

Essay on oregon history

[Literature](#), [Biography](#)



Looking at the nature of autography, a person writes it analyzing oneself in a historical account of him/her. In simple terms, one writes about him or herself and gives this information to others to read. Autobiographies are one of the best sources of historical data, a statement that I will critically analyze in this paper.

On support of autography as a source of historical data, one of the reasons making it a reliable source of information is the writer. One can write very crucial information about oneself regardless of the implication on the society. This is well illustrated in the just read autograph in which the author explains too vividly on one self making the whole account very sufficient with quantitative data. Looking at Oregon's history, autobiographies of several key people in the community of concern serves a very vital role in writing of the community's history. They (autobiographies) provide the compiler or history writer with much sufficient information such that the writer chooses what to write making him/her to have flexibility in writing.

The second factor that makes autography a reliable source of history is the chronological accountability of information. By this I mean that an autograph gives a heavily detailed account which is logically compiled from the oldest piece of information to the newest. This arrangement produces a historical aspect in the work itself. Supporting this from the sources, I can personally claim that the autograph I have read and others I have read before all follow this structure of a chronological sequencing arrangement.

Closely related to the second factor highlighted is the amount of details contained in autographs. From a general perspective, biographies are less quantitative compared to autography. This makes the latter to be much

favorable for historical use compared to the biography. This point is well illustrated by the information obtained from the book on Oregon history. One of the aspects making books better is the actual organization of the information. A book is a biography which requires the author to closely read the autographs of the person or community under study, comprehend and then contextualize on what to write. This in the overall aspect makes the book to contain fine details that the author thinks and finds best for the target audience.

A book also requires some preliminary research before writing. This results in a further reading by the author so as to know what to read. This in turn produces more general and precise background information on the subject matter than autography.

Since a biographer writes from history, he/she is much immune from local influence of the subject study. This results in work which is less biased since no local influence plays any role. Compared to autographs, biographies are better in bias immunity giving them a better hand history which should be as free from bias as possible. Supporting this from the Oregon history, I can claim that the book analyses the autographs of the best historical figures in the community history and then writes biographies. This means that biographies still hold a very vital role in the book compared to autography. Critically analyzing the Oregon history, autography plays a very critical role in depicting the reality about the community and its history. This is well explained in the selected biographies covered in the book. However looking into the book deeper, the author plays a very important role of re-contextualizing the whole content of the autobiographies, finding their

common views and their differences and then writing a harmonized piece of work about the community. This illuminates on the use of biography in history.

Closely reflecting on autobiography and books (most of which contain biographical data), the two appear to carry almost equal weight in history. Autobiographies appear to be much confined to an individual making them much prone to bias. This is because they communicate what a person thinks about himself or his tribe of community. Taking into account that some people have big egos and think too highly of themselves, one can find my basis of argument in which I claim that autobiography is not adequate on their own.

The main aspect that gives books an upper hand is the re-contextualization aspect and lack of bias. This is mainly due to the fact that book authors rely on the autobiography written by the individual people about themselves and first read them (a number of them) and get the glimpse of what the context is all about. With the main points in mind, the authors then compile their work.

These two points bring about a clear difference on the type of historical data that is best from each of the sources. If a person is in need in unbiased qualitative historical account, then the best choice would be books. However in need of quantitative historical account which is much prone to bias, then the best source would be autobiographies.

In conclusion, history cannot be fully obtained from one independent source discussed above. Books depend on the author's ingenuity and ability to write on top of autobiographies. Autobiographies only rely on the person's ability

to write and compile information. This means that autobiographies are the very original sources of historical information but so as to reduce bias, books give a re-contextualized approach on the autobiographical information making the autographs remain the original and best source of historical information.