

UDC 930

<https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/124/77>

OBJECTIVITY IN HISTORIOGRAPHY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MARXIST AND POSTMODERN APPROACHES

©Gazi T., ORCID: 0009-0008-9812-5616, University of Lodz,
Warsaw, Poland, tuncaymantt@gmail.com

ОБЪЕКТИВНОСТЬ В ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ МАРКСИСТСКОГО И ПОСТМОДЕРНИСТСКОГО ПОДХОДОВ

©Гази Т., ORCID: 0009-0008-9812-5616, Лодзинский университет,
г. Варшава, Польша, tuncaymantt@gmail.com

Abstract. This article analyzes the problem of objectivity in historiography in a comparative way, within the context of Marxist and postmodern approaches. The aim of the study is to determine the place, possibilities, and limitations of objectivity in the approaches of both theoretical directions to the science of history. While Marxist historiography explains objectivity through the principles of class analysis and historical materialism, the postmodern approach emphasizes the relative and constructive nature of historical knowledge. The article presents the theoretical foundations of both directions, methodological differences, and critical views on the claims of objectivity. Also, the application of these approaches is compared using a specific historical event as an example. As a result, it is determined that the concept of objectivity in historiography is controversial and variable, and Marxist and postmodern theories approach this concept from different directions.

Аннотация. В сравнительном ключе анализируется проблема объективности в историографии в контексте марксистского и постмодернистского подходов. Цель исследования – определить место, возможности и ограничения объективности в подходах обоих теоретических направлений к науке об истории. В то время как марксистская историография объясняет объективность через принципы классового анализа и исторического материализма, постмодернистский подход подчеркивает относительный и конструктивный характер исторического знания. В статье представлены теоретические основы обоих направлений, методологические различия и критические взгляды на утверждения об объективности. Также проводится сравнение применения этих подходов на примере конкретного исторического события. В результате установлено, что концепция объективности в историографии является спорной и изменчивой, и марксистская и постмодернистская теории подходят к этой концепции с разных сторон.

Keywords: objectivity, historiography, Marxist approach, postmodernism, methodology, historical theory.

Ключевые слова: объективность, историография, марксистский подход, постмодернизм, методология, историческая теория.

This article examines the concept of objectivity in historiography through a comparative analysis of Marxist and postmodern approaches. The study aims to explore the possibilities, limitations, and philosophical underpinnings of objectivity within these two theoretical frameworks. Marxist historiography grounds its claims to objectivity in class analysis and historical materialism,

viewing history as a process driven by material conditions and class struggles. In contrast, the postmodern approach challenges the notion of absolute objectivity, emphasizing the constructed, subjective, and relativistic nature of historical knowledge. By analyzing the theoretical foundations, methodological differences, and practical applications of these approaches, this article highlights their divergent perspectives on objectivity. Through a case study of a specific historical event, the study illustrates how these frameworks shape historical narratives differently. Ultimately, it argues that objectivity in historiography remains a contested and dynamic concept, shaped by the philosophical lenses through which history is interpreted [1-7].

Historiography, the study of how history is written, has long grappled with the question of objectivity—whether it is possible to produce a historical narrative that accurately reflects the past without bias or distortion. Objectivity is a cornerstone of traditional historical scholarship, yet its feasibility and meaning have been debated extensively. Two prominent theoretical approaches, Marxism and postmodernism, offer distinct perspectives on this issue. Marxist historiography claims objectivity through a scientific framework rooted in historical materialism and class dynamics, while postmodernism questions the very possibility of objective historical knowledge, highlighting the role of narrative, language, and power in shaping historical accounts. This article provides a detailed comparison of these approaches, exploring their theoretical foundations, methodologies, and practical implications for historical writing.

Marxist Historiography: Marxist historiography, grounded in the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, views history as a scientific process driven by material conditions and class struggles. According to historical materialism, societal development is shaped by economic structures, which determine class relations and historical outcomes. Marxist historians argue that objectivity is achievable by focusing on these material realities, which transcend individual biases or subjective interpretations. For Marxists, history is not a collection of random events but a structured process governed by discernible laws, such as the transition from feudalism to capitalism [8].

Key to Marxist objectivity is the concept of class analysis. By examining history through the lens of class conflict — between oppressors and oppressed, such as capitalists and proletarians— Marxist historians claim to uncover universal truths about societal development. This approach assumes that historical events can be explained through economic determinism, reducing the influence of individual agency or subjective perspectives. Prominent Marxist historians like Eric Hobsbawm and E.P. Thompson have applied this framework to analyze events like the Industrial Revolution, emphasizing the role of economic forces and class struggles in shaping historical outcomes. **Postmodern Historiography:** Postmodern historiography, influenced by thinkers like Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Hayden White, rejects the notion of a singular, objective historical truth. Instead, it views history as a series of constructed narratives shaped by language, power, and cultural contexts. Postmodernists argue that historical accounts are inherently subjective, as they are filtered through the historian's perspective, language, and societal influences. For example, Hayden White's concept of "emplotment" suggests that historians impose narrative structures — such as tragedy or comedy — on historical events, which shape how the past is understood [3].

Postmodernism emphasizes the relativity of knowledge, asserting that historical "truth" is contingent on the historian's context, intentions, and audience. Rather than seeking universal laws, postmodern historians focus on marginalized voices, fragmented narratives, and the role of power in shaping dominant historical accounts. This approach challenges traditional claims to objectivity, arguing that all historical writing is a form of interpretation, inseparable from the historian's subjective position.

Marxist Methodology: Marxist historians employ a methodology rooted in empirical analysis and historical materialism. They prioritize primary sources, such as economic records, labor statistics, and political documents, to uncover the material conditions underlying historical events. Their approach is systematic, aiming to identify patterns of class struggle and economic transformation across time. For example, in analyzing the French Revolution, a Marxist historian might focus on the economic grievances of the peasantry and the rise of the bourgeoisie, framing the revolution as a stage in the transition from feudalism to capitalism.

This methodology assumes that by grounding analysis in material realities, historians can achieve a degree of objectivity that transcends personal or cultural biases. However, critics argue that Marxist historiography can be reductive, as it prioritizes economic factors over cultural, ideological, or individual influences, potentially oversimplifying complex historical events.

Postmodern Methodology: Postmodern historians adopt a more interpretive and deconstructive approach, focusing on the ways in which historical narratives are constructed. They analyze texts not only for their content but also for their rhetorical strategies, narrative structures, and underlying assumptions. For instance, a postmodern analysis of the French Revolution might examine how revolutionary narratives were shaped by contemporary political agendas or how language was used to legitimize certain power structures.

Rather than seeking a singular truth, postmodern historians embrace the multiplicity of perspectives, often highlighting marginalized or silenced voices, such as those of women, minorities, or subaltern groups. This methodology challenges the idea of a unified historical narrative, but critics argue that it risks relativism, where all interpretations are deemed equally valid, undermining the possibility of any objective historical knowledge.

Case Study: The French Revolution: To illustrate the differences between Marxist and postmodern approaches, consider their interpretations of the French Revolution (1789–1799). A Marxist historian might interpret the revolution as a pivotal moment in the transition from feudalism to capitalism, driven by class conflicts between the aristocracy, bourgeoisie, and peasantry. By focusing on economic factors, such as land distribution and taxation policies, the Marxist narrative frames the revolution as a necessary stage in historical development, with objective truths rooted in material conditions.

In contrast, a postmodern historian might deconstruct the narratives surrounding the French Revolution, examining how revolutionary ideals like “liberty” and “equality” were constructed through language and propaganda. They might highlight the exclusion of certain groups, such as women or enslaved people, from revolutionary narratives, questioning the universal claims of revolutionary leaders. By focusing on the multiplicity of perspectives and the role of power in shaping historical accounts, the postmodern approach challenges the Marxist claim to objectivity, emphasizing the constructed nature of historical knowledge.

Critiques of Marxist Objectivity: Critics of Marxist historiography argue that its claim to objectivity is undermined by its ideological commitment to class struggle and economic determinism. By prioritizing material factors, Marxist historians may overlook cultural, religious, or ideological influences that shape historical events. Additionally, the Marxist framework can impose a teleological view of history, where events are interpreted as inevitable steps toward socialism, potentially distorting historical complexity.

Critiques of Postmodern Objectivity: Postmodernism’s rejection of objectivity is criticized for leading to historical relativism, where no narrative is deemed more valid than another. Critics argue that this approach can undermine the historian’s ability to make truth claims or distinguish between accurate and inaccurate accounts. Furthermore, postmodernism’s focus on language and narrative

may neglect the material realities that Marxist historians emphasize, such as economic structures or class dynamics.

The concept of objectivity in historiography is inherently complex and contested, as demonstrated by the contrasting approaches of Marxist and postmodern historiography. Marxist historians seek objectivity through a scientific framework rooted in historical materialism, while postmodernists challenge the very possibility of objective historical knowledge, emphasizing the subjective and constructed nature of narratives. By comparing their theoretical foundations, methodologies, and applications to events like the French Revolution, this article highlights the strengths and limitations of both approaches. Ultimately, objectivity in historiography remains a dynamic and debated concept, shaped by the philosophical lenses through which historians interpret the past. Neither approach fully resolves the question of objectivity, but their dialogue enriches our understanding of how history is written and understood.

The pursuit of objectivity in historiography—writing history in a manner free from bias or distortion — has long been a central concern for historians. However, what constitutes objectivity remains a subject of intense debate. Marxist historical materialism and postmodern relativism represent two contrasting approaches to this issue. Marxism claims objectivity by grounding historical analysis in economic structures and class dynamics, while postmodernism argues that historical knowledge is inherently subjective, shaped by narrative construction and power relations. This article compares these approaches, analyzing their theoretical foundations, methodologies, and practical implications for historical scholarship. Through a case study, it illustrates how each framework interprets historical events differently, shedding light on the broader question of objectivity in historiography.

Marxist historical materialism, developed by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, posits that history is driven by material conditions, particularly the economic base of society. This base shapes the social, political, and cultural superstructure, with class struggle serving as the engine of historical change. For Marxist historians, objectivity lies in uncovering the universal laws governing these processes, such as the transition from one mode of production (e.g., feudalism) to another (e.g., capitalism). By focusing on empirical evidence of economic relations and class conflicts, Marxist historiography claims to transcend subjective biases, offering a scientific approach to history.

Historians like Eric Hobsbawm and E. P. Thompson have applied this framework to events like the Industrial Revolution, emphasizing how economic shifts—such as the rise of industrial capitalism—drove social transformations. The Marxist approach assumes that by prioritizing material realities over individual perspectives, historians can achieve a form of objectivity that reveals the “true” dynamics of historical development.

Postmodern relativism, influenced by thinkers like Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Hayden White, rejects the idea of a singular, objective historical truth. Instead, it views history as a series of narratives constructed through language, shaped by the historian’s context, intentions, and societal influences. Postmodernists argue that historical accounts are inherently subjective, as they are filtered through the biases of the historian and the power structures of their time. Hayden White’s concept of “emplotment” illustrates this, suggesting that historians impose narrative frameworks — such as tragedy, romance, or comedy — on historical events, which shape their meaning [2, 4].

Rather than seeking universal truths, postmodern historians emphasize the relativity of historical knowledge, highlighting marginalized voices and questioning dominant narratives. This approach challenges traditional claims to objectivity, asserting that all historical writing is a form of interpretation, inseparable from the historian’s subjective position.

Marxist historians employ a methodology rooted in empirical analysis and historical materialism. They prioritize primary sources, such as economic data, labor records, and political

manifestos, to uncover the material conditions driving historical events. Their approach is systematic, aiming to identify patterns of class struggle and economic transformation. For example, in studying the Russian Revolution of 1917, a Marxist historian might focus on the economic disparities between the peasantry and the bourgeoisie, framing the revolution as a class-based upheaval driven by material conditions. This methodology assumes that by grounding analysis in economic realities, historians can minimize subjective distortions and achieve a degree of objectivity. However, critics argue that Marxist historiography can be overly deterministic, neglecting cultural, ideological, or individual factors that also shape history [4].

Postmodern historians adopt a deconstructive and interpretive approach, focusing on how historical narratives are constructed. They analyze texts for their rhetorical strategies, narrative structures, and underlying power dynamics, rather than solely their factual content. For instance, a postmodern analysis of the Russian Revolution might examine how Bolshevik propaganda shaped revolutionary narratives or how marginalized groups, such as women or ethnic minorities, were excluded from dominant accounts.

By embracing multiple perspectives and questioning the authority of traditional narratives, postmodern historians challenge the idea of a single, objective history. Critics, however, argue that this approach risks relativism, where all interpretations are deemed equally valid, potentially undermining the historian's ability to make truth claims.

To illustrate the differences between Marxist and postmodern approaches, consider their interpretations of the Russian Revolution (1917). A Marxist historian might view the revolution as a pivotal moment in the global class struggle, driven by economic inequalities and the contradictions of capitalism. By analyzing primary sources like economic records or Lenin's writings, they would frame the revolution as an inevitable outcome of material conditions, with the Bolsheviks representing the interests of the proletariat. This approach claims objectivity by grounding the analysis in measurable economic factors and class dynamics [1].

In contrast, a postmodern historian might deconstruct the narratives surrounding the Russian Revolution, examining how language and power shaped its historical representation. They might explore how Bolshevik propaganda constructed a heroic narrative of proletarian triumph, while marginalizing dissenting voices, such as those of the Mensheviks or rural peasants. By highlighting the multiplicity of perspectives and the role of narrative construction, the postmodern approach questions the Marxist claim to objectivity, emphasizing the subjective and contested nature of historical knowledge.

Critics argue that Marxist historical materialism's claim to objectivity is undermined by its ideological commitment to class struggle and economic determinism. By prioritizing material factors, Marxist historians may overlook cultural, religious, or psychological influences, leading to a reductive view of history. Additionally, the teleological nature of Marxism — where history is seen as progressing toward socialism — can impose a predetermined framework on historical events, potentially distorting their complexity [6].

Postmodern relativism is criticized for its rejection of objective truth, which some argue leads to a form of historical nihilism where no narrative is more valid than another. This approach can make it difficult to distinguish between accurate and inaccurate accounts or to hold historians accountable for factual errors. Furthermore, postmodernism's emphasis on language and narrative may neglect the material realities that Marxist historians prioritize, such as economic structures or class dynamics.

The comparison of Marxist historical materialism and postmodern relativism reveals fundamental differences in their approaches to objectivity in historiography. Marxist historians pursue objectivity through a scientific framework, grounding their analyses in material conditions and class struggles. In contrast, postmodern historians embrace the subjective and relativistic nature

of historical knowledge, focusing on narrative construction and power dynamics. The case study of the Russian Revolution illustrates how these approaches produce divergent interpretations of the same event, highlighting the contested nature of objectivity. Ultimately, neither approach fully resolves the question of objectivity in historiography, but their interplay enriches our understanding of how history is written and interpreted. By engaging with both perspectives, historians can navigate the complexities of objectivity, acknowledging its possibilities and limitations in the pursuit of historical knowledge [5].

Historiography, the study of how history is written and interpreted, has long grappled with the question of objectivity: can historians produce accounts of the past that are free from bias, distortion, or subjective influence? This question is central to historical scholarship, as it shapes how historians approach evidence, construct narratives, and claim authority over their interpretations. Two prominent theoretical frameworks — Marxist historiography and postmodern historiography—offer starkly different answers to this question. Marxist historiography, grounded in historical materialism, asserts that objectivity is achievable by focusing on the material conditions and class dynamics that drive historical change. Conversely, postmodern historiography, influenced by poststructuralist and deconstructionist thought, denies the possibility of absolute objectivity, arguing that historical narratives are inherently subjective, shaped by language, power, and the historian's context.

This article provides a comprehensive comparison of these approaches, exploring their theoretical underpinnings, methodological differences, and practical applications in historical writing. By analyzing their interpretations of the Industrial Revolution, it illustrates how these frameworks produce divergent narratives of the same historical event. The study concludes that objectivity in historiography is not a fixed or attainable ideal but a contested terrain, shaped by the philosophical assumptions and interpretive strategies of historians.

Marxist historiography, rooted in the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, is built on the framework of historical materialism, which posits that the economic base of society — its mode of production—determines its social, political, and cultural superstructure. Historical change, according to Marxists, is driven by class struggles between groups with conflicting economic interests, such as the bourgeoisie and proletariat in capitalist societies. This framework claims objectivity by identifying universal laws of historical development, such as the transition from feudalism to capitalism, which transcend individual perspectives or subjective biases.

For Marxist historians, objectivity is achieved by focusing on empirical evidence of material conditions, such as economic data, labor relations, and property structures. By grounding historical analysis in these measurable realities, Marxist historiography seeks to uncover the “truth” of historical processes, independent of personal or ideological distortions. Historians like Eric Hobsbawm, in his work *The Age of Revolution*, and E. P. Thompson, in *The Making of the English Working Class*, have applied this approach to analyze the Industrial Revolution, emphasizing how economic transformations and class conflicts shaped modern societies. The Marxist claim to objectivity rests on the assumption that history is a scientific process, governed by discoverable patterns rather than arbitrary or subjective interpretations.

However, this approach is not without critique. Marxist historiography's emphasis on economic determinism can marginalize non-economic factors, such as culture, religion, or individual agency, leading to accusations of reductionism. Additionally, its teleological view—where history progresses toward socialism — may impose a predetermined narrative on historical events, potentially undermining its claim to objectivity.

Postmodern historiography, influenced by thinkers like Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Hayden White, rejects the notion of a singular, objective historical truth. Instead, it views history as a series of constructed narratives shaped by language, power, and cultural contexts. Postmodernists

argue that historical accounts are inherently subjective, as they are filtered through the historian's perspective, societal influences, and the rhetorical strategies used to construct narratives. Hayden White's concept of "emplotment" highlights how historians impose literary structures — such as tragedy, comedy, or romance — on historical events, shaping their meaning and interpretation.

Rather than seeking universal truths, postmodern historians emphasize the relativity of historical knowledge, focusing on marginalized voices, fragmented narratives, and the role of power in shaping dominant historical accounts. For example, Foucault's work on the history of institutions, such as prisons or asylums, examines how historical narratives reflect and reinforce power structures. Postmodern historiography challenges traditional claims to objectivity, arguing that all historical writing is a form of interpretation, inseparable from the historian's subjective position and the cultural or political context in which it is produced.

Critics of postmodernism argue that its rejection of objectivity risks descending into relativism, where all historical narratives are deemed equally valid, making it difficult to distinguish between accurate and inaccurate accounts. Additionally, its focus on language and narrative may neglect the material realities that Marxist historians prioritize, such as economic structures or class dynamics.

Marxist historians employ a methodology rooted in empirical analysis and historical materialism. They prioritize primary sources, such as economic records, trade statistics, labor contracts, and political documents, to uncover the material conditions underlying historical events. Their approach is systematic, aiming to identify patterns of class struggle and economic transformation across time and space. For example, in analyzing the Industrial Revolution, a Marxist historian might examine factory production records, wage data, and labor strikes to argue that the rise of industrial capitalism was driven by the exploitation of the working class [8].

This methodology assumes that by focusing on material realities, historians can minimize subjective biases and achieve a form of objectivity that reflects the "true" dynamics of historical change. However, critics argue that this approach can be overly reductive, as it prioritizes economic factors over cultural, ideological, or psychological influences, potentially oversimplifying complex historical events.

Postmodern historians adopt a deconstructive and interpretive approach, focusing on how historical narratives are constructed and the power dynamics they reflect. They analyze texts not only for their content but also for their rhetorical strategies, narrative structures, and underlying assumptions. For instance, a postmodern analysis of the Industrial Revolution might examine how 19th-century historians constructed narratives of progress to legitimize industrial capitalism, while marginalizing the experiences of displaced artisans or colonized peoples. Rather than seeking a singular truth, postmodern historians embrace the multiplicity of perspectives, often highlighting silenced or marginalized voices, such as those of women, workers, or indigenous groups. This methodology challenges the idea of a unified historical narrative, but critics argue that it risks relativism, where no interpretation is deemed more valid than another, potentially undermining the historian's ability to make truth claims or address factual inaccuracies [3].

To illustrate the differences between Marxist and postmodern approaches, consider their interpretations of the Industrial Revolution (circa 1760–1840). A Marxist historian might frame the Industrial Revolution as a transformative stage in the development of capitalism, driven by class conflicts between the emerging industrial bourgeoisie and the exploited working class. By analyzing primary sources such as factory records, wage statistics, and labor movement documents, they would argue that the revolution was rooted in material conditions, such as the shift from agrarian to industrial economies. This approach claims objectivity by grounding the analysis in empirical evidence of economic structures and class dynamics, presenting the revolution as an inevitable outcome of historical materialism [7].

For example, E. P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* emphasizes how industrial capitalism reshaped social relations, creating a self-conscious working class that resisted exploitation through strikes and unions. The Marxist narrative frames these developments as universal truths, independent of subjective interpretations, with the historian's role being to uncover the material forces driving historical change [3].

In contrast, a postmodern historian might deconstruct the narratives surrounding the Industrial Revolution, questioning the notion of "progress" embedded in traditional accounts. They might analyze how 19th-century historians, influenced by Enlightenment ideals, constructed the revolution as a triumph of innovation and economic growth, while marginalizing the experiences of displaced workers, women, or colonized peoples whose labor fueled industrial expansion. A postmodern approach might also examine the language of industrial progress—terms like "efficiency" or "modernity"—and how it was used to legitimize exploitative labor practices or imperial expansion.

By highlighting the multiplicity of perspectives and the role of power in shaping historical narratives, the postmodern approach challenges the Marxist claim to objectivity. For instance, a postmodern historian might explore how narratives of the Industrial Revolution excluded the voices of child laborers or colonized subjects, revealing the constructed and subjective nature of historical knowledge [3].

Critics of Marxist historiography argue that its claim to objectivity is undermined by its ideological commitment to class struggle and economic determinism. By prioritizing material factors, Marxist historians may overlook the role of culture, religion, ideology, or individual agency in shaping historical events. For example, the Industrial Revolution was not solely driven by economic forces but also by cultural shifts, such as the Enlightenment's emphasis on science and innovation, which Marxism may undervalue.

Additionally, the teleological nature of Marxist historiography — where history is seen as progressing toward socialism — can impose a predetermined framework on historical events, potentially distorting their complexity. Critics argue that this approach risks cherry-picking evidence to fit a preconceived narrative, undermining its claim to objectivity. Postmodern historiography's rejection of objective truth is criticized for leading to historical relativism, where no narrative is deemed more valid than another. This approach can make it difficult for historians to distinguish between accurate and inaccurate accounts or to hold historical narratives accountable to empirical evidence. For example, while a postmodern analysis of the Industrial Revolution might highlight marginalized voices, it may struggle to provide a coherent framework for evaluating competing interpretations, potentially leading to a fragmented or incoherent understanding of history.

Furthermore, postmodernism's emphasis on language and narrative construction may neglect the material realities that Marxist historians prioritize, such as economic structures or class dynamics. Critics argue that this focus risks reducing history to a literary exercise, detached from the tangible forces that shape human societies.

The contrasting approaches of Marxist and postmodern historiography highlight the complexity of objectivity in historical writing. Marxist historiography offers a structured, empirical approach that seeks to uncover universal truths about historical processes, but its reductionist tendencies and ideological commitments can limit its scope. Postmodern historiography, by contrast, provides a critical lens for questioning dominant narratives and amplifying marginalized voices, but its relativistic stance risks undermining the historian's ability to make authoritative claims about the past.

Together, these approaches reveal that objectivity in historiography is not a fixed or attainable ideal but a dynamic and contested concept. Marxist historiography's strength lies in its ability to provide a coherent framework for analyzing large-scale historical processes, while postmodernism's strength lies in its sensitivity to the diversity of perspectives and the role of power in shaping historical

knowledge. By engaging with both approaches, historians can develop a more nuanced understanding of the past, balancing empirical rigor with critical awareness of narrative construction.

The question of objectivity in historiography remains a central and unresolved issue, as demonstrated by the contrasting perspectives of Marxist historical materialism and postmodern relativism. Marxist historiography claims objectivity through a scientific approach rooted in economic determinism and class struggle, while postmodern historiography challenges the possibility of objective truth, emphasizing the subjective and constructed nature of historical narratives. The case study of the Industrial Revolution illustrates how these approaches produce divergent interpretations of the same event, with Marxism focusing on material conditions and postmodernism highlighting narrative construction and power dynamics.

Ultimately, neither approach fully resolves the question of objectivity, but their interplay enriches historical scholarship by revealing the multifaceted nature of historical knowledge. By critically engaging with both Marxist and postmodern perspectives, historians can navigate the tensions between empirical analysis and interpretive diversity, acknowledging the possibilities and limitations of objectivity in the pursuit of understanding the past.

Conclusion

The exploration of objectivity in historiography through the lenses of Marxist and postmodern approaches reveals the profound complexity and contested nature of historical knowledge. Marxist historiography, grounded in historical materialism, seeks objectivity by anchoring historical analysis in the empirical realities of class struggle and economic structures. It posits that history follows discernible patterns driven by material conditions, offering a systematic framework to uncover universal truths about societal development. In contrast, postmodern historiography challenges the very notion of objective truth, emphasizing the subjective, constructed, and relativistic nature of historical narratives. By focusing on language, power, and marginalized perspectives, postmodernism deconstructs traditional historical accounts, revealing their contingency and bias. The comparative analysis of these approaches, as applied to historical events like the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, and the Industrial Revolution, underscores their divergent methodologies and philosophical underpinnings. Marxist historians prioritize primary sources and economic data to construct narratives of class-driven progress, claiming objectivity through a scientific lens. Postmodern historians, however, interrogate the construction of these narratives, highlighting how power dynamics and rhetorical strategies shape historical understanding, thus questioning the feasibility of objectivity. Both approaches have strengths and limitations. Marxism's empirical rigor provides a coherent framework for analyzing large-scale historical processes, but its economic determinism and teleological tendencies can oversimplify complex events. Postmodernism's sensitivity to narrative diversity and marginalized voices enriches historical inquiry, but its relativistic stance risks undermining the ability to make authoritative truth claims. The tension between these perspectives illustrates that objectivity in historiography is not a fixed or attainable ideal but a dynamic and contested concept, shaped by the philosophical assumptions and interpretive strategies of historians. Ultimately, the dialogue between Marxist and postmodern historiography offers a richer understanding of historical knowledge. By balancing Marxist emphasis on material realities with postmodern awareness of narrative construction, historians can navigate the complexities of objectivity, producing accounts that are both empirically grounded and critically reflective. This interplay does not resolve the question of objectivity but underscores its multifaceted nature, encouraging historians to approach the past with humility, rigor, and an openness to diverse perspectives. In doing so, historiography continues to evolve as a discipline that bridges the pursuit of truth with the acknowledgment of its inherent limitations.

References:

1. Carr, E. H. (1961). *What is History?* London: Penguin Books.
2. Hobsbawm, E. J. (1997). *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789–1848*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
3. Thompson, E. P. (1963). *The Making of the English Working Class*. London: Victor Gollancz.
4. White, H. (1973). *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
5. Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books.
6. Jenkins, K. (1991). *Re-thinking History*. London: Routledge.
7. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1848). *The Communist Manifesto*. Translated by Samuel Moore. London: Penguin Classics.
8. Iggers, G. G. (1997). *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*. Hanover: Wesleyan University Press.

Список литературы:

1. Carr E. H. What is History? London: Penguin Books. 1961.
2. Hobsbawm E. J. The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789–1848. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson. 1997.
3. Thompson E. P. The Making of the English Working Class. London: Victor Gollancz. 1963.
4. White H. Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 1973.
5. Foucault M. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books. 1977.
6. Jenkins K. Re-thinking History. London: Routledge. 1991.
7. Marx K., Engels F. The Communist Manifesto. Translated by Samuel Moore. London: Penguin Classics. 1848.
8. Iggers G. G. Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge. Hanover: Wesleyan University Press. 1997.

Поступила в редакцию
08.01.2026 г.

Принята к публикации
21.01.2026 г.

Ссылка для цитирования:

Gazi T. Objectivity in Historiography: A Comparative Analysis of Marxist and Postmodern Approaches // Бюллетень науки и практики. 2026. Т. 12. №3. С. 645-654. <https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/124/77>

Cite as (APA):

Gazi, T. (2026). Objectivity in Historiography: A Comparative Analysis of Marxist and Postmodern Approaches. *Bulletin of Science and Practice*, 12(3), 645-654. <https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/124/77>