

CONFLICT OF HISTORY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CONFLICT, CONVERGENCE AND CONSERVATION

Bain

Department of History, Faculty of Social Sciences, Semarang State University

ABSTRACT

Intelligence and social wisdom mark such a long dialogue between historians and social sciences experts in the 19th century. Since its appearance, social sciences has a unique relationship with history. The pioneer of the social sciences in the 18th century not only have the most extensive knowledge of history, but also a reliable history of the reviewer. However, since its appearance in the 19th century, social sciences is growing very rapidly, forcing the historians do the reforms, especially in terms of data and methodology. The great and very influential historians in the 19th century is Ranke who develop political history. Ranke and other political historians reject the concepts and methods of the experts of the social sciences. Instead of the time the expert social sciences also opposed the work of historians. Development leading to convergence occurred in the 20th century, mainly due to the study of the social sciences expert to the past and the occurrence of major changes in the disciplines of political history of social history to receive and utilize both theories social.

Keywords: social science, political history, and social history

INTRODUCTION

The values of social conservation are based on 2 (two) pillars. They are social intelligence and social wisdom. Social intelligence consists of empathy, intelligence, innovative, resilient and cooperation values. Social wisdom consists of wisdom, honesty, caring, solidarity, responsibility, justice, and love values (Dening, 2015: 1). The values of social intelligence and social wisdom are so visible in a very long dialogue between historians and social sciences experts. Though they are controversial opinions, principles and concepts, they also, in some ways, cooperate in something that are needed and needed each other. They discard the old values that are considered to be no longer useful. They conserve the old values that are still useful and discover new values until both the history and social sciences find their form as they appear today.

Historians and social sciences are not always the most good colleagues. They be partners because in some ways they are both looking at society as a whole. Historians and experts of social sciences is almost impossible to escape from the interplay between each other. Historians are working on a specific area usually as a unique complexity, but the things that are considered unique by the historian is not unique because there are also in other places. Meanwhile, experts of social sciences show their lack of interest in the context of time. The communities they studied is not just appeared at that time or merely the result of social changes that often they discussed, but rather is the result of a long process of development.

Thus, historians and the social science experts sciences should have a collegial relationship of mutual respect. Ironically, each party tend to view others as stereotypes. Some historians, particularly in Europe, view scientists - social sciences as the experts who assess people who obviously distorted, like jargon and less take into account the context of place and time, and insert individuals into certain categories and ignore other individuals. Conversely, some scientists - social science sees the historian's work as an accumulation of facts without a system or a particular method and not able to analyze the data accurately. So, although they can complement each other but they still do not have the same language. Their dialogue, as stated by the French historian, Braudel, is a mute dialogue (Braudel, 1980: 64).

The difference in these two disciplines in full must be seen as a profession and subculture differences, such as differences in language, values and mentality or way of thinking and socialization. The experts of social sciences for example ordinary formulate general laws and often ignore the small things. While historians studying trends in concrete is an extension of the general patterns (Dening, 1973: 673). From that perspective it appears that the relationship between the social sciences and history is not to be deterministic. Theoretically, some scientists - social sciences seen as a historian when they tell political history like what is Von Ranke did in the 19th century that still has influence.

However some historians still regard the social sciences as a science that do generalization without systematic empirical research, and conversely, the experts of social sciences sees the historians as a scien-