however, cannot provide for their definitive reconciliation and final disappearance.

In the process of clarification we discover that time plays a twofold part: It gives birth to history in its "original" and its "derivative" aspects. On the one hand, it seems as though Chronos, the God of Time, has gone through history leaving the past behind "timeless and dead". He has chosen the one reality from the many possibilities, making his decision final and irrevocable. On the other hand, future generations continue to reinterpret what has preceded. The future throws its shadow on that timeless and dead material, entering into the past, shaping and reshaping its face. Thus, even what was, is still becoming, each generation attempting to remould its historical heritage nearer to its own "heart's desire". The irreconcilable antinomy arises between the subjectivistic conception of history as a "fable convenue" (Napoleon) and the objectivistic approach towards history as the narrative of "wie es eigentlich gewesen" (Ranke).

Another conflict grows out of the desire of each age to consider itself its own fulfilment. It requests, to use again Ranke's expression, "direct access to God", rejecting to serve as a means for some ulterior purpose. On the one hand, this desire motivates the impressionistic and positivistic historians to emphasize the detail at the expense of the great trends, tendencies, and interdependencies. Methodologically there is no difference between the good old politico-diplomatic historiography and the so-called New History with its emphasis upon the economic, social, and cultural detail. On the other hand, the quest for immediacy and immanence tends to degenerate into a pragmatic irrationalism as witnessed in the ideologies of fascism, futurism, and nihilism. As the present takes on paramount importance, the future and the past are deprecated and finally forgotten. History ceases to exist in the face of the fulness of the moment. And yet, inspite of this all-pervading drive to hold on to the fleeting hour, we experience the equally strong urge to subordinate each event and each stage to what man would like to see as a meaningful whole, and to consider the present as the means to some future end. Unfortunately, both conceptions are too well grounded to be discarded and too far apart to be easily reconciled. The only "synthesis" we are able to suggest is to retain both views and to recognize their limited value. To us, therefore, history would be a process in which each period is at once episode and epoch. And yet to acknowledge this tragic tension which seems so typical of history is an ordeal almost beyond human endurance.

To give further proof for the antagonistic nature of history, it is necessary to illuminate the relationship of cultural values. Here too we cannot overlook the fact that so frequently values are contradictory and mutually exclusive. In history as in all other spheres of life the creative