

TEACHING HISTORY AND HISTORY OF THE PRESENT TIME: POSSIBLE LOOKS

ASSIS DANIEL GOMES

DOCTOR IN SOCIAL HISTORY BY THE FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF CEARÁ

In this article, we intend to reflect on the relationship between the teaching of history and the history of the present time. For this, we will carry out a theoretical discussion, also tracking elements of my teaching experience in order to indicate possibilities of encounters between teaching and the knowledge produced by this historical field. The problem that directed us was the following: What are the areas of contact between the teaching of history (thought in its broad conception, that is, without its reduction to school spaces) and the history of the present time?

Teaching history and history of the present time

According to Gonçalves (2011), the history of the present time, in the model produced from the end of the 1970s, was constituted through the questions that arose at that time. For example, the economic and social challenges faced after the Second World War, such as tyrannies and totalitarianisms that emerged, such as fascism and Nazism, as well as technological innovations that led to an acceleration in people's daily lives.

According to Dosse (2012), this field of history was not born out of nowhere, but it had a long tradition that referred to the reports made on the Peloponnesian war by Thucydides. This tradition was disowned and put aside by the theoretical and methodological injunctions of the 19th century operated by historians, who intended to transform history into science. For this, they removed the history of objects from their present in order to protect it and give it the sign of objectivity characteristic of physical and biological science.

The return of the studies of the present occurred with the return of the politician as an object of investigation for the historian who, for Dosse (2012), started at the Institute for Political Studies in Paris (IEP), linked to the University of Paris. The construction in 1978 of the Institute of History of the Present Time at CNRS, furthermore, added strength to it. This institution was opened by François Bédarida in 1980, and remained in its coordination until 1990.

The conflicts over its various nominations, for Soulet (1994), made possible profuse approaches and methods that characterized it for its quality and breadth. For example, the definition made by Jean-François Soulet who called it immediate history. This approached the conception of contemporary history. In 2005 Fabrice d'Almeida and Christian Ingrao, through the contributions of François Hartog, mainly the concept of historicity regime, stated that this approach was part of the so-called "présentisme". In order to deepen the methodological issues surrounding the field, we highlight the works of Christian Delacroix, François Dosse and Patrick Garcia.

In this list of clashes, for Delacroix (2018), Emmanuel Droit and Franz Reichherzer defended the foundation of a "social science-history" of the present". This defense was intended to give autonomy to the field of historical discipline itself. He also emphasized that in order to think about the history of the present time, the incorporation of the relationship thought by Paul Ricoeur on memory and history was made through the link between ethics and science; as well as the approximation of what Michel Foucault called "ontology of the present".

In the 1980s and 1990s, oral history left a subordinate place and researchers began to perfect their methodology and theoretical support in order to use it in humanities research, for example. The studies done on the present were undertaken by different fields of knowledge that gave it its tonality and named it with different terms. Thus, the clash of how to name the History of the present time was born. We are not interested in this debate, as we understand that this plurality of names is part of its particularity, resulting from its formation, that is, the confluence

of several practices that thought of the present since the first works.

According to Wolikow (1998), the history of the present time in the 1970s was more associated with journalism, for example, they used oral history to build an immediate history. For him, memory had its specificities and oral history made it possible to remove the historian from tyranny from the written document. It also gives you gaps to think about new subjects and research objects. For Wolikow,

La mémoire est productrice de représentations, individuelles et collectives du passé, entretenues par de nombreuses activités commémoratives organisées par les différents groupes sociaux. Les rapports qu'elle entretient avec l'histoire du temps présent sont donc ambivalents. En principe, eles n'ont pas la même relation avec le passé: si l'histoire, en tant que savoir rigoureux, critique et scientifique se donne comme objectif la connaissance du passé la mémoire, elle, reconstitue et reconstruit le passé comme un moyen d'identité individuelle ou collective. Leurs intérêts peuvent coïncider, mais il existe souvent une tension entre eux. (WOLIKOW, 1998, p.16).

We chose to highlight two authors who contributed to the reflection on the writing of history and the relationship between history and memory: Michel de Certeau and Paul Ricoeur. Both thought of the historian's place, the relationship of time, memory with the present and the metier of the one who produced official knowledge about the past.

According to Poirrier (2008), the clarification of the deontological rules of historical discipline gave the possibility to build paths for what he called "the cultural history of the present time". For him, some elements emphasized it: 1 - it was a practice carried out by several generations, thinking, thus, a tradition since the Hellenic historians; 2 - the diversity of choosing the object and the method, as well as its various forms of bricolage, the practice of interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity; 3 - the approximations with sociology and political sciences, specifically with the sociology of culture of the 1960s, whose use of the methodology of oral history was already present.

The fundamental element was its coexistence with the other social sciences, highlighting the pioneerism of French

historiography in cultural studies in relation to other places, incorporating the contributions of other disciplines, but without losing its character of historical knowledge. For Poirrier, *“ces défis obligent l'historien du culturel à rappeler avec force les spécificités de la pratique historique. Sans exclure le raisonnement sociologique, il s'agit de privilégier l'examen des temporalités localisées dans une perspective diachronique”* (2008, p.86).

In this scenario, two themes became relevant: history and memory. Seeking to look at it, they tracked down a regime of truth in order to provide answers on specific questions, for example: How was society able to produce the holocaust? Thus, this field was driven by institutions that held a collective couch and treated their referred nations to the traumas of their recent history. This memory should be thought of for some as “memory duty”, for others “memory activity”.

In 1970, with the Truth and Reconciliation Commissions, the testimony-memory was handled in order to respond and be the proof of humanitarian catastrophes. Therefore, this

traumatic past was being invoked and instrumentalized to open the wounds of this society, trying to cure it. This in order to free it from possible rebirths of such facts, which would lead, in turn, to experience the same chaos, for example, of the Second World War.

For this, themes were dealt with about remembered and forgotten memory, the desire to expose it and its fear, the desire to recover it in order to do justice and the clash of memories that crossed this battlefield. endless. This memorial culture that emerged in the 20th and 21st centuries related celebrations, heritage and identity as a way to sustain and produce memory policies. This nodal question of thinking about the writing of history was at stake in the ethical character of the metier, when it was a recent past. This is especially present when we touch on its transmission within the classroom, whether in elementary or higher education. At that moment, the subjectivities are touched on, both by the historian and the students, with the fact that recently happened, thus providing elements for the public to also place themselves. It is up to the historian to manage his

historiographic arsenal to carry out a non-closed analysis of events, for example, looking at the present elements belonging to a long duration. For Agamben,

Contemporaneity, therefore, is a unique relationship with time itself, which adheres to it and, at the same time, takes distances from it; more precisely, this is the relationship with time that it adheres to through dissociation and anachronism. Those who coincide very much with the era, who adhere perfectly to it in all aspects, are not contemporary because, exactly, for this reason, they cannot see it, they cannot keep their eyes fixed on it. (2009, p.59).

To think about teaching the discipline of history, in its effective action in the present, would be to think about some questions imposed on it “today”. That is why, when looking at the past and thus making an explanation that is not only rationally “scientific”, but also seeks to awaken in the lived world, in the “present”, the ardor of a past that is not entirely dead. However, it still has remnants that were (re) appropriate and (re) meanings over time.

To understand the present would be to put it in relation to the past, to see that temporalities are not separate, past,

present and perspectives for the future are mixed. And, thus, we are able to understand the dramas of memory and forgetfulness, of the social and cultural, of the political and economic. According to Le Goff (1999), the “history of the present time” should be taken in its long duration. We also understand, according to Rémond, that “nowadays the politician concerns everything that touches individual existence: the body, life, birth, death” (1999, p.59).

One way of thinking about the present is to use it as a pedagogical device: the “places of memory”. Using them the teaching of history would be less abstract and more visible through the senses, for example, of those who stepped on their land (of a 19th century mansion) using their body. This enabled them to bring their senses to local things, their political being under construction, thus linking the lived and the studied. This would make it possible to favor students with pleasure, treat historical knowledge, the possibility of deconstructing sacred images and historicizing monuments. According to Delgado and Ferreira, “the teaching of history can be exactly an instrument to

establish clearly the distinctions between memory and history” (2013, p.31).

This way of making historical knowledge more pleasurable, awakening readers beyond academic boundaries, would be based on a perspective that began to be thought of in 1990. Building, furthermore, history lovers who delighted in the works and together with that, understood the message transmitted. After that, seeds began to be planted in the Brazilian population, which increased the improvement and performance of a criticality. This position of some theorists of the teaching practice in history was important to realize “that teaching History is also teaching its method (Segal) and, therefore, accepting the idea that the content cannot be treated in isolation. Less is needed to teach quantities and more to teach how to think (reflect) historically”(NADAI, 1993, p.159).

This historical awareness, built through strategies that foster the relationship between the school and the social, the subjects / subjects with the students' socioeconomic and cultural life, helps us to think about teaching history beyond the school

space. These zones of contact between teaching and history, producing it and living it, require a clear methodological stance from the historian, based on the rules of his profession.

Anyway, the use of the history of the present time in the teaching of history is a double-edged sword. This characteristic imposes on the teacher a greater preparation for his class, where one would run away from traditional themes. We agree with Delgado and Ferreira (2013) that working with memory, in its public and private dimension, is to promote the “citizenship right” of those who are affected.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- AGAMBEN, Giorgio. **O que é o contemporâneo?** E outros ensaios. Chapecó, SC: Argos, 2009.
- CARRETERO, Mário; ROSA, Alberto; GONZALEZ, Maria Fernanda. **Ensino da historia e memoria coletiva.** Tradução Valério Campos. Porto alegre: ARMED, 2007.

CAIMI, Flavia Eloisa. **Conversas e controvérsias**: o ensino de história no Brasil (1980-1998). Passo Fundo: UPF, 2001.

DELACROIX, Christian. A história do tempo presente, uma história (realmente) como as outras? **Tempo e Argumento**, Florianópolis, v.10, n.23, p.39-79, jan/mar, 2018.

DELGADO, Lucilia de Almeida Neves; FERREIRA, Marieta de Moraes. História do tempo presente e ensino de história. **Revista História Hoje**, v.2, n.4, 2013, p.19-34.

DOSSE, François. História do tempo presente e historiografia. **Tempo e Argumento**. Florianópolis, v.4, n.1, p.5-22, jan-jun, 2012.

FONSECA, Selma Guimarães. **Didática e prática de ensino de história**. Rio de Janeiro: Access, 2001.

GONÇALVES, Cécile. Qu'est-ce que l'histoire du temps présent? Tentative de définition. **Estudos do século XX** (Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra), n.11, 2011.

LE GOFF, Jaques; Nora, Pierre (org). **História**: novos problemas. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 1976.

_____. **História e Memória**. São Paulo: Editora da Unicamp, 2013.

NADAI, Elza. O ensino de história do Brasil: trajetória e perspectiva. **Revista Brasileira de História**. São Paulo, v.13, n.25/26, p. 143-162set. 1992/ago. 1993.

NORA, Pierre. Entre Memória e História: a problemática dos lugares. **Projeto História**. São Paulo, n.10, p.07-28, 1993.

POIRRIER, Philippe (dir). **L'histoire culturelle**: un "tournant mondial" dans l'historiographie? Postface de Roger Chartier, Éditions Universitaires de Dijon, 2008.

RÉMOND, Réne (org). **Por uma história política**. Rio de Janeiro, UFRJ/FGV, 1996.

SOULET, Jean-François. **L'histoire immédiate**. PUF, Collection Que-Sais-Je?, n° 2841, 1994.

WOLIKOW, Serge, L'histoire du temps présent en question. **Territoires contemporains**: Bulletin de l'institut d'histoire Contemporaine, n.5, 1998.

Tradução: Assis Daniel Gomes



ZUMÉ

Boletim Eletrônico do Núcleo de Pesquisa e Extensão em História, Filosofia e Patrimônio (NATIMA), Juazeiro do Norte, vol. 2, nº 2, 2020.

ISSN 2675-0201