How should historians study causes in history? Writer said they should select causes and bring them to future. Firstly, he said historians must study through multiplication and simplification of causes. Studying history is studying causes because just the past event except causes explains nothing. And they study through multiplication of causes because every event has several causes and hierarchy of causes. And he said history can advance with simplification because he thought Poincare’s saying 'science was advancing simultaneously towards both variety and simplicity’ is true of history like science. Secondly, he said there are two traps historians should avoid. One is ‘determinism’. Of course, human action is determined by ascertainable causes. For example, Kafka's novel lies in the fact that nothing has apparent or ascertainable cause, leads to total disintegration of the human personality. History is same as human action, since investigating these causes is historians’ function. However, they do not reject free will, since it is a condition of social life that adult has moral responsibility of free will. Also, nothing in history is inevitable to them. Because historians do not consider event inevitable but ‘extremely probable’, discussing alternative courses. Another to avoid is ‘accident’. Rational causes broaden and deepen our understanding, since they are potentially applicable to other situations, lead to fruitful generalizations, and lessons can be learned. However, accidental cause, just merely accelerate or retard, not alter result. Also, historian can do nothing with it, since it is not amenable to rational interpretation, has no meaning either for past or present. For instance of Cleopatra's nose, it makes no sense as a general proposition that defeat of battle is attributed to infatuation of someone. Therefore so-called ‘accident’ in history is clashing with which historians are primarily concerned to investigate. Lastly, he said good historians have future in their bone. Because interest in the past and the future are interconnected. It is because both periods are in same time-span, since present has no more than imaginary line between them.

Clarity: Keyword of my text is ‘causes’. Although both are not justified in text, ‘causes’ does not make some confusion or ambiguity. Relatedness: Main problem is ‘the way how historians should study causes in history’, and I think almost of contents are related with main problem, but the part ‘historians have future in their bone…’ is quite separated because it talks about ‘future’, not ‘causes in history’. Validness: I think my main assertion is valid by reasons. Rightness: I think the reason ‘he thought Poincare’s saying 'science was advancing simultaneously towards both variety and simplicity’ is true of history.’ is not intuitively connected to assertion ‘history can advance with simplification’. Because the reason is kind of assumption that both science and history advance in same way. And the reason of ‘accidental cause, just merely accelerate or retard, not alter result.’ is not enough to introduce example of Cleopatra’s nose.

Width and depth: depth of assertion that accidental causes should be avoided is too shallow because its reason part has only example that shows accidental cause make no sense as a general proposition.