WELCOME

Five years ago, we proposed a center on global history at Harvard University, an initiative to create a cluster of scholars devoted to understanding how human societies have developed as an interactive community across the world. Our goal was to embed a range of activities here in Cambridge within a global network of like-minded scholars. Thanks to the generous support of the Weatherhead Center, the Volkswagen Foundation and various donors, 2015-216 was the year when the Weatherhead Initiative on Global History (WIGH) fulfilled our initial vision, with visiting fellows from Brazil, Italy, Colombia, Switzerland, India, Germany, Canada, and the US; a rich roster of seminars; an international conference on soccer/football sparking great interest; and the first meeting of the members of our Global History Network in São Paulo, Brazil (see the above photo.)

This inaugural newsletter gives us the opportunity to share the vibrant community that has grown here at WIGH. We hope to be able to welcome you soon at one of our events.

With best wishes,

Sven Beckert and Charles S. Maier
Co-chairs, WIGH
One of the landmark events for WIGH this year was the first meeting bringing together the global history network. Coordinated by Jessica Barnard from Harvard, the network consists of six universities and institutes from every continent and is dedicated to this emerging subfield of historical study. Under the title “Scales of Global History,” WIGH, in collaboration with the Laboratório de Estudos sobre o Brasil e o Sistema Mundial (LAB-Mundi) at the University of São Paulo (USP), hosted the first of a series of international global history seminars. Additional support for the event was offered by FAPESP, CAPES, the Volkswagen Foundation, the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam, Harvard University, and the Department of History and Social History at USP. Attended by two faculty members and two graduate students from each partner institution, the meetings were held at the Fernand Braudel Auditorium of the Department of History at USP between March 3 and March 5, 2016. Conference participants were enthralled by the vast campus engulfed in wild greenery and beautiful landscapes. They also celebrated the fact that at all times during this conference six different institutions were represented on each panel—it was indeed special to have people from all over the world, who read different repertoires and speak different languages, still share common ground and even thematic unity.

The first panel, chaired by Professor Hector Maldonado of the Universidad de San Marcos, Lima, tackled the question of labor in global history. The session was opened by Professor Marcel van der Linden of IISH, who presented an Aristotelian approach to the understanding of coerced labor generally. Later papers covered more specific aspects of global labor. Professor Babacar Fall of the Université Cheikh Anta Diop in Dakar discussed the labor organization of early colonial projects in Senegal through the case of the men deported to work the Dakar Port and the Dakar–Saint Louis Railway in the thirty years from 1855. Professor Rafael Marques of USP examined compulsory labor within the global coffee industry during the Age of Revolutions. Professor Prabhu Mohapatra of the University of Delhi closed the session with a discussion of Indian labor migration from a global history perspective in the century from 1840.

The second panel, chaired by Professor Gustavo Paz of Universidad Nacional de Tres de Fribreo, tackled two linked themes: commodities and immigration, the latter theme providing continuity between this panel and the first. Professor Sven Beckert of Harvard University opened with a discussion of his coming project on the history of global capitalism, which builds on the research he undertook in the process of writing his latest publication, a global history of cotton. Professor Amar Farooqui of the University of Delhi discussed the global opium market and its impact on the “small” lives of local communities in different geographies. On the theme of migration, Professor Leo Lucassen of Leiden University discussed the intersections between cross-cultural migrations and changing labor relations on a global scale, while Professor Mu Tao of the East China Normal University in Shanghai focused on the flows between China and Africa in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Professor Charles Maier of Harvard University was the first speaker on a panel dedicated to “Territories, Regions, and Cities,” giving an overview of territoriality in global history over the last five centuries. Professor João Paulo Pimenta of USP followed with a focus on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and what he described as geographical, political, and ideological territories within the new-world colonial empires. Professor Zhu Ming of East China Normal University offered a closer analysis of global cities, exploring a regional and interregional approach to their analysis, and using Paris, Saigon, and Shanghai as case studies. Professor Rokhaya Fall of the Université Cheikh Anta Diop finally zoomed in even further without losing sight of global history, getting down to the level of particular agents, and discussed the role of African women in transatlantic networks. This panel was chaired by Professor Iris Kantor of USP.

The last two panels, chaired respectively by postdoctoral students at USP and UNIFESP, Gabriel Aladrén and Tâmis Parron, were dedicated to the ongoing research of graduate students. These two final panels featured:

- Priscila Ferrer (USP): “Cuba, Venezuela, Mexico, Spain, Brazil: Joaquín Infante in the Age of Revolutions.”
- Ben Goossen (Harvard University): “Religious Nationalism in an Age of Globalization: A Case Study.”
- Gambou Prisca Nadine (Université Cheikh Anta Diop, Dakar): “Emancipation, work and mission: works of Saint-
Joseph's of Cluny convent in Senegal and Congo 1819-1965.”

- Xu Shikang (East China Normal University, Shanghai): “The Funeral system of the Middle Chinese's influence on the Qidan people: entering on the compare of the epitaphs between the two.”

- Ritik Jaiswal (University of Delhi): “Recasting Indian Migratory trends: An analysis of Maistry Mediated Mobility to Burma (c. 1880–1940).”

- Pepijn Brandon (International Institute for Social History, Amsterdam): “Between the Plantation and the Port: Racialization and Labor Control in 17th Century New Amsterdam and 18th Century Paramaribo.”


- Joan Chaker (Harvard): “Muleteers as Bandits and Mutineers: Global Capital and Social Transformation in the Ottoman Countryside.”


- Chen Jinlong (East China Normal University, Shanghai): “A Colonial Economic History: Study on the Development of Sisal Industry in Tanganyika.”


A special issue of the University of São Paulo's history journal, Almanack.unifesp.com, will feature some of the presentations as a dossier. The platform is published in Portuguese, English, and French, and enjoys good readership abroad—which makes it a perfect platform for global history publications.

Participants to this event were all delighted at the productivity of the exchange and at the larger research community in which they were able to share their work. It was agreed that more such meetings will be convened, the three upcoming ones to be held in Delhi, Shanghai, and Dakar. The conference thus closed on a roundtable dedicated to the discussion of “Perspectives for the Global History Research Network,” and geared towards learning from this event with a view to future meetings. The question was put to the graduate students, who will be the ones to write this global history: How was this meeting helpful to you? As this network develops, what sort of activities and ideas would be useful to you in your own work?

Most importantly, this final roundtable recognized that the group brings together diverse views to global history that are irreducible to a single approach, and insisted on the importance of preserving this multiplicity rather than foreclose the debate over the organizing principle of the global. For instance, participants decided to remain open on the question of whether global history addresses a system, or comparisons and connections. Another such difference among participants related to the role of theory. Some participants wished to see future conferences dedicate panels to methodological and theoretical questions, going beyond an intuitive sense of global connections to effectively define a global process, describe its organization of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and determine its turning points. Other participants expressed doubt about the fruitfulness of a conversation about theory that does not arise from the critique of a specific piece of empirical history writing.

On a pedagogical level, it was decided that future meetings should discuss the question of a global–history bibliography. The issue of language in the teaching of global history was also raised: most of the literature is in English, and thus cannot be assigned at an undergraduate level in some institutions. It was thus decided that future meetings would include book panels.

It is noteworthy that beyond these annual meetings, the global history network allows an ongoing exchange. A network website acts as a platform for the sharing of global history syllabi or working papers, as well publications. Year-round, the activities of the various partners are publicized throughout the network, and even shared by video-conferencing, live-streaming, or recorded video. Beyond facilitating global discussion, the network supports cross-continental collaborations and long-term projects, particularly through graduate student exchanges: nine global fellows have so far spent a semester at another partner institution. To incentivize the study of global history, the network helps students in institutions with no access to funding access fellowships and stipends, and is often working to raise funds for research.
Held at the Tsai Auditorium of Harvard’s Center for Government and International Studies from April 14 to April 16, 2016, this conference highlighted the relevance of the study of soccer and sports more generally for a deeper critical understanding of global history. Soccer, an engine of globalization and a global industry in its own right, still derives much of its vitality from passions rooted in a sense of place and of community. The organizing theme of the conference was precisely this tension or accommodation between the globalizing impulse and the tenacious appeal of local attachments, past and present, at the level of clubs, nations, regions, and continents.

Convened on behalf of the Weatherhead Initiative for Global History by Francesco Erspamer, Professor of Romance Languages and Literature, Cemal Kafadar, Vehbi Koç Professor of Turkish Studies, Department of History, Steven Ortega, Associate Professor of History, Simmons College, and Mariano Siskind, Professor of Romance Languages and Literature, all at Harvard, the conference was made possible with additional funding by the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs at Harvard and Olympiacos FC, Greece. The Center for Middle Eastern Studies, the Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies, and the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies, all at Harvard, also offered their support, along with Simmons College.

Attended by more than 50 attendants per panel, and many more on the opening session and the plenary, the event opened on a welcome note by Professors Cemal Kafadar and Sven Beckert of Harvard University, who presented the theme of the conference and introduced the six panels to follow over the next couple of days. The first two panels were chronologically defined and respectively dedicated to “Early History and Diffusion of the Game” and to “Soccer in the Age of Decolonization and Cold War.” To being with the first of these, charting the turn to professionalism in the sport and the rise of a meritocratic and modern outlook that freed soccer from British masculine Christianity, Professor Tony Collins of De Montfort University argued that there was nothing inevitable about the rise of soccer to globalism. Professor Thomas Adam of the University of Texas in turn discussed the intercultural transfer of soccer in the late nineteenth century, with a focus on the transmission from England to Germany and from England to Argentina. In both cases, the event was closely connected to educational reform and to the emphasis on self-determination – soccer being perceived as fostering agency disciplined by the need for cooperation. The first panel ended with Salmaan Mirza of Harvard University, whose work on soccer in the Ottoman Empire complicated the narrative about Christian and modernizing influences. Ottoman soccer was not necessarily a national culture – interest in the game rather came from a cosmopolitan Ottoman elite. Here soccer played into discourses of social reform, as an antidote to Oriental bodily weakness, and as an answer to larger political concerns about Ottoman decline. The comment was provided by Professor Maya Jasanoff of Harvard University, who raised the question of contingency in this history: what if Britain had not been the global hegemon? Why soccer, not rugby? The answers highlighted the role of institutions and social class dynamics, the ingredients going into the rise of soccer being global hegemony, institutionalization, professionalization, and nations asserting modernity. Lest these factors overshadow the aesthetic aspect of soccer, the discussion also pointed to the
emotions soccer can tap into, which wrap with civic ideology, nationalism, and modernity in a way rare to find in other walks of life. The discussion also took up the issue of gender: one of the chief motivating factors in the rise of soccer was to create a sphere that excludes women as of the 1890s and then again as part of backlash against women in the workforce after WWI.

Professor Robert Edelman of the University of California San Diego started off the second panel, which focused on the function of soccer in the Cold War era as a practice that both disrupted and reified political forces. The papers described western- and eastern-block countries using sports to show the domination of their ideologies but also as unique opportunities for exchange. Professor Todd Cleveland from the University of Arkansas showed the Portuguese national team using African players to whitewash its colonial nature, while the African players themselves viewed their stint as an opportunity for growth and learning. This interest convergence was also on display in the paper by Ingrid Bolivar Ramirez of the University of Wisconsin on the use of soccer by Latin-American authorities to pacify political dissent and foster intercultural exchange. These two papers also highlighted how sociopolitical factors of the day structured the blurring of national regional ethnic political identities, be it the new community arising from African players relocating to Portugal and projecting identities rooted in both places, or the Paraguayan and Colombian identities in constructed in Argentina. The paper by Temrgys Xell’tia Lane of UCLA took up the complicated question of national representation in the context of indigenous and national identity and decolonizing borders. After a comment by Professor Daren Graves of the Simmons School of Social Work, the panel addressed the tension in soccer as a possibility of emancipation but also simultaneously as a means of social control.

The theme of Panel 3 was “Globalization and Soccer.” It mainly addressed the relation between the history of soccer and the history of globalization. The panel opened with a mini-keynote by Professors Richard Giulianotti and Roland Robertson of the universities of Loughborough and Pittsburg, respectively, whose work was cited by most of the applicants to the conference. Robertson insisted on the cultural dimension of globalization, largely neglected in accounts thereof, as it entails a mixture of global and local scales. Giulianotti argued for the profound utility of the notion of “glocalization” – signifying the complex interdependencies between the local and the global – in historical and anthropological terms, and showed how the concept may be useful to a history of soccer.

Heidi Voskuhl of the University of Pennsylvania addressed the global and gender dimensions in soccer and their mediation in film. Tarek Abu Hussein of Harvard University discussed the global and local significance of a visit by Pele, the global face of the sport, to Beirut, Lebanon. On the global level, the visit came in the context of the Cold War as well as the Cola wars. On the local level, the invitation was extended in the context of rivalries between local political factions for the purpose of fundraising and recognition. Professor Agbeneyega Adedze of Illinois State University presented the iconography of soccer on African stamps, linking each of the sport and the postage stamp to the phenomenon of globalization, and finally Luis Guilherme Porto Rocha of the University of Sao Paulo discussed the role of a transnational elite in tying the fates of Brazilian foreign policy in the Cold War to the election of a FIFA president. The comment was offered by Professor Mariano Siskind of Harvard University.

Building on the theme of globalization, the fourth panel treated of “Migration: South to North and North to South.” Professor Sine Agregaard of Aarhus University in Denmark studied the recruitment of African women to Scandinavian clubs, Paul Darby of Ulster University wrote about the immobility constraining players in soccer academies in Ghana, and Can Evren of Duke considered the Europeanization of soccer from Europe’s periphery. The discussant professor Stephen Ortega of Simmons College compared the three papers by resorting to postcolonial themes decentering Europe and highlighting the significance of imagination as a driver or motivation for migratory processes.

Panel 5 was entitled “Soccer’s Place in Urban Space.” It was opened by Public Works Studio in the persons of Abir Saksouk-Sasso and Nadine Bekdache, who discussed the communal making of informal soccer fields in Beirut by youth defying the language of property in the face of a government-backed real-estate sector’s encroachment on shared places in the city. Similar dynamics are at play in the case of a new stadium built in Mexico’s Monterrey, discussed by Heron Gomez of the National Autonomous University of Mexico. Professor Devanathan Pathasarathy of the Indian Institute of Technology traced the connections between soccer and class in the cities of Mumbai, Singapore, and Bangkok. The connections of place and local popular culture as they impact young soccer players in Africa were the subject of two papers by Tarminder Kaur of the University of the Free State in South Africa and Professor Olutago Adesina of the University of Ibadan, Nigeria. The comment was offered by Professor Judith Grant Long of the University of Michigan.

Finally, the last panel was dedicated to the politics of fandom. As per the paper by Professor Tamar Rapoport of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Daniel Regev of Tel-Aviv University, soccer clubs in Israel stand for liberal and anti-liberal political stances. Dispute over the

Many of the “Soccer as a Global Phenomen” conference participants.
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Conference sponsors Olympiacos F.C. present an autographed jersey. Left to right: Konstantinos Vernikos, Theodoros Yiannikos, Cemal Kafadar, Leslie Osborne, Christian Karembeu.

representation of the city of Shanghai by rival clubs was discussed by Professor Yannan Ding of Shanghai Jiao Tong University. As discussed by Yagmur Nuhrat of Istanbul Bilgi University, fans stood for ethical stances on the structure of the sport in Istanbul. Professor Pablo Alabarces of the University of Buenos Aires mined soccer cheers by clubs in Argentina and Brazil to unearth entrenched political tensions. And finally, writer Nick Davidson portrayed the fans of St. Pauli as anarchist-leaning local activism against capitalist globalization. The comment by Professor Francesco Erspamer of Harvard University reflected on the consequences of an academic study of the sport and the possibilities of preserving the aesthetic dimension in the face of institutionalization, commercialization, and scholarly scrutiny. The discussion that followed also debated the impact of sport tourism and virtual social networks on soccer fandom.

Both Thursday and Friday nights were marked by a dinner for conference participants at the Charles Hotel in Cambridge. The dinners featured presentations about Olympiacos soccer club and its action in the support of Syrian refugees in Greece. Leslie Osborne delivered a first Keynote on Thursday, raising the issue of the US national soccer team for women, who are currently struggling to be paid equally with the men, although they have recently performed better in the international arena and effectively generate more revenue. Friday night, the attendants were moved by the account of soccer legend Christian Karembeu, who told the story of his growing up in New Caledonia, and the vital role of the island’s spirit and the support of his family in his success. Karembeu’s speech was a reminder of just how truly global and diverse soccer is.
Annual Graduate Conference on International and Global History, Con-IH16

This year’s run of Con-IH was organized in tight cooperation with the Weatherhead Initiative for Global History. It was entitled “International and Global History: The Economic Dimension.”

Running March 10 and 11, 2016 to overlap with the campus visit of newly admitted graduate students, the conference consisted of four panels of three presentations each. Each graduate-student presenter submitted an article-length paper that was pre-circulated to a faculty commentator, who gave a public comment on that paper before opening the floor for Q&A. While each panel drew at least 25 attendants, a public keynote and a plenary session gathered a greater audience of at least 35.

Financial, economic and political-economy issues have played a fundamental role in world development and continue to do so. They involve multiple agents besides the nation state; they prompt refined policy analysis; and they challenge historians to turn to the broadest range of sources and demand interdisciplinary analysis. Con-IH16 sought to discuss cutting-edge studies that take up the dimensions of economics in international, regional, and global historical study, for any era from early modernity to the present, and proceeding outward from any world region. It provided an unparalleled opportunity to engage in lively and lengthy discussions with an emerging cohort of researchers in training from Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Georgetown University, Stanford, UPenn, Johns Hopkins, the University of Akron, and Humboldt University in Berlin, as well as with faculty from Harvard’s Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the Harvard Law School, the Harvard Kennedy School of Government, Ohio State University, Boston University, and Boston College. The keynote address was given by Professor Patrick O’Brien, professor emeritus of economic history at the London School of Economics and Political Science, who has written extensively on a wide range of topics in global economic history from the early modern period to the twentieth century. The plenary featured closing remarks by Professor Charles Maier, Professor Sven Beckert, Professor Prasannan Parthasarathi, and Dr. Megan Black.

The first panel was entitled “Labor and the State.” It tackled the labor policies of Houston oilfield companies operating in the North Sea in the 70’s, the Mayan labor in Mexico’s chewing-gum forests in the early 20th century, and the rubber industry in colonial German Cameroon up to the first world war. The second panel on “Development” examined Wilsonian multilateralism during World War One, changing ideas of gender in development discourse over the 60’s and 70’s, and China’s policies in the developing world in the 70’s. A third panel on “Global Capital” discussed late 19th-century Ottoman land-owning joint-stock companies and early 20th-century local Burman businessmen as agents of global capital in their respective contexts. One paper in this panel also examined the role of German Americans in the establishment of Deutsche Bank. Finally, under the title of “World Economic Orders,” a last panel addressed the role of economic sanctions in the post-WWI order, the quasi-global power of British gold and silver merchants in the 17th century, and ideas of an American welfare state post-WWII. The conference included a dinner for participants at the Harvest restaurant in Cambridge.

The principle funding sources for this year’s conference were the Weatherhead Initiative for Global History and the Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History, followed by the History Department, the Center for European Studies, the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, the Center for History and Economics, the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, the Asia Center, the Fairbank Center for Chinese Studies, the South Asia Institute, and the Center for African Studies.
Sir Hilary Beckles on Reparatory Justice for Global Black Enslavement

The Weatherhead Initiative for Global History was one of the sponsors of this year’s public lecture by Sir Hilary Beckles, “Reparatory Justice for Global Black Enslavement: The Greatest Political Movement of the 21st Century.” Alongside the Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History and the Program on the Study of Capitalism at Harvard, WIGH invited the Chairman of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Commission on Reparation and Social Justice, Professor of History and Vice Chancellor of the University of the West Indies, Jamaica to make his case at the Ames Court Room in Harvard Law School's Austin Hall, on the afternoon of February 22, 2016.

Sir Beckles spoke in front of an audience of hundreds, with many more following an online live stream of his speech, after an introduction by Laird Bell Professor of History at Harvard, Sven Beckert. Charles Warren and Carol K. Pforzheimer—er Professor of History Annette Gordon-Reed, Lawrence D. Biele Professor of Law Kenneth Mack, and Charles Warren Professor of History and of African and African American Studies Vincent Brown acted as respondents.

A prolific historian and a committed social justice activist, Sir Beckles has been at the forefront of an international effort for reparations from nations that benefited from the African slave trade between the 16th and 19th centuries. Discussions on reparations have a long history going back to the nineteenth century, but have picked up steam again as CARICOM is making legal claims through the U.N. against the United Kingdom, France, Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. Sir Beckles addressed President Obama directly, from his alma matter, urging him to use the United States’ global influence to push reparatory justice as a matter of civil rights in the 21st century.

This event at Harvard connected to recent discussions in the US, from Ta-Nehisi Coates’s powerful writings to the rise of Black Lives Matter. In the Q&A, Harvard Law School students raised their concerns about how best to confront racism and the School’s own historic links to slavery. Embedded in the students’ questions was the complaint that they were not receiving due support from members of the faculty in their efforts to pressure the institution for reparatory justice. Sir Beckles took the opportunity to reflect on his own militancy as a student, and offered his support to the young activists.

Earlier that day, Sir Beckles and his wife Mary Beckles had lunch with the students enrolled in the research seminars HIST2950 (“Approaches to Global History,” run by Professors Sven Beckert and Charles Maier”) and HIST2480 (“The Political Economy of Modern Capitalism,” run by Professors Sven Beckert, Kenneth Mack, and Michael Zakim), as well as other interested students and faculty from across the campus. Two students offered comments before the floor was opened for Q&A. Sir Beckles later expressed his gratitude for the constructive criticism as well as the message of support that was conveyed in the conversation.

In October 2013, WIGH co-organized and cosponsored a conference entitled “The Global E.P. Thompson: Reflections on the Making of the English Working Class after Fifty Years,” interrogating the vitality of Thompson’s social history at the present moment of social and intellectual upheaval. This year, many of the outstanding papers presented at that conference were collected in E.P. Thompson-themed issues of two journals, the International Review of Social History (IRSH) and the Journal of Social History, both leading journals in their fields.

Published by the George Mason University Press, the Journal of Social History is dedicated to this subfield of historical study across periods and geographical contexts. In fact, its editors often privilege analysis that integrates work on different contexts between North and South America, Africa, Europe, and Asia, including Russia.

The summer 2015 issue of the Journal of Social History (vol. 48 n. 4) opened on an introductory article that introduced the issue’s special theme and presented its theoretical stakes. The authors, Rudi Bätzeli, Sven Beckert, and Andrew Gordon of Harvard University, as well as Gabriel Winant of Yale, who were also the organizers of the aforementioned conference, fleshed out the actual and latent linkages between historiography and social movements on the left as revealed in the articles that followed, re-opening debates on moral economy and on the relevance of past class struggle for the present moment. More specifically, they examined the utility of Thompson’s work for more recent social movements, indigenous, anticolonial, anti-racist, feminist, and anti-war, which might not have been considered “working-class” by Thompson himself, highlighting how the published papers push the boundaries of the Thompsonian inheritance. In the four articles that followed, Gabrielle Clark (of the European University Institute, Florence, Italy at the time of writing) examined the struggle over coerced labor within the legal realm in the US through the second half of the twentieth century; Lisa Furchtgott (Yale, New Haven) argued for the relevance of Thompson’s work on workers’ organization for contemporary feminist movements through a case study of the anti–bomb and anti–bloc activists’ camp in Greenham Common; Nikos Potamianos (University of Crete, Greece) delineated the part of moral economy and the part of modern politics in the struggle over the anti–profiteering laws promulgated in Greece in the wake of WWII; and Devanathan Parthasarathy (Indian Institute of Technology, Mumbai, India) argued against Eurocentric Marxist accounts of the relationship between capitalism and de-peasantization in a study of regional variations in the emergence of provincial capital and development of state control in rural India.

IRSH is published by Cambridge University Press for the International Institute of Social History. Dedicated to the history of work and workers broadly defined, it addresses social, cultural, and political aspects of workers’ lives and struggles, both in the modern and early modern periods. Most relevant for this publication, the IRSH is global in scope and stresses the interrelationship of historical change across geographical contexts. It takes up its theme proceeding outward from any world region, on a local, regional, national, or transnational level, but always in the aim of achieving a better understanding of what it refers to as global labor history.

The IRSH April 2016 issue (vol. 61, part I) also opened on an introductory article by the 2013 conference organizers. The authors argued for the necessity of an interdisciplinary and global approach to Thompson’s work, and presented their views on how such an approach would impact our conceptions of class, nation, and “the people” as historical categories. This introduction was followed by five articles: Thomas Lindenberger (Center for Contemporary History, Potsdam, Germany at the time of writing) examined the reception of Thompson’s work in Germany and across the shift from structuralism to culturalism in a Cold–War perspective; Rudolf Kucera (Masaryk Institute and Archives, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic) reassessed the post–WWII historiographies of Poland and Czechoslovakia between what he termed Western Marxism and orthodox Marxism; Hideo Ichihashi (Saitama University, Tokyo, Japan) discussed the consequences of The Making for the New Left in Japan; Lucas Poy Piñeiro (University of Buenos Aires, Argentina) presented the impact of Thompson’s work on labor historiography in Argentina; and Jonathan Hyslop (Colgate University, New York) examined the work’s historiographical and political consequences for South Africa as of the 1970s. Bringing together a specific focus on varied contexts, this collection of articles recast national historiographies as the products of local processes of state and class formation as well as of the transnational transfer of ideas.
The core activity of the Weatherhead Initative on Global History is our seminar “Approaches to Global History, co–taught by Professor Sven Beckert and Professor Charles Maier. The seminar introduces students to the literature on and practice of global history today, and brings together faculty and students on a continuing basis. The course includes both reading sessions and research meetings during which students and scholars interested in global history present their work-in-progress. Faculty participants are drawn from different institutions around the world and from the group of fellows in global history spending the academic year at the Weatherhead Initiative on Global History. Students are expected to write a research paper on a topic in global history. While all students meet repeatedly throughout the academic year in small groups including the course instructors and coordinators to jointly discuss their progress, some have the opportunity to present and discuss a working draft of their paper at the seminar at the end of the spring semester. In addition, every student is given the opportunity to deliver a formal comment on one of the papers to be presented by the guest speakers, which often turns out to be the first-year and second-year students’ first such formal intervention.

For the 2015-2016 academic year, students started off getting acquainted with themes and cases in global history through readings and seminar discussion of the works of Edward Barbier, Christopher Bayly, Sven Beckert, Thomas Bender, Sugata Bose, Marcel van der Linden, and Sidney Mintz. Based on the substance of this empirical history writing, the discussion moved onto a more theoretical level as the seminar tackled the works of Giovanni Arrighi, Rainer F. Buschmann, Charles Maier, Patrick Manning, Rafael Marquese, Jürgen Osterhammel, João Paulo Pimenta, Kenneth Pomeranz, Dominic Sachsenmaier, and David Simo.

The Faculty presenters for this year and their respective commentators were the following:

- **Sheldon Garon** (Department of History, Princeton University): “On the Transnational Destruction of Cities: What Japan and the U.S. Learned from the Bombing of Britain and Germany in World War II.”
  Faculty commentator: Fredrik Logevall (Harvard Kennedy School)
  Graduate student commentator: David Krueger

- **Stefan Link** (Department of History, Dartmouth College): “Detroit, Capital of the 20th Century: Fordism’s First Globalization.”
  Faculty commentator: Terry Martin (Harvard University, History Department, Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies)
  Graduate student commentator: Tim Barker

- **Patrick Manning** (Department of History, University of Pittsburgh): “Africans on the World Stage: a Critique of World Historiography.”
  Faculty commentator: Jean Comaroff (Harvard University, Department of African and African American Studies and Department of Anthropology)
  Graduate student commentator: Sarah Balakrishnan

- **Vanessa Ogle** (Department of History, University of Pennsylvania): “Archipelago Capitalism, Or What Tax Havens Tell Us About the Nation–State in the International Political Economy, 1870s-1980s.”
  Faculty commentator: Neil Brenner (Harvard University, Graduate School of Design)
  Graduate student commentator: Rephael Stern

- **João Paolo Pimenta** (Department of History, University of Sao Paulo): “From USA to Brazil: Some Notes Concerning a Modern–Revolutionary Space of Experience in the 18th and 19th Centuries.”
  Faculty commentator: Sugata Bose (Harvard University, History Department)
  Graduate student commentator: Ruodi Duan

- **Kenneth Pomeranz** (Department of History, University of Chicago, Illinois): “Wastelands, Heartlands and El Dorados: Rethinking China’s Western Frontiers from High Qing to 20th Century.”
Faculty commentator: Sunil Amrith (Harvard University, History Department)
Graduate student commentator: Thomas Jamison

Also, this seminar joined with the history of capitalism seminar this past spring to invite Professor Sir Hilary Beckles, vice-chancellor of the University of the West Indies and chairman of the Caribbean Community Commission on Reparation and Social Justice to give a talk on “Reparatory Justice for Global Black Enslavement: The Greatest Political Movement of the 21st Century.” On the occasion, Sir Beckles had lunch with the seminars’ attendants and responded to formal comments by graduate students Joan Chaker and Westenley Alcenat, as well as other students and faculty in an open Q&A.

Participating WIGH Fellows for this year were the following:

- Jesus Bohorquez (Department of History, European University Institute): “Global Capital or a Global History of Capital? Transoceanic flows, Forced Labour and mercantile Institutions during the Age of Revolutions.”
  Faculty commentator: Sidney Chalhoub (Harvard University, History Department)
  Graduate student commentator: Kelly Brignac

- Jean-Philippe Dedieu (Center for International Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences; Department of Social and Cultural Analysis, New York University): “Dreaming of Revolutions in Post-Colonial France.”
  Faculty commentator: Mary Lewis (Harvard University, Department of History and Center for European Studies)
  Graduate student commentator: Joan Chaker

- Jim Downs (Department of History, Connecticut College): “The Geography of Containment: Colonialism, Slavery, the American Civil War, and the Making of Epidemiology.”
  Faculty commentator: Evelynn Hammonds (Harvard University, Department of the History of Science)
  Graduate student commentator: Westenley Alcenat

The following Global Fellows at WIGH presented their work at seminar lunch meetings:

- Sheng Li (East China Normal University): “Aging Population in Modern New York City: A Global Perspective.”

- Zhanna Popova (International Institute of Social History, Netherlands): “Exile as Imperial Practice: Penal Transportation in Western Siberia, 1870-1900.”


Last but not least, the seminar’s graduate-student presenters for this year were:

  Graduate student commentator: Raphael Stern

- Tim Barker: “Seeing the Economy Whole: Input-Output Analysis in the Age of Convergence”
  Graduate student commentator: David Krueger
  Graduate student commentator: Joan Chaker
Alumni Interviews: Marcelo Ferraro

What is the nature of your involvement with the WIGH? How did you come to be involved with WIGH?
As an undergrad student from the University of São Paulo and later a PhD candidate from its Social History program, I have been deeply influenced by a systemic perspective on history, especially after Professor Rafael Marquese became my adviser and invited me to join Lab-Mundi (Brazil and the World System Studies Laboratory), a research center created by him and Professor João Paulo Pimenta. After the creation of the Global History Network in 2013 – that connected Lab-Mundi and the WIGH program, I met Professor Sven Beckert in São Paulo, who, along with my adviser, encouraged me to join the WIGH program as a Global Fellow in 2015.

How have you benefited from that involvement?
Fernand Braudel once said that living in Brazil made him brighter as a historian. Of course Brazilian historians as much as myself will never miss an opportunity to mention this, but taking his sentence seriously, I must agree that living a global experience made my historiographic perspective wider.

As a historian from the University of São Paulo, I have been influenced by an intellectual tradition concerned with understanding Brazil (more precisely Portuguese America in the colonial period and the independent state after 1822) as part of a broader system. However, actually living in another country and dialoging with other historians and intellectuals in the United States, especially in the WIGH program, turned this global theoretical perspective into a material reality.

Moreover, I had the challenging opportunity of presenting my research and historiographic perspectives to historians from all over the world at the same time I heard and debated about theirs, an amazing interaction that turned debates and classrooms into real global experiences.

It is said that global history as a new subfield is still in the process of defining itself. What is your definition of global history?
All of us who have been dealing with the Global History challenge face the risk of turning it into an empty concept or an editorial brand. From my point of view, it is not necessarily about the study of a global space and neither a new kind of international or transnational history. It is a both a premise and a perspective according to which even the analysis of local and particular historic processes can be benefited from a global perspective or horizon.

As a researcher interested in slavery, I do not intend to ignore its specificities in comparison to other economic and social systems. Rather, I believe a precise description of slavery in the 19th century must be combined with a full understanding of structural powers and broader contexts, such as capitalism and the interstate system. Therefore, even an exercise of microhistory may be integrated into this perspective, in a way that any attempt of historical explanation will be based on a multiplicity of factors.

Hence, the lack of definition might be one of the most interesting aspects of global history, as long as it remains a horizon – even though I might never reach it, it keeps leading my steps forward.

What is your project, and how does it pertain to global history? How does a global lens affect your argument, or what are the advantages of this particular approach?
I have been studying the relation between slavery and architecture in Brazil – and more precisely strategies of the slaveholding class strategies to control slaves and distinguish itself socially. This may appear to be a local theme, without connections to global structures. However, following Dale Tomich, I believe slavery has both particularities and deep connections to the capitalism in the 19th century, in a way that may be defined as a “Second Slavery.” Even though his concept was mainly economic at first, Brazilian historians such as Rafael Marquese and Tamis Parron have been analyzing its political aspects and the importance of liberal institutions to the expansion of slavery during this period. Therefore, this global lens on capitalism and liberalism integrates slavery.

I believe my research adds the fact that the making of a slaveholding class in Brazil was integrated with the rise of the capitalist world-economy in the 19th century, and with other ruling classes, such as the European and North American bourgeoisies and other slaveholding classes, as in the South of the United States and the Spanish colony of Cuba. Hence, a global perspective on slavery, capitalism and liberalism made it possible for me to integrate a local experience in the Province of Rio de Janeiro into a broader historical process. Secondly, it allowed me to develop a comparative analysis on the slaveholders in Brazil to slaveholders in Cuba and in the South of the United States and, finally, to the European and North–American bourgeoisies. The third step will be to describe the making and desegregation of Brazilian slaveholding class in the 19th century both as a particular and global process.
What is the nature of your involvement with the WIGH?
How did you come to be involved with WIGH?

Whence, a global perspective on slavery, capitalism and liberalism made it possible for me to integrate a local experience in the Province of Rio de Janeiro into a broader historical process. Secondly, it allowed me to develop a comparative analysis on the slaveholders in Brazil to slaveholders in Cuba and in the South of the United States and, finally, to the European and North-American bourgeoisies. The third step will be to describe the making and desegregation of Brazilian slaveholding class in the 19th century both as a particular and global process. My next research topic will be an integrated analysis of the political economy of punishment (both from the state penal systems and the slaveholders in their private properties) under the Second Slavery, integrating Brazil and the United States (and maybe Cuba) in the 19th century. Therefore, it seems that this global lens have become part of my way of seeing and understanding history, leading both my present and future steps.

Why global history now?
Since the 1980s and specially after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Soviet Union, wide theories and utopias have been gradually left behind, substituted by studies based on individual agency and local processes. Despite the fact that historians have presented amazing findings these last decades, few have tried to develop broader explanations and theories. I believe both the limits of this historiography and present events such as the major economic crisis of 2008, brought back the need and interest in more ambitious analysis and explanations.

Nevertheless, even though we have been witnessing this new wave of historic studies, there is an inevitable dialog with an intellectual tradition from the 1960s and 1970s, particularly in Latin America. Despite the clear differences between systemic history then and now, I believe knowledge is the result of debate and accumulation, more than innovation.

Do you have ideas for bringing a global lens to teaching a history course at the undergraduate level? How would it benefit the students in the course to engage with the lenses and approaches of global history?

While demands of our time lead historians to specific topics and perspectives, their undergraduate students face outdated courses. Despite the difficulty of bringing new studies into traditional courses narratives, this is a challenge Professors must accept. Not only global analysis could be presented, but also historiographic debates between different historians and approaches, allowing students to develop their own perspectives on history, theory and methodology.

A global history approach would not only build a broader understanding on social processes both in the past and the present, undermining traditional nationalist and individualist approaches.

As an undergrad student from the University of São Paulo and later a PhD candidate from its Social History program, I have been deeply influenced by a systemic perspective on history, specially after Professor Rafael Marques became my adviser and invited me to join Lab-Mundi (Brazil and the World System Studies Laboratory), a research center created by him and Professor João Paulo Pimenta. After the creation of the Global History Network in 2013 – that connected Lab-Mundi and the WIGH program, I met Professor Sven Beckert in São Paulo, who, along with my adviser, encouraged me to join the WIGH program as a Global Fellow in 2015.
Shaun S. Nichols

What is the nature of your involvement with WIGH? How did you come to be involved?
I was an exchange student—a "global fellow"—with the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam in the fall of 2012. I have of course attended many of its global history seminars as well.

How have you benefited from that involvement?
The experience of going abroad—working with colleagues from research institutes and universities all over the world—was truly eye-opening. It not only gave me a bigger appreciation for the diversity of scholarly approaches around the world, but, more concretely, my archival work and interactions with my colleagues pushed me to globalize my own historical work, and think about the bigger global implications of my topic.

It is said that global history as a new subfield is still in the process of defining itself. What is your definition of global history?
I think of it more as a methodology than a field of study per se. Traditionally, historians have used relatively small frames of reference to circumscribe their subjects: nations, regions, sometimes towns or villages. But, as I have explored in my own work on the industrialization of Southeastern Massachusetts, analyses of even the smallest places can look radically different when analyzed from a global perspective.

What is your project, and how does it pertain to global history? How does a global lens affect your argument, or what are the advantages of this particular approach?
My book project, Crisis Capital: Industrial Massachusetts and the Making of Global Capitalism, 1865-Present, explores the history of the Massachusetts industrial economy as told through the global movements of migrant labor, mobile capital, and state power. In other words, it takes a very old story—the industrialization and de-industrialization of Massachusetts—and tells it through the perspective of migrating Azorean seamen, British weavers, Quebecois farmers, globetrotting whalers, New York mobile manufacturers, and Asia-bound garment producers. In so doing, it shows both how even the most local places are intimately bound to the broader dynamics of global capitalism, while at the same time using this larger global story to paint a very different, far more cyclical, portrait of the making of the American industrial economy.

Shaun S. Nichols is College Fellow in History at Harvard University, where his research and teaching center on the history of capitalism, immigration, and labor in the United States and the world. His current book project, Crisis Capital: Industrial Massachusetts and the Making of Global Capitalism, 1865-Present (abstract), explores the ways in which Massachusetts business, labor, and government leaders sought to manipulate the global geographies of migrant labor and mobile capital to continually rebuild the state’s economy in the face of recurrent economic crisis.
Edited by Sven Beckert and Seth Rockman

During the nineteenth century, the United States entered the ranks of the world’s most advanced and dynamic economies. At the same time, the nation sustained an expansive and brutal system of human bondage. This was no mere coincidence. Slavery’s Capitalism argues for slavery’s centrality to the emergence of American capitalism in the decades between the Revolution and the Civil War. According to editors Sven Beckert and Seth Rockman, the issue is not whether slavery itself was or was not capitalist but, rather, the impossibility of understanding the nation’s spectacular pattern of economic development without situating slavery front and center.

Drawing on the expertise of sixteen scholars who are at the forefront of rewriting the history of American economic development, Slavery’s Capitalism identifies slavery as the primary force driving key innovations in entrepreneurship, finance, accounting, management, and political economy that are too often attributed to the so-called free market. Approaching the study of slavery as the originating catalyst for the Industrial Revolution and modern capitalism casts new light on American credit markets, practices of offshore investment, and understandings of human capital. Rather than seeing slavery as outside the institutional structures of capitalism, the essays recover slavery’s importance to the American economic past and prompt enduring questions about the relationship of market freedom to human freedom. (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016)

Sven Beckert is the Laird Bell Professor of History, Harvard University, and co-chair of WIGH.

A questão nacional e as tradições nacional-estatistas no Brasil, América Latina e África
Edited by Norberto Ferraras

Este livro discute uma temática um tanto negligenciada nos últimos anos com a emergência de novos paradigmas interpretativos. A questão nacional e as tradições nacional-estatistas são fundantes nas tradições historiográficas brasileira e latino-americana, por isso sua importância e centralidade analíticas são revisitadas pelos autores aqui reunidos.

This book explores two topics that have become understudied since the emergence of new scholarship paradigms in History in the last decades: nationality and statist-national intellectual traditions. Authors of this book give these topics their due weight back as essential aspects of Latin-American and Brazilian historiographies. (FGV Editora, 2015)

Norberto Ferraras, a WIGH Fellow in 2013-2014, is Professor of American History, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brazil.

Once Within Borders: Territories of Power, Wealth, and Belonging since 1500
By Charles S. Maier

Throughout history, human societies have been organized preeminently as territories—politically bounded regions whose borders define the jurisdiction of laws and the movement of peoples. At a time when the technologies of globalization are eroding barriers to communication, transportation, and trade, Once Within Borders explores the fulful evolution of territorial organization as a worldwide practice of human societies. Charles S. Maier tracks the epochal changes that have defined territories over five centuries and draws attention to ideas and technologies that contribute to territoriality’s remarkable resilience.

Territorial boundaries transform geography into history by providing a framework for organizing political and economic life. But properties of territory—their meanings and applications—have changed considerably across space and time. In the West, modern territoriality developed in tandem with ideas of sovereignty in the seventeenth century. Sovereign rulers took steps to fortify their borders, map and privatize the land, and centralize their sway over the populations and resources within their domain. The arrival of railroads and the telegraph enabled territorial expansion at home and abroad as well as the extension of control over large spaces. By the late nineteenth century, the extent of a nation’s territory had become an index of its power, with overseas colonial possessions augmenting prestige and wealth and redefining territoriality.

Charles S. Maier is the Leverett Saltonstall Professor of History, Harvard University, and co-chair of WIGH.

The Franciscan Invention of the New World
by Julia McClure

This book examines the story of the ‘discovery of America’ through the prism of the history of the Franciscans, a socio-religious movement with a unique doctrine of voluntary poverty. The Franciscans rapidly developed global dimensions, but their often paradoxical relationships with poverty and power offer an alternate account of global history. Through this lens, Julia McClure offers a deeper history of colonialism, not only by extending its chronology, but also by exploring the powerful role of ambivalence in the emergence of colonial regimes. Other topics discussed include the legal history of property, the complexity and politics of global knowledge networks, the early (and neglected) history of the Near Atlantic, and the transatlantic inquisition, mysticism, apocalypticism, and religious imaginations of place. (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017)

Julia McClure, a WIGH Fellow in 2013-2014, is Lecturer at University of Warwick, UK.
NEW AFFILIATES

We have a wide range of graduate students, postdocs, and established scholars visiting WIGH in 2016–2017:

MAREIKE BUES
Affiliate. Visiting Fellow, Department of History, Harvard University. Economic history; and the history of migration and trade.

CHRISTOPH CONRAD
Visiting Scholar (spring 2017). Professor of Contemporary History, Department of General History, University of Geneva. Global aging; comparative history of welfare states; and history of historiography.

SIBYLLE DUHAUTOIS
Affiliate. Visiting Fellow, Department of History, Harvard University; PhD Candidate, Centre d’histoire de Sciences Po. History of the future; and global history.

SARA LORENZINI
Postdoctoral Fellow. Associate Professor, School of International Studies, University of Trento. Cold War focusing on North-South relations and East-South relations.

MARIUSZ ŁUKASIEWICZ
Visiting Fellow (spring 2017). PhD Candidate, Department of International History, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva. Nineteenth-century comparative economic development; business history; and imperialism in sub-Saharan Africa.

HEENA MISTRY
Visiting Fellow (fall 2016). PhD Candidate, Department of History, Queen’s University. British imperial citizenship; South Asian migration; and deterritorialized nationalism.

LILIANA OBREGÓN
Visiting Fellow (spring 2017). Associate Professor, School of Law, Universidad de los Andes, Santiago de Chile. International legal history and historiography; ideologies of historical narratives; and peripheral histories, colonialism, and forgotten actors and events of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Americas and Europe from a global history perspective.

SHUBHANKITA OJHA
Global Fellow. Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of South Asian Studies, Harvard University; PhD, Department of History, University of Delhi Bombay dock workers; dock workers from a global comparative perspective.

TÂMIS PARRON

CASEY PRIMEL
Volkswagen Postdoctoral Fellow. PhD, Middle Eastern, South Asian, and African Studies (MESAAS), Columbia University. The history of finance and economic practice in the early twentieth century.

SEBASTIAN SCHMIDT

WWW

The Global History Network now has its own website, www.globalhistorynetwork.net. Please visit to learn more about past and current Global Fellows, participating universities, and international global history events.