

The First GHC Summer School was held at Tokyo University from September 7-12, 2015. Here is the report from the students of Tokyo team who participated in the Summer School.

【Day 1】 September 7, 2015 @ Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia, University of Tokyo

Seminar sessions began on the first day of the Global History Collaborative (GHC) First Summer School (Monday, September 7, 2015). In his opening address, Professor Haneda explained the method for managing the temporal scale, spatial scale, and global history scale, but he focused on the discussions slated for the summer school (i.e., participating graduate students were requested to submit papers on their own research themes in advance). Next, the participants introduced themselves and two sessions were held. Session 1 (“Colonial and Decolonial”) was chaired by Professor Conrad, and Session 2 (“Shared Knowledge and Science”) was chaired by Professor Adelman. In each session, participants studied the papers submitted by graduate students. The following describes the seminar sessions in more detail:

Session 1 (Colonial and Decolonial)

- Fabian Krautwald (Berlin): Colonialism, Revolution, and the Scaling of History—The German Colonial Society 1918–1919

- Nakano Saki (EHESS): Defining “Africa”: the Pan-African Struggles of the Young Elites during the Decolonization in West Africa (1945–1962)

Session 2 (Shared Knowledge and Science)

- Emily Kern (Princeton): Evolution’s Footprints: Transnational Science, Human Identity, and the Emergence of Global Research Networks in Twentieth Century Biology

- Emoto Hiroshi (Tokyo): The Reception History of John Ruskin: Towards a Global History of Modern Architectural Thought

- Fukuhara Kotaro (Tokyo): Factors of the Development of Rice Farming in High Latitudes: An Example from Northeastern China

Session 1, which dealt with the themes of colonization and decolonization, began with a discussion of Fabian Krautwald’s paper. Krautwald explained trends in the German Colonial Society at the peak of and after the November Revolution and analyzed discussions about the society’s membership and internal organization. The general discussion focused on the question of whether or not the worldwide spread of the concept of self-determination advocated by President Wilson should be viewed as global history.

Next, Nakao Saki considered Africa and its political impact, focusing on the process of decolonization in West Africa from 1945 to 1962. She took questions from the audience that included “What sort of people were the elites and students who led the Pan-African Movement?” and “How did Africans relate to other regional ideologies, such as Pan-Arabism, European, and so on?”

Both researches showed that ideas advocated by the Colonial Society’s members, elites, students, etc. were linked to the worldwide decolonization process. It is believed that the links between global ideologies and regional and state power are themes of extreme importance in the narration of global history.

Session 2 (afternoon), entitled “Shared Knowledge and Science,” began with a discussion by Emily Kern, who argued that twentieth century research on the origins of the human race was influenced by global affairs, imperialism, the rise of Nazism, and World War II. In response to the emphasis on national identity in historical narratives that supports nation-states, the view has emerged in recent years that there must be a global identity among people throughout the world. However, the difficulty associated with achieving this objective has been clearly shown by the state of the human origins research network.

Next, Emoto Hiroshi, who considered the architectural thought of John Ruskin (1819–1900), presented a method for verifying how the world accepted Ruskin’s concepts and examined differences caused by dissimilarities between translated languages and regions. Discussions concerned research methods and languages necessary for using digital archives.

Finally, the paper presented by Fukuhara Kotaro considered the increase in rice production during the twentieth century in Heilongjiang Province in northeastern China. Fukuhara proposed application of the agricultural research method (i.e., analyzing technical aspects and climatic conditions for predicting rice production) to historical narration. Questions from the floor concerned the impact of political and economic factors as well as humans on rice production.

Throughout Session 2, I was given the impression that creative methods are necessary for establishing dialogues; even though all the research discussed can be summed up as historical research. It is noteworthy that required knowledge and research methods vary between the natural sciences, architecture, agriculture, and other fields. Therefore, it was necessary for the participants arrived on the first day of summer school to provide a personal introduction with an additional focus on representing their specialized field and to try communicating according to the framework of global history. In retrospect, the introduction and the discussions on the first day was very meaningful in this respect. Looking back on the entire summer school experience, I think that the very relaxed atmosphere of the second half of the event enabled researchers to conduct dialogues even more freely with researchers in other fields.

(TERADA Yuki)

【Day 2】 September 8, 2015 @ Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia, University of Tokyo

On the second day of the GHC Summer School, the ideas of Fabian Steininger (Berlin), Sarah Abel (EHESS) and Kim Jiyoung (Tokyo) were discussed. With “Nation and Identity” as the overall theme, research papers regarding the consideration of national and ethnic frameworks in historical investigations were introduced to prompt related discussions. The moderator was Professor Andreas Eckert (Humboldt University of Berlin). Participants conducted spirited discussions and laughed in the face of successive days of torrential rainfall outside the venue.

I had never seen the cheerful atmosphere that marked the duration of the summer school at any of the academic discussions I have attended in Japan. It was free of solemn formality. I feel that its merry and lively atmosphere and lack of reserve resulted from the inflow of the ethos of foreign academic air; further, it was strengthened by the creative approach to problems shared by GHC participants, who were searching for historical methodologies for the next generation.

The first presenter, Fabian Steininger, introduced his research theme—“The Nation Forms: A Study of Conceptual Change in the Late Ottoman Empire”—and tracked the transformation of the concept of “the national” in the late Ottoman Empire through the examination of historical documents, music, artistic expressions, and social activities. During the discussion, participants vigorously exchanged many views concerning the breadth of the historical source collection and research methods, as well as the method for developing the “history of emotions” that Mr. Steininger advocates. At the conclusion of this session, I was reminded that “this summer school should provide suggestions on how to build a framework for highly motivated research.”

The concept of the “semantic net,” which Mr. Steininger advocates, is similar to the concept of “reception history” that has been a theme of my own research; it is a historical process related to the creation and transformation of meaning. Our awareness of and ideas about methodology are certainly closely related, though the specific areas of our research are completely different. It was my experience of a sort of communion that made me think deeply of the possibility of a “sharable” foundation for a new global history that both embodies and transcends an individual harvest.

The next topic was research by Sarah Abel, “Assessing the Social Limits of Genetic Identities: A Study of DNA ‘Ancestry’ Testing Practices in the US and Brazil.” This is social science research based on extensive interviews, and it is conducted to track the impact of DNA analysis-based ancestry testing on American and Brazilian societies. During the related discussion, it was pointed out that this research could form a point of contact between the social sciences and natural science. The discussion also focused on the point that this summer school, which brings researchers with varied ethnic backgrounds together, and this particular session could provide a setting for participants to reconsider their individual identities.

KIM Jiyeon, in her report entitled “Overseas/Foreign Travel Experience and Korea’s Globalism in the 1980s,” studies the characteristics of overseas travel in South Korea since the 1980s, based on the backpacker travel and the Bloc trip. During the discussion, participants exchanged views considering how examples of South Korea were positioned according to the global popularity of backpacking at about the same time and how Ms. Jiyeon chose the target time period for her study.

The discussion of the latter half dealt with the general question, “What is internationalization?” Does internationalization signify only the geographical narrowing of the world, or the sharing and leveling of values and standards, as shown by the South Korean board game, “Blue Marble?” I believe that for future research on global history, which will eventually include “global citizenship,” correctly understanding the relationship between clarifying phenomena from a macroscopic field of vision on the global scale with (conventional) microscopic regional historical research will be extremely important in as much as it will require researchers to overcome their own fixed notions and develop new historical methods. (EMOTO Hiroshi)

【Day 3】 September 9, 2015 @ Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia, University of Tokyo

On day 3, we had two sessions. In the morning, Session 4, titled “Nation and Identity 2,” was moderated by Prof. Silvia Sebastiani (EHESS).

Ms. Karina Kriegesmann’s (Free University Berlin) “Dangerous Fears: Brazilian Media and the Emotionalization of the Public, 1917–1930” was a PhD project analyzing the “German peril” or the threat of German immigrants discussed in newspapers published in Brazil during that period. The participants pointed out various issues to reflect on, such as the limited effectiveness of the newspapers in measuring the influence of the arguments about “German peril;” whose “emotion” the newspaper showed; the possibility that the meaning of the term “peril” changed as time passed, etc. Many suggestions for further research were also offered, such as investigating other sources in order to analyze the reactions and influences of politicians or other actors, introducing the sociological concept of “moral panic,” and considering the background of the spread of socialism and communism.

Ms. Gabriela Goldin Marcovich’s (EHESS) PhD synopsis was titled “A Collective Biography of New Spain’s *Lettered City* in the 18th Century: Some Reflections on the Use of Scale Variations in a Transnational Context.” This focused on intellectuals in eighteenth-century New Spain. Although the paper was mainly written from “transnational” and “transatlantic” perspectives, there were many remarks about how we could position it as a study of global history; for example, considering the relationships between the Jesuits residing all over the world and the history of Mexico, the possibility of the perspective of “global orientalism,” and the mutual transpacific relationships with China. The questions raised in the discussion—whether global intellectual history can also mean Brahmanic global history and how we

should deal other aspects of global history—seemed to stimulate other participants to consider how they could position their own work with the concept of global history.

Ms. Terada Yuki's (UTokyo) PhD synopsis was titled "Global History through the Medium of Museums: The Establishment and Evolution of Museums in Iran." Many asked about the perspective of this being clearly conscious of globality: how does the author periodize the era from the early twentieth century to the present day? What changes does she regard as the most important? Whether should she select one particular museum for her analysis, given that each museum has unique traits? In other words, the questions were mostly related to her current narrative focus. Furthermore, the discussion developed in various directions, including the terminology of "museum," "national museum," "modern/contemporary art," etc.; the two functions of museums: conservation and exhibition, and their chronological changes; and the meaning of a study by a Japanese scholar on museums in Iran: namely, the problem of the positionality of the researcher.

Session 5, in the afternoon, titled "Eurasia and East Asia," was moderated by Prof. Janet Chen (Princeton University)

Ms. Lkhagvasuren Mandkhai's (UTokyo) PhD synopsis, "Reexamination of Mongol Administration: The Case of Bitigchis," aimed to reexamine the Mongol (Ilkhanid) administration in Iran by focusing on the *Bitigchis*, a type of local official, as a case study for the investigation of Mongolian influence in local societies. The questions asked by the participants focused on the steps to complete the project as an empirical source-based study, such as the selection of sources, time scale, or individuals to be investigated. The context of how the present study could be positioned as a global history, and the meanings of the problematic terms of "Mongol," "state," and "bureaucracy," were also discussed.

Ms. Cheng Yongchao's (Nagoya University) PhD synopsis, "Role and Contribution of Joseon Embassies to Tokugawa Japan and Imperial China," featured the commonality of the Joseon embassies to Japan and China, which many previous studies have dealt with separately. Many of the remarks from the floor were concentrated on the concrete aspects of the study. There were questions on the educational background of the individuals and the incentives to participate with the embassies, and suggestions that the age and rank of the individuals in the embassies could be analyzed from the perspective of their career paths, and that the embassies could be considered from the perspective of knowledge production/exchange.

Throughout this summer school, there seem to have been two types of question relating to every paper. One focused a paper's role as a study of global histories, and the other examined its role as an empirical historical study. Although both were naturally connected to the purpose of the school, I had the impression that these two types of remark were not always evenly balanced in every individual case. It

may help the presenters if the moderators were rather more pro-active in controlling the direction of discussion in the context of the broad array of comments that we experienced. (KATAKURA Shizuo)

●GHC Forum “The Potential of Global History” 16:30-18:30 @Fukutake Hall, University of Tokyo

On the late afternoon of September 9, 2015, the roundtable-style symposium was held with the title of “The Potential of Global History” (「グローバル・ヒストリーの可能性」) as a part of the 1st GHC Summer School program. Five leading scholars in Global History Collaborative Consortium – Jeremy Adelman (Princeton University, USA), Alessandro Stanziani (EHESS, France), Andreas Eckert (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany), Sebastian Conrad (Freie Universität Berlin, Germany), and HANEDA Masashi (University of Tokyo, Japan) – joined this forum as main speakers and shared their idea and experience in investigating the question of “Global History” so as to raise the issues to think about.

The themes covered are as following: what “Global History Collaborative” is, clarification of concepts, global history in each country, global history shared by us, the potential of global history, and examples of global history. Prof. Haneda, after giving an introduction of Global History Collaborative project, opened the discussion by proposing to re-consider the differences among the relevant concepts, namely, *world history*, *global history* (in English), グローバル・ヒストリー (global history in Japanese) and 新しい世界史 (new world history in Japanese). Each speaker first gave a general background in terms of the development and the recent situation of this challenging field in each country that indeed is connected to the contexts including academic traditions and temporal concerns both in each society and a broader world. The problems of migration, environmental climate change, history education, and English as the official academic language, for example, were brought up as factors that influenced the increased interest in the entanglement and global history.

Then the talks moved toward the discussion on the meaning of global history and its challenge upon national historiography, area studies, and any kind of centrism: in other words, Global History as a method and perspective. It helps to reflect on and modify fundamental premises. This does not necessarily mean to discard nation-states, but rather, it relates to locating and problematizing units, objects, regions, and terms in a larger and open context so as to go beyond the hegemony in academia and the hierarchy in the world. History and politics of knowledge production herein is another thing to think about. The conversation with different kinds of expertise and participation from mainstream historians will be necessary.

The last part of symposium was a more open-ended ideation on what we need to do with the tool of global history. The potential of global history is associated with the reason why we need global history today as well as the roles of history and (global) historians in the current world. This topic was continued in the

open discussion with the audience. The importance of collaborative works, critical engagement, movements to make counter-effects, democratization of knowledge, the revision of national history and new identity such as “earthman/earthwoman”, once again were highlighted as possible strategies.

The reception at Sanjo Conference Hall in University of Tokyo was followed after the symposium. Prof. TAKAMIZAWA (Director of the Institute of Advanced Studies on Asia, University of Tokyo), in his welcome remarks, put emphasis on the significance of this kind of collaborative works in the field of Humanities and Social Sciences, which could provide inspiration and a platform especially for young researchers. Prof. Sonoda proposed a toast to celebrate the event. Not only the participants of GHC Summer School, but also numerous researchers as well as faculty members of University of Tokyo joined the banquet and continued dialogues and networking. (Jiyeon KIM)

【Day 4】 September 10, 2015 @ Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia, University of Tokyo

Session 6: Indian Ocean

Summer school was finally half over as Day 4 began.

Today, only a morning session was held because the event moved to Hokkaido in the afternoon. This session was chaired by Professor Alessandro Stanziani of the School for Advanced Studies in the Social Sciences in France. Leonard von Galen of Humboldt University of Berlin and Katakura Shizuo of the University of Tokyo conducted lively discussions with participants concerning nineteenth century trade activities in the Indian Ocean from the perspective of global history.

In the abstract of his master's thesis, “(...) they were like kings” Indian Merchants in the Sultanate Zanzibar and Oman (1840–1856), Mr. von Galen discussed the activities and roles of Indian merchants in Africa, pointing out that they influenced the African continent not only economically, but also politically. Questions from the floor about this research began with basic inquiries regarding the setting of the time period, contents and types of goods traded, lingua franca of the period, and characteristics and contents of historical sources. The necessity of a perspective focused on elements such as networks, currencies, credit, etc. was also pointed out. Others expressed the positive view that making the objects of research specific families or the lives of individual Indian merchants was an attractive feature of his research. A lively series of comments were made from the floor regarding matters such as Indian merchants' consciousness of sultans. Finally, important reference sources and a new research approach were introduced by the teaching staff.

Mr. Katakura's doctoral dissertation proposal, “Institutional Changes of Major Port Cities in the Nineteenth-Century Western Indian Ocean: Overlapping Empires and Merchant Networks,” was an

attempt to clarify changes in the political and economic systems of port cities of the Western Indian Ocean in the nineteenth century and the impact of these changes on relationships between the cities. First, he confirmed the possibility of interpreting historical sources in multiple languages and reasons for selecting the time span in question. He continued his discussion with a focus on the impact of advances in navigational technology on the political and economic systems of the port cities. Regarding the Western Indian Ocean, which he set as the framework for this research, Mr. Katakura was asked to explain its significance, specifically in terms of distinguishing it from the Eastern Indian Ocean. Additionally, many participants were interested in how he positioned his study of the Western Indian Ocean in the nineteenth century in the context of global history. They also asked him to explain the characteristics of the historical sources he used and the possibility of discovering new ones.

I felt that Mr. von Galen's research possibly reveals a new approach to past research on trade via the Indian Ocean by focusing on Indian merchants. Mr. Katakura's research, which attempted to clarify worldwide links in the nineteenth century on the basis of four port cities and their interrelationships, can be described as an ambitious project. Both researchers attempted to transcend the conventional dichotomy of "Western" versus "non-Western" and combined a positivism that meticulously interpreted complex processes with a theoretical awareness of problems associated with Indian Ocean trade. We are looking forward to future undertakings of these researchers. (CHENG Yongchao)

【Day 5】 September 11, 2015 @ Hokkaido University

The last day of GHC Summer School was held on 11th of September 2015 at Hokkaido University thanks to generous help offered by professor Morikawa Tomoko of Hokkaido University. Professor Kuroda Akinobu of University of Tokyo moderated the morning session titled "Economy and Finance" with three presenters from Princeton and Ehess. The presenters' key issues were the question of money and its role in American revolution, the banking system and the rise of public debt in XVIII century Great Britain as well as the question of credibility in Latin American countries as part of the British imperial orders. The session was a particularly good example of the benefit of having closely related topics discussed from different angle and positionality.

Each presenters were able to draw on different aspects of common theme of the period such as public debt and credibility. However, such approach was possible precisely because the imperial framework of the topic had a wide ranging implications in different countries and approaching it from global history perspective was in some cases, the only effective way of looking at given problems.

The afternoon session titled "Transnational" was moderated by professor Sheldon Garon of Princeton University with two presenters from Princeton University and Free University of Berlin. Transnational movement of people and information between nations and its global interpretation was the topic of

discussion. After the Q&A and discussion based on the topic, the key taking point from this session was that it is important not to shy away from dealing with the subject matter from national or transnational perspectives before going further with global perspective. This is to suggest that whether to have global or not global perspectives is dependent on the nature and the aim of the research and rather than other way around. In this regard, whether any subject is global enough should not prevent us from looking at local issues and stories to engage in a meaningful way to the national or transnational narratives.

To conclude the Summer School, general discussions was held to reflect on our findings and lessons learnt as well as to outline future issues to be solved. Among the raised issues were the need for discussing more on the point of why should we do global history before the question of how we do it. Particularly the question of how much is global enough or not enough should be dealt carefully in order not to restrict ourselves within the context. However, the intensity and close proximity of whole week enabled us to get to know each other well and this in turn I am sure would enable us to become a historian of global nature. (Mandkhai Lkhagvasuren)

【Day 6】 September 12, 2015, Excursion

Hokkaido—focused on the development of Hokkaido by the Japanese, but it also presented many exhibits from perspectives other than those of the pioneers who developed the region. Participants in the GHC First Summer School researched themes—although defined simply as “History”—that actually spanned many topics including colonization, formation of ethnic identity, economic history (including the circulation of currency), and the history of architecture. Perhaps for this reason, the interests of participants differed for this broad range of exhibits. For example, participants researching colonization tended to be particularly interested in viewing exhibits about the development of Hokkaido.

The Historical Village of Hokkaido is an outdoor museum that was created by moving and reconstructing more than 50 of Hokkaido’s historical buildings on a site covering almost 50 hectares. It brings together a range of structures including public buildings (e.g., town hall and train station), a restaurant, a newspaper office, an official residence and other urban housing, and fishing and farming village homes and barns. Public exhibitions are presented in the Town, Fishing Village, Farm Village, and Mountain Village sections of the site.

As noted on the visit to the Hokkaido Museum, participants’ interests in buildings and exhibits varied greatly according to each person’s preferences and research theme. Although they were divided into two guided (English) tours, some participants were seen leaving their groups to tour the village individually.

The Ainu Museum is a public educational facility intended to contribute comprehensively to the transmission, preservation, survey, study, and spread of knowledge regarding the Ainu culture. In addition

to storing and exhibiting documents and artifacts concerning the Ainu people and other northern ethnic minorities, traditional houses of the Ainu called *chise* have been reconstructed in an outdoor museum that restores a traditional Ainu village. Along with its exhibits, the museum also presents performances of ritual dances and music of the Ainu.

Participants observed the various exhibits and performances with great interest, revealing their concern with the culture of ethnic minorities. Some conflicts between the present values of the Western world and traditional culture of the Ainu were observed; for example, some members of the group reacted to the Ainu custom of *iomante* (killing a bear as a ritual or sacrifice), with negative comments from the point of view regarding the protection of animals. (FUKUHARA Kotaro)