

- Global History Collaborative (GHC) Summer School 2016 Report (Day 1)

The GHC Summer School 2016 began with an explanation by Professor Jeremy Adelman (Princeton University) regarding the aim of the school. In his opening address, Professor Adelman mentioned the importance of a connection in a cross-national study, and he proposed some questions about the relationship between a global study and regional study. Two sessions and one method session were held on day 1.

For the first morning session, Professor Sheldon Garon (Princeton University) was the chair. Ms. Anne Oetjen ((Free University of Berlin) made a research presentation entitled “Locating World Health: The League of Nations’ Far Eastern Bureau and the Development of Regional Health Politics.” She examined the League of Nations’ health policies in Southeast Asia from the 1920s to the 1940s. After the presentation, we had a question and answer session. There was a suggestion to reconsider the concept and range of Asia. The general discussion focused on a question about the relationship with the other group that worked for the same purpose in the same period. We also debated about the process by which data information is transformed to knowledge, and effective ways to introduce effectively monographs written in non-European languages.

Mr. Hiro Fujimoto (University of Tokyo) made a presentation entitled “From Western Medicine to American Medicine: Changing Discourses of the American Medical Missionaries in Modern Japan, 1859–1945.” He mentioned efforts by American medical missions to promote American medicine in the competitive relationship with German medicine, which had been dominant in Japan. From his analysis, he articulated the complexity of this relationship for the West. Questions from the floor concerned whether there were cooperative relations among Anglo-Saxon medical missions and a continuity of activity in American medical missions after World War II.

The next session began with the presentation by Mr. Fidel Tavaréz (Princeton University) entitled “The Spanish Theory of Commercial Empire, c. 1740–1762.” Professor Andreas Eckert (Humboldt University of Berlin) was the chair. Mr. Tavaréz examined several publications of the 18th century, which became foundational to the Spanish theory of the commercial empire. By analyzing the background of thought for the authors of the publications, he tried to clarify

the root of the commercial empire theory, which expanded widely after its emergence. Questions raised in the discussion included one regarding the meaning of “contextual intellectual history.” We also discussed how we should treat and use records, such as a memorandum relative to global history.

A Ph.D. synopsis by Mr. Tsuyoshi Kamimura (University of Tokyo) was entitled “British Political Thought Regarding Anti-despotism in the 1770s: The Case of the East Indies and Quebec.” Mr. Kamimura focused on the debate about despotism in England in the 1770s in the context of the history of political thought. By comparing debates over India and Quebec, he pointed out the common anti-despotic characteristics in their legislative processes. The questions asked by participants focused on relationships with other regulating acts, and we also discussed the possibility of using American sources.

In the afternoon, the first method session entitled “Area Studies and/or/in World History?” was held. Professor Ines Zupanov (EHESS) made a presentation entitled “South Asian Cosmopolitanism: Sources, Itineraries, Languages (16–18th centuries).” In her presentation, she explained how to “widen [the] scope of archives” and “widen periodization.” Next, Professor Alessandro Stanziani (EHESS) gave a presentation entitled “Reciprocal Comparison and History: A Few Proposals Based on the Case of Russia.” He picked up on “serfdom” of Russia and reexamined given regions in Europe, Asia, and Africa. He mentioned that the goal is not to develop a new “general model” but to reconcile the differences between historical paths specific to particular regions with the overall dynamics and consider a new definition of reciprocal comparison.

We discussed how we move from one region to another and how to avoid simple comparisons. Additionally, some opinions were raised regarding the problem of the structure of discipline, and there was a suggestion that we need to be aware of the differences in definitions of area studies among countries.

(Merisa Harada)

- GHC Summer School 2016 Report (Day 2)

The first session of the second day was moderated by Dr. Joël Glasman (Humboldt University of Berlin). The first speaker was Mr. Oury Goldman (EHESS), who spoke on “Grasping the World: Printers, Booksellers, and Translators as Agents of Global Knowledge in Sixteenth Century France.” He explored how knowledge circulated throughout Paris and Lyon in the 16th century by various actors from the perspective of translation studies. A uniqueness of his argument was that he contextualized 16th century France not in the history of knowledge production but rather by means of an account of history circulation. In other words, he used not only texts of philosophers and thinkers but also works of publishers, booksellers, and translators. His talk attracted the audience’s attention and drew many questions and comments (e.g., Did the government control French publishers for the use of propaganda? How does the topic relate to the scholarship of “Global Renaissance”? Could the discussion fall into French exceptionalism? How are publishing cultures in Paris and Lyon different from other French cities such as Montpellier?)

The second speaker, Benjamin Sacks (Princeton University), read a paper entitled “Urban Espionage: Spying, Copying, and Borrowing Colonial Cities, 1704–1731.” He started with a simple question: Why were colonial cities similar? In order to answer this question, he connected the perspective of global history with urban studies, which scarcely covered the international exchange of knowledge on urban planning. He pointed out that British governors learned the technique of fortress construction from the French when Britain took over the French territory of St. Kitts Island after the signing of the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. The floor posed many questions and comments (e.g., Why was the term “spy” used instead of “steal” to describe the action of the British governors? How did the local people react to the new city plans? Is it appropriate to call new communities cities, not settlements?)

The second session was chaired by Professor Ines Zupanov (EHESS) and consisted of two papers. The presentation by Ms. Merisa Harada (University of Tokyo) was entitled “Modern Sino-French Diplomacy over the Interests in South China in Relation to the Formation of French Indochina.” She pointed out that scholars have tended to concentrate on the relationship between China and Britain, overlooking the Sino-French relationship when they worked on the diplomatic history of 19th century China. She aimed to disentangle the complicated relationships between France, China, and Japan around the turn of the 20th century. Ms. Harada also analyzed the diplomatic conflicts in Guangzhouwan, Fuzhou, and French Indochina by

using various archives of multiple languages. Questions from the participants included the following: Did Macao or Portugal influence diplomacy in Guangzhouwan? What was the terminological difference between China and the Qin Dynasty? How can her work connect to Japanese scholarships?

The second lecturer was Ms. Natalie Pashkeeva (EHESS); her presentation was entitled s “Writing of « Global » and « National » Histories of Young Men’s Christian Associations from the Third Quarter of the Nineteenth Century and the Twentieth Century.” Her initial interest was to clarify the possibilities and limits of the narratives of national history and global history. She described how the American YMCA tried to define itself as a global movement from the second half of the 19th century until the first half of the 20th century. The questions and comments covered her work’s contributions to gender studies, including her coverage of the American YWCA. It was also brought up that it is not necessary to use the word “global” from the perspective of global history. Someone also inquired about responses by Woodrow Wilson and John Mott to the Russian Revolution in 1917.

In the method session, Professor Jeremy Adelman (Princeton University) delivered a lecture entitled “Are World Systems Helpful for Global History?” He aimed to suggest an alternative view of world systems based on his article, “Mimesis and Rivalry: European Empires and Global Regimes,” published in the *Journal of Global History*, 10(1), 2015, pp. 77–98. He discussed the possibilities of a polycentric narrative by refusing the core/periphery narrative.

The participants discussed many topics. For example, they examined how closely globalization and media were connected. Though Professor Adelman focused on the relationship between globalization and publishing technology in the 15th and 16th centuries, a student pointed out the importance of the impact of visual media in the 20th century. Furthermore, students argued that scholars should reconsider the works of Herbert Marshall McLuhan and Susan Sontag in the context of writings regarding global history. Another student indicated that information circulated in “the West and the Rest,” but the relationships between empires and colonies were always asymmetrical in terms of scientific knowledge production.

After the sessions, participants traveled to the historical district of Trenton with local volunteer guides. Princeton University is located in New Jersey; the state capital is Trenton. The city used

to be populated, but its current population decreased to eighty thousand. The city has taken some measures to restore historical buildings. Students and professors visited the Old Barracks Museum (erected between 1758 and 1759 as a New Jersey colony and restored in the 1990s), Petty's Run Archaeological Site (remains of industries from the 1730s to 1870s), and the Masonic Temple (founded in 1927). They had an opportunity to talk to the architect in charge of Trenton's urban planning.

(Hiro Fujimoto)

- GHC Summer School 2016 Report (Day 3)

On day 3, two morning sessions were held. One was a special joint session with the participants of GHC Summer School 2015, and we discussed the GHC. In the afternoon, we took an excursion to Philadelphia.

In the morning, a collaborative journal presentation was held, chaired by Professor Jeremy Adelman (Princeton University). The participants of Summer School 2015 from Princeton University made a presentation focused on "What Do Global History/Global History Collaborative[s] Look Like?" Other members also participated in the discussion from all over the world using Internet telephones. They continue working on collaborative journals from the last summer school session in small groups. We heard from them regarding the difficulty of managing differences and maintaining optimistic perspectives. As to the difficulty of generalization of problems, there was advice from the hall recommending an analysis of a single text as a starting point. We also discussed the importance of problematizing one's own field before engaging in collaborative work. A question concerning which language we will use for publishing the collaborative works was raised by a participant. There was also an opinion about the "glocal" character of the GHC.

Next, Associate Professor Ryuto Shimada (University of Tokyo) chaired a session. Mr. Maxence Klein (EHESS) made a research presentation entitled "Berlin Seeks Jerusalem: Culture, Secession, and Identity in the Jewish Zionist Youth Group Jung Juda (1912–1917)." He analyzed the background of this Jewish Zionist youth group and its expansion by focusing on its "hybridity," placing it in the historical and geographical frame of the diaspora. He also

mentioned the effects of this German youth group. There were questions about whether they were conscious of the distinction between the political and non-political and how to capture “political implications.” Our discussion focused on social relationships among people.

(Merisa Harada)

In the afternoon, we went on an excursion to Philadelphia. First, we participated in a walking tour, which started in the center of the city. This tour was unique in that we visited not only famous sights such as the Pennsylvania State Capitol but also many wall paintings, which were pervasive in the city. A tour guide identified the artists, subjects of the paintings (e.g., Abraham Lincoln), and their meanings (e.g., liberty and harmony between ethnic groups). Next, we headed to the Mutter Museum, which was established in the middle of the 19th century. It features many specimens, skeletons, and collections of strange diseases in its exhibitions.

(Tsuyoshi Kamimura)

- GHC Summer School 2016 Report (Day 4)

On day 4, we had three sessions. The first session in the morning was a method session, led by Professor Masashi Haneda (University of Tokyo) and Professor Miki Sugiura (Hosei University). Their session’s title was “Positionality and Language in Global History.” It mainly focused on the possibility of arguing global history, coupled with national history. It was pointed out that historiographies by global historians had a tendency to use English too much. Further, historians frequently use terms such as “global English” and “global citizenship” in their perceptions about Europe. Participants asked about the difference between unification and integration and the meaning of “civilization.” They also discussed whether global history and national history were really compatible, observing that historians must be nationalistic because they have to make a distinction between self and others. Additionally, a question about understanding national history from the standpoints of “who” and “how” was raised.

The second session, moderated by Professor Sebastian Conrad (Free University of Berlin), consisted of two reports regarding the U.S. after World War II. First, Mr. Marvin Menniken (Free University of Berlin) spoke on “Between Conservatism, Cold War, and Counterculture?”

The American Legion in California, 1950–1980,” arguing the role of the American Legion of California in terms of conservatism. According to him, the American Legion of California was not merely a veteran’s lobbyist group but also a major political force of conservatism that contributed to gathering support in local communities. In this context, conservatism consisted of three factors: traditionalism, anti-communism, and libertarianism. This conservatism was diverse and fragile and in opposition to the New Left. After the report, participants mainly discussed the appeal of California and whether it is appropriate and valid to focus on the area with regard to conservatism.

The second report, was made by Ms. Emily Riley (Princeton University), was entitled “Intra-European Cooperation on Foreign Aid: The OEEC, Marshall Plan, and ‘Post-war Europe.’” She rejected two views of the Marshall Plan—as Europe’s savior or as America’s pursuit of hegemony. Instead, she insisted on considering it from the broader European context and examined the national case of Italy. There were some questions as to why the Marshall Plan was not put into practice in Japan and why Italy was chosen as a case study. Further, there was a comment that her reference to Europe did not include East Europe. Then, the Marshall Plan and its locality were discussed.

After lunch, another session was held, moderated by Professor Alessandro Stanziani (EHESS). First, Mr. Jan Severin (Humboldt University of Berlin) made a report entitled “Male Same-Sex Desire and Masculinity in Colonial German Southwest Africa.” He was absent from the workshop because of illness, so we discussed the topic online as we did the day before. Mr. Severin dealt with the difference between masculinity in colonial German Southwest Africa and the Kaiserreich. To answer a question on this matter, he took other colonies such as Southern Rhodesia into consideration minutely, comparing them with German colonies. As a result, it turned out that colonial masculinity could be marked as heterosexual; in fact, there was no public debate about it in colonies. There were some questions about the existence of rape, the form and character of colonial laws, and the literature regarding this topic.

The second report in this session was “Rethinking Development for a New Decade: The Ford Foundation in Chile, 1969–1980” by Ms. Abigail Kret (Princeton University). This research focused on the role the Ford Foundation played in Chile in order to regard the limits and possibilities of structural change in the international system and global economy, and the links

between development and democracy and development and markets. There were some questions on what local communities did for development, the link between development and dictatorship, and the Ford Foundation's expertise.

(Tsuyoshi Kamimura)

- GHC Summer School 2016 Report (Day 5)

The fifth day included one method session, one student session, and the wrap-up session. In the method session, Professor Andreas Eckert (Humboldt University of Berlin) and Professor Sebastian Conrad (Free University of Berlin) gave a lecture entitled "What is Global Intellectual History?" They assigned a couple of articles: Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori, "Approaches to Global Intellectual History," in Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori, eds., *Global Intellectual History* (New York: Columbia UP, 2013); and Sebastian Conrad, "Ch. 10 Global History for Whom? The Politics of Global History," *What Is Global History?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016). Professor Eckert explained that the concept of global history spreads to international scholarships; further, new subfields have been emerging, such as global intellectual history. He considered how global intellectual history could contribute to global history in general. Based on his specialty of historical theories in Germany and Japan, Professor Conrad noted that global historians still hold the Euro-centric view and overlook non-Euro-centric works regarding intellectual history.

In the following discussion, the participants argued that scholars should understand the emergence of similar ideas in different places. Based on Professor Conrad's idea, a student posed a question as to how Asian intellectual history could draw the attention of intellectual historians in Europe and North America. Participants discussed the possibility and limits of locating ancient history and history of the Middle Ages in global history. They dealt with other topics, such as the relationships between reception and invention and presentism and historicism.

Professor Miki Sugiura (Hosei University) chaired the final student session. The first speaker was Ms. Susanne Schmidt (Cambridge University), who presented a paper entitled "Possible Histories of the Midlife Crisis: New York, Hamburg, Mumbai." She examined how Gail

Sheehy's book—*Passages: Predictable Crises of Adult Life* (1976)—circulated throughout the world. She pointed out that many countries translated the book, and some removed the characteristics of gender from the book. Her project, therefore, can bridge works of media studies and gender studies. The floor offered her translated editions from other countries, which she could not deal with in her paper. Some participants asked questions about the response from medical professions to midlife crises and the characteristics of feminists included in the book.

As the final lecturer, Mr. Dongxiang Xu (EHESS) delivered a talk entitled “Asia is One: Pan-Asianism in Two Chinese and Japanese Intellectual Groups of ‘National Essence.’” He aimed to elucidate how the concept of Asia was reformed and circulated in modern China. His paper focused on the two Pan-Asianism intellectual groups in Japan and China. The Japanese group Seikyōsha was founded in 1908, and the Chinese group Guocui pai (literally, National Essence Group), was influenced by Seikyōsha (literally, Society for Political Education). He elucidated the close relationship between nationalism and internationalism in the Asiatic Humanitarian Brotherhood, which was formed in Tokyo in 1908 by the members of Guocui pai. In the discussion, the participants posed a number of questions and comments regarding how Asian countries received the concept of Asia (invented in Europe), when Asian countries started to use the term Asia, how the lecturer's argument connected to gender studies, and how Japan and India used the term Asia when their intentions regarding its use were completely different.

The summer school ended with the wrap-up session. First, students shared their takeaways. They agreed that the method sessions were generally very helpful because they enabled participants to learn important ideas and perspectives in global history. A student pointed out that the styles of discussion were very different in other countries. Some participants stated that the summer school offered a good opportunity to consider commonalities and differences in histories. Some hoped to organize collaborative works to deal with language problems, as participants in the last summer school did; consequently, the latter group has been coauthoring papers.

Second, the students put forward some suggestions for the next summer school. Several students wanted to learn broader contexts for their submitted papers and suggested that they should express their intentions toward global history in the introductions of papers. Some students asked moderators to indicate how a student's argument could be connected to global

history. One student proposed that method sessions should include not only lectures but also points at issue.

Third, professors reacted to the students' comments. As for submitted papers, professors could instruct students to write papers in the same style. Students could seek feedback from professors after submitting papers. As for method sessions, the themes of the session could be modified according to content of submitted papers. The professors from Berlin closed the session with their plan for the next summer school to be held in their city.

(Hiro Fujimoto)

- GHC Summer School 2016 Report (Day 6)

On the last day, we went to New York City. Members took the train together from Princeton and visited the Guggenheim Museum, which is famous for its collection of contemporary art. A special exposition entitled "But a Storm Is Blowing from Paradise: Contemporary Art of the Middle East and North Africa" was held and we viewed it with a curator. There were various works of art such as photos, video works, and sculptures. A work of art based on news photos was impressive. In the afternoon, we had free time, so we walked around the city. For some of us, it was our first visit to New York, so we were given a fresh impression of the city and the architecture. Since this excursion was blessed by good weather, we enjoyed the opportunity to visit parks in the city. That evening, we had dinner in a restaurant and discussed our impressions of the city; we also reflected on our week at Princeton. With a sense of fulfillment, we returned to Princeton by train.

(Merisa Harada)