• The linguistic turn - focus on language.
• Gareth Stedman Jones - had been a new social historian. Began to think about problems that hadn’t been very well explained. Associated with the linguistic turn.
  ○ On topic of his choice 19th century Chartism. Cannot understand Chartism’s rise or fall in the classic social history way. Must understand Chartism in relation to language. Chartists were reforming and redeploying language which had been used before. The language they are using is older and different.

  • **What he goes a long way to saying is that people are prisoners to the language discourse that we inherit. Language conditions the way we think. Language is a force which determines thoughts and ideas.** Constitutes a kind of social reality. Who lives embedded within whole lives. Where have we seen this before? Skinner and emphasis on language. From same institutions. Both developing their ideas productively on the basis of this. Stedman Jones changes fundamentally the way social history was conducted, seen as offensive. Thought to undermine the fabric of social history and played out in academic journals. Social history journal has an angry response. Palpable sense of crisis for social history.
  ○ Social history responded to this challenge. Developed something new.
  ○ Peter Laslett - interested in intellectual history but then became a social historian.
  ○ Developed studies of populations. Working in the early modern period, family, local society how the world worked for ordinary people. Challenged the concept of class. Didn’t think 17th century was class based. Disagrees with Marxist categorisation.
  ○ Keith Wrightson- need to recognise differences of equalities and expire cd but not see.
  ○ New Social Historians:
  ○ How society influences structures? How individual forces change structures? Even human agency on the behalf of poor individuals, men, and women. States have to adapt to the action taken by individuals who have exercised agency.
  ○ People from outside social hierarchies, bringing new things to the debate.
  ○ Social history has a place.
  ○ Old left the journals especially cultural and social history- that move 2004 is similar to the move discussed in the lecture. Social historians need to reconnect with culture. It needs to come together and this can be fruitful. This comes for the LSE tradition.
  ○ What can be done with this? Where does this fit with other courses?

Cultural History:

1. Origins of cultural history/ definition.
   a. Until 1800.
      ○ Bourke- how to define cultural history. He takes the line that it is extremely difficult to date cultural history. The methods are anything but uniform. Existentialist approach- there is no essence to cultural history. We are not the first people to recognises the role of cultural history.
      ○ High cultural practices- poetry, literature. Actually predates 1800.
      ○ Shift away from cultural practices starts in 18th and 17th century. Look at rituals. (Winkleman).
      ○ By end of 18th century interest in folk music. Rise of popular culture in this period.
      ○ Underlying philosophical assumptions:
        • Notion of infancy- maturity- decline.
        • Translatio studdii.
1. Imperial history as teleology
   1. Work backwards to explain the end. Politically seductive. Gibbon- rise and fall of Roman Empire, writing at the point at which Britain lost its first empire. No strong political points about what was going on US. But did ask if empires were destined to overreach themselves and collapse from the centre? See this question throughout the 19th century. Macawley- immensely confident about whigish rise of Liberty and freedom and Britain was the vanguard of its rise.
   2. Idea that imperialism destroys democracy at home. Mid 19th century, little England type arguments that England shouldn't intervene because inevitably will lead to despotism. John Stewart mill, argued a lot about the East India company- not subjected enough to parliamentary scrutiny. Indian rebellion of 1857 or Indian mutiny/ first war of independence. Not until after this that a formal structure of imperial rule is established in India with a raj in 1858. After 1858 another argument emerges in the historiography- does India really fit into the British empire. If India doesn't fit, then what is the British empire?
   3. J R Seely- the expansion of England. Delivered as a serious of lecture from 1869-1885. Published 1883. Talking about what he sees as Greater Britain- colonies of settlement, dominions. In thinking about empire and writing about empire there is a distinction between settlements and the subjugation of peoples in other countries. The indigenous peoples in these dominions lacked agency and were ignored. Massively popular book. Written just as Britain invaded Egypt in 1882. Beginning of the scramble for Africa. As a consequence, Britain developing interests into East Africa. His thinking about greater Britain and expansion of liberal values predates most of the acquisition of Africa. He viewed India as misfit of the empire. India was not necessarily seen as an asset for Britain. So why hold it? Actually fundamentally wrong due to its value in the cotton industry. But in Seely's view why hold India if it's a burden? Part of the civilising mission, Britain is doing India a favour by colonising it by sowing the seeds of liberal development. Imperialism of Britain is benevolent and a a gift- significant value judgement being made. Seely immensely confident about whigish rise of Liberty and freedom and Britain was the vanguard of its rise.
   4. Early Marxist notions of imperial expansion. 1890s imperialism really takes off. European powers rapidly accelerating colonisation of territory. Lenin wrote in 1917 imperialism the highest stage of capitalist expansion. Taking the view of liberal imperialism as a study. Imperialism a study. Lenin wrote in 1917 imperialism the highest stage of capitalist expansion.
   5. Jingoistic. Jingoism at height at the turn of the 20th century. J.a.Hobbson imperialism a study. Lenin wrote in 1917 imperialism the highest stage of capitalist- relied heavily on Hobbson. Talked about the economic interests of gold miners in South Africa and their influence on politicians in London. Imperialism extracts value from workers and profits. Hobbson- Prevalence of surplus capital in metropole encouraged exploration of new markets to sell goods and invest money. What happens is went to territory extracted primary goods, manufactured them in metropole and then sold them on to the empire for profit. Hobbson argued no need for Germany and Britain to go to war as long as they trade enough.
   6. Critics of neo-liberalism see multi national co operations as new forms of hegemony/ imperialism. Washington consensus criticised for opening up free trade and removing tariffs and leading to exploitation of poorer nation states.

0. Structure of empire
   1. 1919 allow for Indians to take place in democracy.
   2. Partition seen as a means for peace not war.
   3. Palestine- dominion affairs. 1926 dominions seen as autonomous but United with the British crown.
   5. Emphasis on raising standard of living after ww2, based on modernisation theory. British Labour Party took this up the most between 45- into 50s was at the project of colonial development.
   6. 1950- Africa and the Victorians. Ronald Robinson. Took a step back from the missionary imperialism stance and informed by post war social science. How the empire worked. Don't want to justify it or not so interested in this but want to explain how it functions as a system. Empire only works between core and the periphery- the actors in the colonies are integral to the working of the system. Still the official mind at the centre but to understand how an empire really works need to understand the periphery. Whole new range of actors come into play as indigenous populations are given agency.