

True History versus New History

—A Brief Discussion on the Position of Buddhism
in History Based on *The Agama Sutras*

Tsai Lichen

Research Fellow,
Buddhist Institute of True Enlightenment

Abstract

The new history is a general mark for the historiographical society to challenge the old history. Under the continuous development of new historiography, gradually, the new historiography has become the target challenged by the newer historiographical theories. Therefore, in the slogan of new history, the new historiography marches toward postmodernism step by step, overturns all theoretical bases of historiography, and makes historiography face the predicament of “the death of history.”

The challenge from postmodernism reveals a common defect of new and old historiographical theories, i.e., lack of theoretical basis and consistency on the basic questions about “What is history?”, “What function can history have?”, “What is the scope of the subject of history?”, etc. However, the historiography of postmodernism neither solves the basic questions nor discovers the fact that its defect does not differ from that of other new historiographies; on the contrary, it continuously goes forward according to the original wrong base and direction of new and old historiographies, and thus results in the predicament of “the death of history.” This article finds both new and old historiographies are wrong, false historiographies because they are all based on the wrong start and end points of logic.

The article tries to further explore the basic questions of historiography and fundamentally corrects the common defect of new and old historiographies so that the historiography can become alive again and marches toward the stage of the true history. This article discovers that both new and old historiographies confuse the definition of history with that of historical book, and wrongly claim that history only has the past character, neglecting it in fact having the present and future character at the same time.

The argument between new and old historians about the scope of historical subject is only the argument for the minority or majority of human beings; both historians do not correctly recognize