup> Clark, 66-68; Megill, 66-70; Richard Tuck, "History of Political Thought," in *New Perspectives*, 229.

<sup>90</sup> Iggers, 51-52, 98.

<sup>91</sup> Theodore S. Hamerow, "The Bureaucratization of History," *American Historical Review* 94 (1989): 657-58.

<sup>92</sup> Startt and Sloan, 72.

<sup>93</sup> Berlin, xxviii.

<sup>94</sup> Startt and Sloan, 72.

<sup>95</sup> La Capra, 803.

<sup>96</sup> Hughes, 70-71, 80.

<sup>97</sup> Hughes, 72, 75-77.

<sup>98</sup> Allan Megill, "Recounting the Past: 'Description,' Explanation, and Narrative in Historiography," *American Historical Review* 94 (1989): 630; Iggers, 65; Startt and Sloan, 72.

<sup>99</sup> Rock, 355; Hughes, 86; Elton, 127; Fischer, 306.

<sup>100</sup> Gaddis, 115, 141.

<sup>101</sup> Giovanni Levi, "On Microhistory," in *New Perspectives*, 110-11.

<sup>102</sup> Appleby, 263, 265.

<sup>103</sup> Clark, 86-87, 91.

<sup>104</sup> Thomas Bender, "Wholes and Parts: The Need for Synthesis in American History," *Journal of American History* 73 (1986): 131; Elton, 11.

<sup>105</sup> Elton, 127; Hughes, 69.

<sup>106</sup> Green and Troup, 206.

<sup>107</sup> Gaddis, 2.

<sup>108</sup> Prinz, in *New Perspectives*, 272.

<sup>109</sup> Bynum, 72, 80-81.