



University of Dundee

Writing Global History and Its Challenges - A Workshop with Jürgen Osterhammel and Geoffrey Parker

Van Ittersum, Martine; Gottmann, Felicia; Mostert, Tristan

Published in:
Itinerario

DOI:
[10.1017/S0165115316000607](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000607)

Publication date:
2016

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Van Ittersum, M., Gottmann, F., & Mostert, T. (2016). Writing Global History and Its Challenges - A Workshop with Jürgen Osterhammel and Geoffrey Parker. *Itinerario*, 40(3), 357-376.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000607>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**‘Writing Global History and Its Challenges’
A Workshop with Jürgen Osterhammel and Geoffrey Parker
University of Dundee
4 June 2016**

**Martine van Ittersum
Felicia Gottmann
Tristan Mostert**

Keywords

Global history, history of empire, environmental history, Jürgen Osterhammel, Geoffrey Parker

Abstract:

On 4 June 2016, Professor Jürgen Osterhammel of the University of Konstanz and Professor Geoffrey Parker of The Ohio State University gave an all-day workshop on Global History for graduate students and junior and senior scholars of the Universities of Dundee and St. Andrews in Scotland. The workshop consisted of three discussion sessions, each with a different theme, i.e. the conceptualization(s), parameters, and possible future(s) of Global History. The central question was to what extent this fast-changing field required adjustments of “normal” historiographical methodologies and epistemologies. The workshop participants agreed that Global History focuses in particular on connections across large spaces and/or long timespans. Yet reconstructing these webs of connections should not obscure global inequalities. In the case of empires, many of the exchanges across space and time were/are ordered in a hierarchical fashion --metropolises profiting from peripheral spaces, for example-- and imposed by certain groups of people on others, resulting in, for example, the enslavement or extermination of indigenous peoples. As historians, we should also ask ourselves the question what we do about peoples or areas that were or are non-connected, local, and remote. Where does globalization end? As always, in working through these problems, the fruitful workshop discussions generated more questions than answers.

Bios

Dr. Martine van Ittersum is Senior Lecturer in History at the University of Dundee. She is the author of *Profit and Principle: Hugo Grotius, Natural Rights Theories and the Rise of Dutch Power in the East Indies, 1595-1615*, Brill Intellectual History Series (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2006). She has published widely on the history of international law and on the theory and practice of Western imperialism and colonialism, particularly in the early modern period.

Dr. Felicia Gottmann is the Leverhulme Early Career Research Fellow in History at the University of Dundee. She obtained her D.Phil from the University of Oxford in 2010. She is the author of *Global Trade, Smuggling, and the Making of Economic Liberalism: Asian Textiles in France 1680-1760* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

Tristan Mostert is a Ph.D. student at the University of Leiden, specializing on the political, diplomatic and military relations between the Dutch East India Company and native polities in what is now Indonesia. He is the Dutch translator of Tonio Andrade, *Lost Colony: The Untold Story of China's First Great Victory over the West* (Princeton University Press, 2013).

Text

On a pleasantly warm and sunny day –somewhat unusual for Scotland – twenty graduate students and academics from the Universities of Dundee, Edinburgh and St. Andrews gathered in Dundee for a workshop on global history. Dr. Martine van Ittersum and Dr. Felicia Gottmann, members of the Scottish Centre for Global History, organized the event, which was co-sponsored by the Universities of Dundee and St. Andrews, the journal *Itinerario* and the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland. In three lively workshop sessions, the participants discussed the state of the field –conceptualization(s), parameters, and possible future(s)—with two of the most distinguished global historians alive today, Professor Jürgen Osterhammel of the University of Konstanz and Professor Geoffrey Parker of The Ohio State University. ¹

Introductions

Geoffrey Parker, author of *Global Crisis: War, Climate Change, and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century* (2013), was born in Nottingham in 1943, and grew up amid the destruction caused by World War II. “As I looked at the streets and noted the surprising absence of one or more houses, I remember thinking: ‘Great and terrible things have happened here, and I want to find

out why.” He went to Christ’s College, Cambridge, to read history in 1962, and almost immediately had his first direct encounter with global history: “During my first term as an undergraduate, for the only time in my life so far, I thought I was about to die.” The Cuban Missile Crisis had brought the world to the brink of nuclear war, and Parker recalled how:

After eating dinner together in the college hall on the night of 25 October 1962, my friends and I all shook hands and said goodbye. We rated our chances of seeing another dawn at about 50/50. When I read the accounts of John F Kennedy’s discussions with his advisers in the “Excomm”, all of them apparently prepared to fight the USSR to the last European, I think we were a trifle optimistic.²

Parker did not study global history at Cambridge (no courses were offered), but he became enthralled by Sir John Elliott’s lectures on the history of early modern Europe, and in particular by the question why Spain, the greatest empire of its day, failed to suppress the Dutch Revolt. Under Elliott’s supervision, and thanks in part to the generosity of Fernand Braudel, who opened the doors of several French provincial archives for him, Parker completed *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road, 1567-1659. The Logistics of Victory and Defeat in the Low Countries Wars* (1972). Four years later, while teaching at the University of St. Andrews, he received an invitation to serve as a scholarly consultant for the *Times Atlas of World History*: his first encounter with global history as an intellectual endeavour.³ Still, he has never offered courses on the topic for either undergraduate or graduate students, instead teaching early modern European and military history at St Andrews, the University of British Columbia, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Yale University and the Ohio State University. In 2012, the *Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie voor Wetenschappen* (Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences) awarded him the biennial Heineken Foundation Prize for History.

Parker’s current project – a biography of Charles V (1500-1558), Holy Roman Emperor and King of Spain – took him in 2014 to the University of Konstanz. The University library contains copies of no less than 120,000 letters written by or to Charles V. This led to a chance encounter between Parker and Osterhammel, a professor at Konstanz and the author of the magisterial *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century* (2009, in the English translation 2014).⁴

Jürgen Osterhammel explained that he, too, had never taught global history – a subject unknown under that label at any of the universities where he was employed. In fact, he considers himself less

international than the younger generation of German historians (for example, he continues to write his books in German). When he began his graduate work in the 1970s, the historical profession in Germany was still very Eurocentric. Historians who specialized in non-Western fields found themselves on the margins of the profession. Consequently, his Ph.D. thesis on the history of Chinese foreign relations (1980) was published three years later not as a work of history but in a Sinological book series.⁵ He never experienced a personal turn or conversion to global or world history. Instead, he has always taught courses on the history of China, the British Empire and European colonialism. In his view, British and German approaches to global history make for an interesting comparison. Global history in Britain can be conceived of as a broadening and modernizing of the well-established field of imperial history. Germany, which never had much of an overseas empire and little imperial historiography, partly imported global history from abroad and partly profited from the influence of the Bielefeld School of comparative European history, now slowly establishing links with ‘*Aussereuropäische Geschichte*’, i.e. ‘Non-European History’. Jürgen Kocka, the great social historian, for example, has recently undertaken a global history of capitalism.⁶

Although Osterhammel’s *The Transformation of the World* contains over 1,100 pages, he does not believe that every global historian should inflict big books on the reading public. Moreover, *The Transformation of the World* is based on secondary literature out of necessity, not as a matter of personal preference. Osterhammel feels that, given the scope of the book, he should have consulted a huge number of documentary collections – but there were no sabbaticals or institutional funding for extended journeys to archives. Some have wondered why, having focused on eighteenth and twentieth-century topics before, he opted for the nineteenth century in *The Transformation of the World*. Because of that very fact: the nineteenth century was perfectly positioned *between* his main research interests. He had no personal stake in any of the major historiographical debates concerning the nineteenth century, and so, crucially, could offer a quasi-ethnographic view from the outside. He has continued to expand his focus since writing *The Transformation of the World*. He is now pursuing his interests in decolonization, global intellectual history and classical music. Together with Akira Iriye, he is editor-in-chief of a six-volume *A History of the World*, published jointly since 2012 by Harvard University Press and C.H. Beck in Munich.⁷ In 2014 the *Deutsche Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung* (The German Academy for Language and Literature) awarded him its annual *Sigmund Freud Preis für Wissenschaftliche Prosa* for non-fiction literature.

The three workshop sessions that followed these introductory remarks focussed on three questions:

- a) “Does Size Matter?”, which explored the methodologies of global history.
- b) “Global History for Whom?”, which addressed the thorny topics of politics and ideology.
- c) “Are we all global historians now?”, which speculated about the possible future directions that the field might take.

The workshop participants arrived well prepared to tackle these questions. They had received a hefty reading list in advance, which consisted of a dozen publications (articles, essays, interviews, and book chapters: see below) in addition to the volumes by Parker and Osterhammel.

“Does Size Matter?”

The first session analysed the extent to which global history requires adjustments of “normal” historiographical methodologies and epistemologies. The focus of the discussion was an exchange of ideas on “How Size Matters: The Question of Scale in History,” involving four historians from the United States – Sebouh David Aslanian, Joyce E. Chaplin, Kristin Mann and Ann McGrath – published in *American Historical Review* in December 2013.⁸ According to Osterhammel, this debate reflected the anxieties of historians in the face of Big History, supported by digital humanities and Big Data. A case in point is the Big History Project, financially supported by Bill Gates.⁹ Should Big History be regarded as a threat or an opportunity? Workshop participants pointed out that historians have always had the choice of taking either a horizontal or a vertical approach to their research topics, i.e. casting one’s net wide versus drilling deep. Moreover, it is essential to zoom in and out in order to construct a persuasive historical argument. As Jaap Jacobs, St. Andrews, noted, “seeing the world in a grain of sand” also belongs to the historian’s toolbox.

Jürgen Osterhammel addressed the problem by asking “*The Size of What?*”, and considered four different categories:

(a) *Publications*

In his 2012 interview with *Itinerario*, David Armitage mentioned the “crisis of the codex,” and seemed to dismiss big books as “dinosaurs,” preferring digital presentation or relatively slim volumes of at most 150,000 words instead.¹⁰ The standard length of articles published in scholarly journals is also getting shorter. Still, the robust sales of the recent global histories published by Osterhammel, Parker, and others suggest that the age of “dinosaurs” has not ended yet.

(b) *Geographical scope?*

Osterhammel contrasted the immediate cause of the First World War in July 1914 with the outbreak of “Spanish Flu” in January 1918. The July Crisis of 1914, which began with the murder of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir apparent to the Austro-Hungarian Empire, involved only a few dozen people, all of them residing in European capital cities. The crisis would have immense global repercussions. The mutual misunderstandings and miscommunications of the handful of monarchs, statesmen, generals, and high-ranking civil servants would result in World War I – but nobody knew that at the time. By contrast, the Spanish Flu Epidemic of 1918-19 was perceived as a global event from the start.

(c) *Time spans?*

In Osterhammel’s view, not all global history has to conform to Fernand Braudel’s *longue durée*.¹¹ The time spans covered by the PhD candidates and postdoctoral researchers working at the University of Konstanz range from six to sixty years, and this is probably the norm for historians – not just global historians – at many universities, largely because those who attempt to cover longer periods run out of funding.

(d) *Significance?*

Are we talking about “big events” versus “small events” here? How do we judge that? The crucial issue is the future potential of an event. For example, the German physicist Wilhelm Conrad Röntgen (1845-1923) discovered X-rays in his laboratory in Würzburg on 8 November 1895. Two weeks later, he made the very first picture using X-rays (of the hand of his wife Anna Bertha). These were local events, but with enormous potential, and, after some time, a global impact.

Osterhammel confessed that he was not terribly interested in “Deep History,” which he considers to be closely related to astrophysics and evolutionary biology. He gave two reasons for his scepticism:

- a) Deep History is apolitical, and does not even try to address the major political questions of the day, and
- b) Deep History has no effective way of countering the claims of national histories – i.e. histories of a far more limited timescale, which, contrary to Armitage’s optimistic claims in the 2012 *Itinerario* interview,¹² remain a popular format among historians and the reading public.

Osterhammel concluded that the question of size was of secondary importance. Ph.D. students must give very careful thought to the question of how they *manage* their global history projects.

Conversely, for works of synthesis, selectivity – not ‘size’ – is the essential issue, because syntheses, too, must be controlled. They have to be selective in various ways. John Darwin, author of *After Tamerlane: The Rise and Fall of Global Empires, 1400-2000*,¹³ did not claim to be comprehensive. As a specialist on Eurasia and Africa, he paid little attention to Latin America or the Pacific, for example. This did in no way invalidate his contribution to global historical analysis.

Perhaps to reassure the numerous graduate students and early-career scholars present, Geoffrey Parker insisted that a “big book” should rarely if ever be a historian’s first book. Such projects, he argued, take a lot of time and should be considered a career goal rather than a starting point. Nor did he consider the methodological issues raised by global history to be characteristic of that field alone. He identified five common problems:

1. the question of scales (*jeux d’échelles*), i.e. the micro versus the macro problem
2. the question of explanation and causation (are there “laws” of history?)
3. the Braudelian issue of human agency versus structure
4. the comparison and analysis of connections and connectedness
5. the contested legitimacy of “grand narratives.”

All historians must address these problems: they are not confined to those who wish to write global history. Parker also noted the problem of finding an appropriate chronology when writing global history. Does a timeframe that works for one region (say Europe) also make sense for other regions? Parker found good reason to begin his narrative of the seventeenth-century “crisis” in 1618, since that year saw not only the beginning of prolonged conflicts in both Europe and China, but also a sudden drop in global temperatures. However, it proved impossible to find a single date for the end of the crisis – although most afflicted states and societies began to recover at some point in the 1680s. He recalled a detailed discussion of this conundrum by participants in the “Special Forum: The Afterlife of Geoffrey Parker’s *Global Crisis*”, held at the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association in Washington D.C. in January 2014.¹⁴ As for knowing how much detail to include, consider the July crisis of 1914. Despite hundreds of studies of how the Great Powers blundered into war, and thousands of surviving documents, only in 2012 did a historian manage to provide a definitive account of the process by which the British cabinet decided to declare war on Germany in the first days of August 1914.¹⁵ Once again, the challenges that face global historians face all historians.

The workshop discussion now turned to contingency. As Parker pointed out, when it comes to differentiating between “big events” and “small events”, the role of contingency must not be

underestimated. The old-fashioned historiographical consensus that big events require big causes is now balanced by the realization that small events can have immense consequences as well. Parker cited the example of the Hungarian theoretical physicist Leo Szilard, who first visualized how to create a “nuclear chain reaction” when he observed how traffic lights changed from green through yellow to red while waiting to cross a London street in 1933. When Szilard filed a patent for his idea the following year, he specifically mentioned that, with it, “I can produce an explosion.” He was entirely correct. But it took eleven years, tens of thousands of co-workers, and billions of dollars to produce the “explosions” that would abruptly end World War II.¹⁶

Jim Livesey, Founding Director of the Scottish Centre for Global History at the University of Dundee,¹⁷ sounded a note of caution at this point. More people than just historians are engaged in global history, he noted, and not all of them share the historian’s approach to the past. Economists, for example, do not accept the rules of contingency. How do we distinguish global history from global economic history? Livesey suggested that global history should be considered a perspective on a topic – an approach, rather than a conceptual understanding.

The workshop then discussed different types of global or connected histories. Bernhard Struck, Founding Director of the Institute for Transnational and Spatial History at the University of St. Andrews,¹⁸ compared and contrasted transnational history and global history. In Struck’s view, the ‘transnational’ operates at a lower level, on a continental rather than a global scale. Transnational history is the entangled history of nations and/or nation-states, such as, for example, Germany and Poland in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Is it possible to trace the genealogies of global history in Britain? Workshop participants pointed out that the Warwick School prefers to focus on “connections” – usually between Europe or Africa and another region of the world – rather than “comparisons”. Certain examples of the “new international history” came in for criticism as being little more than twenty-first century repackaging of old-fashioned diplomatic history. However, workshop participants agreed that the fashion for global history had raised the bar for good practice in historical research. Parker suggested that the new “normal” in terms of epistemology requires a symmetrical approach: historians must always look at all parties to a problem, and at all the relevant sources. On any given research topic, they must become familiar with the existing literature in all relevant languages. One can no longer call oneself an “expert” on, let us say, Anglo-Dutch relations without examining sources and the secondary literature available in at least Dutch and English.

Guy Rowlands, St. Andrews, drew attention to the practical problem of access to sources, which he considered a particularly pressing one for global historians. Digitization of archives is usually seen as an important step forward in making primary sources available to (potential) users. Parker provided the example of Spain's *Patrimonio Nacional* which has already digitized fifty million documents from various archives, almost all of them available on-line. He can consult them (and if necessary print them) in his office in Columbus, Ohio, whether or not the archive itself is open.¹⁹ Other workshop participants provided more instances of valuable digitization projects, such as those undertaken by the Indonesian National Archives and Dutch National Archives.²⁰ Yet Livesey noted that digitization is understood as appropriation by quite a few subaltern historians in the Caribbean -- scholars who can read documents at home may cease to visit the region they study. Many European institutions are also unhappy at the prospect of putting entire collections online.

Parker then urged Ph.D. students to 'muddy their boots' regardless, for two reasons. It is always better, he argued, to look in person at the places one studies, and not rely on, for example, Google maps. Visiting archives in person allows one to meet other scholars working on the same topic or a closely related one. Parker did not succeed in convincing the younger members of his audience -- not initially, at least. They pointed to the growing importance of virtual forums, mailing lists, and dedicated social media platforms. Parker responded by emphasizing the importance of meeting local historians, who are not always active in such virtual forums and who can provide a local perspective that might be very different from one's own. For example, while working on *Global Crisis* in 2002, Parker visited Shanghai and met a local historian to whom he explained his theory that climate change explained the collapse of Ming rule in Jiangnan (the lower Yangzi valley.) "Rubbish!", the local historian exclaimed. "The critical factor in causing the catastrophic famines of the mid-seventeenth century was the practice of partible inheritance which, created ever-diminishing landholdings per farmer." Although Parker did not abandon his belief in the role of climate change, he gained important insights from this exchange of ideas, and he incorporated them into the argument of *Global Crisis*.

Osterhammel concluded this part of our discussions by noting the confusing state of the field of global history -- although he stressed that this should be expected in a rapidly growing field. Could somebody step forward to map and categorize the vast amount of empirical work done in a global history? None present volunteered, but all considered Sebastian Conrad's *What is Global History* (2016) at least a step in the right direction.²¹

“Global History for Whom?”

The second session of the day explored the politics of global history, i.e. the question of whose interests are being served by the study of global history. The starting point of our discussions was Conrad's *What is Global History?* Whilst favourably impressed with the book's intent, scope and execution, many workshop participants also had serious reservations, especially about the author's conclusions in chapter 10. In particular Parker considered it rather naïve to suggest, as Conrad does, that “[g]one are the days when history departments could be content with a focus on one nation alone.”²² It certainly does not apply in most British universities. As Parker put it, just look at the preponderance of faculty who study “national history” in Oxford and in some Scottish universities! The research produced in these institutions may no longer be nationalistic, but it still has a national focus. Recent figures support Parker's sceptical view. Peter Mandler, President of the Royal Historical Society, noted in his letter to RHS members of July 2016 that “only 13% of historians in UK university departments study the non-Western world; the equivalent proportion in Canada is 20% and in the US 27%.”²³

Osterhammel did not share Conrad's optimism either. He felt it was important to make two distinctions: a) between Europe-centred and Eurocentric approaches, and b) between national and nationalist history, which can, in fact, be easily camouflaged as world history. Chinese scholars often adopt a global perspective in order to reinforce the notion of Chinese primacy in world history. He questioned as over-optimistic David Armitage's claim that “[t]he hegemony of national historiography is over.”²⁴ Global historians and their reading public constitute an autonomous sphere of “circulation” – and not a very large one at that. He estimated that the reading public for European history in Germany exceeded that for global history by a factor of ten. For example, *1913: Der Sommer des Jahrhunderts* (2012), written by the German journalist Florian Illies and translated into English as *1913: The Year Before the Storm*, has sold 500,000 copies in Germany alone.²⁵ By contrast, it has become almost obligatory for German historians to situate their country's history into transnational contexts. An early impetus in this direction came from the volume of collected essays *Das Kaiserreich Transnational: Deutschland in der Welt 1871-1914* (2006), edited by Sebastian Conrad and Osterhammel.²⁶

Like most of the other workshop participants, Osterhammel endorsed the gloomy diagnosis of the late Christopher Bayly (1945-2015) that the prevalence of national – and often nationalist history—

should not be underestimated.²⁷ The majority of historians in the world today are not free to write what they want, but are expected to create the “useable pasts” demanded by ruling elites, often via a kind of national genealogy (“our country in world history”). A whole body of literature exists about states and societies allegedly locked in a kind of Darwinian competition with each other. Kenneth Pomeranz’s *The Great Divergence: China, Europe and the Making of the Modern World Economy* (2000) can be considered the most elegant formulation of an argument of this kind.²⁸

Do historians still have a moral responsibility towards their readers, though? Put differently, when do they neglect that responsibility? In *What is Global History?*, Conrad asks the question whether “twenty-first century global history [is] not essentially a handmaiden of twenty-first century globalization.” His answer is that “one of the crucial tasks of global history is to offer a critical commentary on the ongoing globalization process.”²⁹ Parker begged to differ: historical writing, he suggested, tends to *mirror* developments in society but does not shape them – nor, for that matter, does it shape the future. Osterhammel argued that the days are gone when Western historians considered themselves answerable to collectives and abstractions such as the nation, a class, socialism, etc. Perhaps global historians could be said to have a duty towards “the human species”. While a noble ideal, Osterhammel did not consider it particularly helpful, however.

For many workshop participants, a thornier issue was that of language. Conrad criticizes the alleged hegemony of English as an academic language in the field of global history. He goes so far as to argue that “[m]ost global historians today continue to ignore scholarship written in other languages.”³⁰ Parker totally disagreed with Conrad’s contention. In his view, it is the *non-global* historians who “ignore scholarship written in other languages.” Thus Bernard S. Capp, a specialist on mid-seventeenth century England, wrote an excellent study entitled *Cromwell's Navy* (1989) based on extensive research in English sources, but he completely ignored the previous study of exactly the same subject by German scholar Hans-Christoph Junge, published nine years earlier. Similarly, in his monograph *The King's Living Image* (2004), about the mediation and delegation of royal power in the early modern Hispanic world, Alejandro Cañeque made no reference to a study in German published by Regine Jorzick six years earlier on much the same subject that cited many of the same sources.³¹ Parker quoted John Richards, another pioneer of “Big History”, who in *The Unending Frontier* (2003) observed that “in the best of all worlds, the author would be proficient in a half-dozen more languages.”³² He also pointed out that, if necessary, one can “pay to play” in

order to follow Richards' advice: find someone who can translate or summarize a text, be it a primary or secondary source, written in a language one cannot read.

Workshop participants argued that there was nevertheless an issue with English as *the* lingua franca of global history. It is a factor that contributes to the worldwide dominance of Anglo-American scholarship. In communicating with readers, non-native speakers of English are at a disadvantage when they cannot articulate their research quite as well or quite as appealingly as native speakers of English can. True proficiency in a language exceeds the level required for a basic comprehension of primary sources, and involves a thorough appreciation of metaphor, usage, and historic linguistic change. That, of course, was also true when French and, before that, Latin and Italian had been the mediums of intellectual exchange in the Western world. *Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.*

The third and final discussion centred on the mantras of connectivity and mobility in the field of global history. Conrad is quite critical of this development:

[t]he concern with globality and globalization has led many historians to privilege interactions and transfers, and to treat them as ends in themselves. Connectedness then becomes the only language that the sources seem to speak, as if this was their deep and true meaning.³³

Parker interpreted this as a critique of Sanjay Subrahmanyam's article on "Connected Histories" (1997) and of recent work by Subrahmanyam and others on global microhistory.³⁴ Osterhammel disagreed, however. He considered it a swipe at anthropologists, who tend to use images of water and fluidity when referring to movement, thus misrepresenting processes that, in reality, are subject to many barriers and complications. Moreover, such a choice of metaphors ignores the salient question of global inequalities. For who is being moved? Who is doing the trading and shipping? As Osterhammel pointed out, networks do not always result in communities and certainly not in communities of equals: think of patronage networks, for example. In his view, sociological network theory offers several well-established ways to prevent such misconceptions.³⁵

Staying with the topic of mobility and connectivity, workshop participants discussed the extent to which immobile communities were nevertheless affected by mobility – through the increased availability of consumer goods or information, for example. Jacobs brought up the "globalization of the mind": a drip, drip, drip of tales told by people who had come into contact with individuals or

groups living elsewhere on the planet. Livesey suggested that it might be more helpful to investigate whether there was a shared repertoire of behaviour as a consequence of increased global connections. Analogous to the “repertoire of empire” which Burbank and Cooper discussed in *Empires in World History*, one might re-conceptualize connectivity and mobility as being part of “repertoires of innovation”, available to different individuals or groups at different times. Parker considered this an attractive option for historians. Rulers of empires such as Philip II of Spain possessed a limited repertoire of military and administrative know-how at their disposal. There were limits to what they could do. In sixteenth-century Europe, although letters travelled faster than any other man-made item, they never travelled faster than one hundred miles a day, for example, limiting the ability of even the most powerful rulers to influence let alone to control events. Although in theory rulers could learn new tricks, they did not always do so (as Parker shows in his *Grand Strategy of Philip II*).³⁶

This brought us to the topic of microhistory and historical biography. In an age of global history, does it make sense to write about individual, perhaps totally unexceptional human beings? Most workshop participants shared a belief in the power of human agency and in the unique opportunities offered by individual stories to reveal wider pictures, and they concluded that biography and microhistory would continue to be valuable historiographical genres.³⁷ Of course, many open questions remain regarding the way global history can or should be written. Attacks on the methodology of an emerging field are nothing new either. Recent dismissals of global microhistory reminded Parker of the criticism which John Elliott had levied at Carlo Ginzburg’s *The Cheese and the Worms* (1980) in *The New York Review of Books*.³⁸ Elliott wondered “how many Menocchios” there had actually been in European history, and whether their stories were worth telling. He made a similar point in his inaugural lecture as Regius Professor of Modern History at the University of Oxford in 1991, remarking that “[T]here is surely something amiss when the name of Martin Guerre becomes as well or better known than that of Martin Luther.”³⁹ In 2014, Natalie Zemon Davis, author of *The return of Martin Guerre* (1984), responded to Elliott’s criticism. In the journal *Common Knowledge*, she argued that both the Protestant Reformer and the obscure French peasant

are part of the same universe of historical inquiry. Knowing about Martin Guerre brings understanding of the peasant world, which is also important for the trajectory of Luther's Reformation. Knowing about Martin Luther brings knowledge of major religious change, essential to understanding Martin Guerre's village world and what happened in it. Themes of “imposture” and “dissimulation” and the fashioning of identity are central to social conflicts

and social and personal aspiration across the spectrum in the sixteenth century: they are found in the actual lives of both men and in Martin Luther's sermons, as well as in the Martin Guerre trial.⁴⁰

This took Parker back to the question of what is “good” and “bad” global history. Which criteria do we use for inclusion and exclusion? Where does one stop? As always, there are more questions than answers!

Conclusions: Are We all Global Historians Now?

A concluding session allowed participants to exchange their experience of actually writing (global) history. Do you use index-cards? Do you work from generals to particulars? What are the advantages of single and joint authorship? At the request of various workshop participants, both Osterhammel and Parker offered some insights into the making of their respective global histories.

Geoffrey Parker began.⁴¹ In 1976, he listened to a BBC broadcast featuring the American solar physicist John A. Eddy,⁴² who suggested that there might have been a causal link between the so-called “Maunder Minimum” in the number of sunspots and the so-called “Little Ice Age” in the seventeenth century. Eddy speculated that the prolonged absence of sunspots had resulted in global cooling. Average temperatures in seventeenth-century Europe had been a degree centigrade lower than normal. Eddy’s research was perhaps the first application of solar physics to early modern history. Parker, who had long suspected that there was something missing in the *Past & Present* debate about “The General Crisis”,⁴³ immediately got in touch with the American solar physicist, who gave permission to include his essay in a collection co-edited by Parker and a former student, Lesley Smith: *The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (1978).⁴⁴

Then, in February 1998, shortly after completing a revised edition of that collection, Parker awoke from a dream convinced that he should move beyond a volume of essays and write “an integrated narrative and analytical account of the first global crisis for which we possess adequate documentation for Asia, Africa, the Americas, and Europe.” Penguin and Basic Books gave him a book contract for “The World Crisis, 1635-1665,” to be delivered in 2003. Parker soon discovered that the project was far more complicated than first expected. The study’s proposed start and end dates had to be extended back to 1618 and forward to the 1680s. More importantly, his decision to combine material from the “natural archive” of the period (climatic proxy data such as tree-ring size, precipitation records, and glacier advances) with data from the “human archive” (chronicles,

letters, “weather diaries”, art, and archaeology) resulted in a 1,500-page typescript, submitted four years late, in 2007. After six months of total silence, Parker’s editor at Basic Books curtly rejected the work as “too long and too late.” Parker’s editor at Penguin, by contrast, first lost the typescript, then reconstituted it from electronic files in the wrong order, and finally criticized him for writing a typescript that did not “flow” – responses which, to put it mildly, did not motivate him to pursue the project any further.

With the benefit of hindsight, Parker eventually realized that the double rejection had been a blessing in disguise. By the time he regained his enthusiasm for the project, far more material from both the natural and the human archive had become available, while the contemporary debate over the impact of climate change had intensified. In 2010, he signed a new contract with Yale University Press. The typescript was cut by more than one-third by three ruthless graduate students from The Ohio State University – Sandy Bolzenius and Kate Epstein from the US, and Mircea Platon from Romania – and an equally ruthless visiting scholar from Australia, Rayne Allinson. At the same time, they unearthed much new material that strengthened his argument, while Kate Epstein forced him to abandon his original title. First, she noted that “The World Crisis” had been used by Winston Churchill as the title of his history of World War I. When Parker hesitated, she reminded him that A. J. Balfour had waspishly dismissed that work as “Winston’s brilliant Autobiography, disguised as a history of the universe.” Parker duly changed his own title to *Global Crisis*.⁴⁵

How does one select and present a representative selection of material that tells a truly global story? Parker explained that his friend Robert C. Cowley, a historian with extensive editorial experience, had advised him to enliven the text of *Global Crisis* by including at least one “Gee-whiz” fact per page, in order to keep the reader engaged. He sought to follow this advice by identifying one contemporary source for each of the regions afflicted by the “fatal synergy” between natural and man-made disasters. For example, the Swede Karl Anders Pommerenning was the only resident foreign diplomat in Russia during the traumatic upheavals of 1648-49, but he described and analysed those upheavals in his dispatches for the benefit of his home government. He also sent home copies of documents, mostly of originals now lost. Enomoto Yazaemon, a salt merchant living northwest of Tokyo (Edo), left an autobiography that included a vivid record of the extreme weather experienced during the 1640s. Both sources were suggested to Parker by specialists in (respectively) Russian and Japanese history, and he obtained English translations which he quoted extensively in his book.⁴⁶

Parker secured a sabbatical leave for the academic year 2011-12, and spent it implementing the many helpful suggestions of his ruthless editorial quartet, as well as those supplied by other experts in areas where his own knowledge was weak. In May 2012, he sent Yale University Press the revised typescript, a tight 1,200-pages, reflecting the research and reading undertaken over the thirty-six years since he had heard the radio interview with Jack Eddy. *The Global Crisis* appeared in both Britain and the United States in spring 2013; in December *The Sunday Times* of London proclaimed it “The History Book of the Year;” and in 2014, it won a “British Academy Medal”, awarded for a “landmark academic achievement in any of the disciplines supported by the Academy, which has transformed understanding of a particular subject or field of study.” The book may still be “too long,” Parker reflected, but it may not, after all, be “too late.”

Jürgen Osterhammel then discussed his own *magnum opus*, *The Transformation of the World*. This was a product of the sabbatical year spent at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies in 2001-2002. Osterhammel had gone to NIAS with the intention of writing a comparative study of European overseas empires in the nineteenth century. However, upon arrival at NIAS, it turned out that Henk Wesseling, the Institute’s Director, had just submitted his own book on the topic to the publishers. What was to be done? Osterhammel felt that he had two options: either write a research monograph or “hazard a *Flucht nach vorn* [to take the bull by the horns] and attempt something even grander,” meaning a comprehensive portrait of an age, of which empires would just be one facet. He opted for the latter. He spent his time at NIAS drawing up various outlines for the book, both in terms of contents and argument. His conversations with Peer Vries --soon to move to the University of Vienna, but a resident fellow at NIAS at the time – were crucial in this respect.⁴⁷ Following the publication in 2004 of Chris Bayly’s masterpiece *The Birth of the Modern World*,⁴⁸ Osterhammel again shelved his own, very similar project for a while. When he overcame the ‘Bayly shock’, as he calls it, he managed to write the bulk of the manuscript in 2006 and 2007. A sabbatical year in Munich sponsored by the Carl Friedrich von Siemens Foundation made it possible for him to complete the book.⁴⁹

Discussing the place of his book in the field, Osterhammel started out by noting that even generalists are specialists most of the time – beware of fulltime generalists! There are many different styles of doing global history, most of which he considered legitimate. Following Isaiah Berlin, he distinguished between what he called ‘the fox approach to history’, which concentrates on one big problem, such as Pomeranz’ *The Great Divergence* and the entire debate about Western

exceptionalism, and what he called ‘the hedgehog approach to history’, which deals with many small problems. The writing of syntheses is, in quantitative terms, a very marginal genre. As J.R. McNeill noted in his book review, *The Transformation of the World* is not exactly a textbook written for undergraduate students, but rather a collection of analyses aimed at professional historians.⁵⁰ Osterhammel quoted the Qing dynasty philosopher Zhang Xuecheng (1738-1801): “Literary skill, learning, and insight – to possess any of these is not an easy task, but to be equally proficient in all three is even more difficult.”⁵¹

When asked, Osterhammel found it difficult to compare the historical interpretations offered by *The Transformation of the World* and *Global Crisis*. It was far easier and more appropriate to do that for *The Transformation of the World* and, for example, Bayly’s *The Birth of the Modern World*. In his book review, McNeill agreed with Osterhammel that *The Transformation of the World* and *The Birth of the Modern World* were “kindred spirits.” However, McNeill also saw important differences. In his view, “Bayly’s is more tightly focused, less sprawling, less abstract, less influenced by the traditions of German historical sociology, which Osterhammel finds especially useful in his discussions of the state and of social hierarchy.”⁵² Osterhammel was glad to hear from people close to Bayly that the author of *The Birth of the Modern World* did not believe such differences precluded useful comparisons between the two books. Carla Pestana notes in her contribution to the American Historical Association’s special forum on *Global Crisis* that Parker and Osterhammel have “a somewhat similar approach to writing history on a grand scale.”⁵³ A case in point is the attention paid by both authors to time and chronology.⁵⁴ In Osterhammel’s view, both *Global Crisis* and *The Transformation of the World* can be characterized as global *portraits* of a defined time-period. Like most works of historical scholarship, both books speak to the present as well as the past. In the twenty-first century, human populations around the world are unevenly affected by globalization and man-made climate change. There are notable differences, of course. According to Osterhammel, Parker successfully combines the ‘fox’ and ‘hedgehog’ approaches to history, making *Global Crisis* a much more thesis-driven work than *The Transformation of the World*. Another striking difference is the ingenious use of primary sources in *Global Crisis*. Apparently, the editor removed all quotations from *The Transformation of the World*, on the grounds that an even longer book would never see the light of the day.

As noted earlier, *The Transformation of the World* is based entirely on secondary literature – as many or even most syntheses of comparable scope tend to be. Osterhammel emphasized the pleasure of reading first-rate monographic work. Why should specialists only find a response

among small circles of their fellow-experts? Even so, workshop participants asked, how had he selected his materials for a global history of a “long” century (c. 1760 to 1920) and succeeded in covering almost all major aspects of the past, from politics to religion? Osterhammel replied that relying on the secondary literature is actually a boon. It provides a coherence that a highly selective employment of primary materials could not possibly guarantee. Too many topics would have to be left untouched.

Finally, the workshop participants gave some thought to the possible futures of global history.

Jürgen Osterhammel saw the need to integrate global and international history. Currently, many “global historians” ignore the fundamental conditions of war and peace. “Environmental studies” is another promising avenue of research, of great relevance of the modern world. Parker praised Braudel’s “problematic imperative”:

The framework of research is *the problem*, selected with full independence and responsibility of mind, beyond all those plans, so comfortable and so tempting, that carry with them as an extra dividend, the warranty and blessing of the University.⁵⁵

And what problem could be more “imperative” than environmental studies? Yet global history, Parker claimed, to murmurs of agreement, faces a tenacious and powerful enemy: the increasing imposition of metrics to evaluate research, such as the Research Excellence Framework (REF) in Great Britain.⁵⁶ This, he asserted, would have prevented Braudel from completing both of his two masterpieces – *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, and *Civilization and Capitalism* – because each took decades to complete.⁵⁷ Despite this gloomy prediction, the junior scholars and graduate students present seemed undeterred. The workshop itself was an illustration of the breadth, relevance, and appeal of global history today. On that cheerful note, the workshop participants relocated to the Dundee Contemporary Arts Centre for drinks, dinner and convivial conversation.

Pictures taken at the workshop and at the DCA can be viewed on the Facebook pages of the journal

Bibliography:

Works on the workshop reading list have been marked with an asterisk.

- Barracough, Geoffrey, *The Times atlas of world history* (London: Times Books, 1978).
- Bayly, Christopher A, 'History and World History', in: Ulinka Rublack (ed.), *A Concise Companion to History* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 3-25.
- Bayly, Christopher A., *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).
- Benton, Lauren, and Clulow, Adam, 'Legal encounters and the origins of global law' in: Jerry H. Bentley et al. (eds.) *The Cambridge World History* (CUP, 2015), 80-100.*
- Berlin, Isaiah, *The Hedgehog and the Fox: An Essay on Tolstoy's View of History* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1953).
- Blussé, Leonard e.a. "I end up with the question "why", but I don't start with it": Interview with Geoffrey Parker', *Itinerario*, 21, issue 2 (1997), 8-19.
- Braudel, Fernand, *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II* (Paris, 1949; second, expanded edition Paris, Colin, 1966), translated into English as *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, 2 vols. (New York : Harper & Row, 1972-1976)
- Braudel, Fernand, *Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme XVe-XVIIIe siècle*, 3 vols. (Paris: Armand Colin, 1979), translated into English as *Civilisation and Capitalism, 15th-18th century*, 3 vols. (London: Collins, 1981-84).
- Braudel, Fernand and A. Coll, "Histoire et sciences sociales: La longue durée," *Réseaux*, 5:27 (1987), 7-37.
- Burbank, Jane and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in world history: power and the politics of difference* (Princeton University Press, 2011).
- Cañeque, Alejandro, *The King's Living Image: The Culture and Politics of Viceregal Power in Colonial Mexico* (New York: Routledge, 2004).
- Capp, B.S., *Cromwell's Navy: The Fleet and the English Revolution, 1648-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1989).
- Chaplin, Joyce E., "Ogres and Omnivores: Early American Historians and Climate History," *William and Mary Quarterly* 72 (2015), 25-32.*
- Churchill, Winston, *The World Crisis*, 5 vols. (London : T. Butterworth, 1923-1931)
- Clossey, Luke, and Guyatt, Nicholas, 'It's a Small World After All: The Wider World in Historians' Peripheral Vision', *Perspectives on History* (May 2013), available at <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/may-2013/its-a-small-world-after-all>
- Colley, Linda, 'Empires of Writing: Britain, America and Constitutions, 1776–1848', *Law and*

- History Review* 32 (2014), 237-266.*
- Conrad, Sebastian and Jürgen Osterhammel eds., *Das Kaiserreich Transnational: Deutschland in Der Welt 1871-1914* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).
- Conrad, Sebastian, *What is global history?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016).*
- Darwin, John, *After Tamerlane: The Rise and Fall of Global Empires, 1400-2000* (Penguin, 2008).
- Davis, Natalie Zemon, “Martin Luther, Martin Guerre and ways of knowing,” *Common knowledge*, 20 (2014), issue 1, 4-8.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon, *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Harvard University Press, 1984)
- Egremont, Max, *Balfour: A life of Arthur James Balfour* (London: Collins, 1980),
- Elliott, J. H., ‘Discussion of H. R. Trevor-Roper: “The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century”, V’, *Past and Present* 18.1 (1960), 25-30.
- Elliott, J.H. ‘Rats or Cheese?’, *The New York Review of Books*, 26 June 1980.
- Elliott, J.H., *National and Comparative History: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered Before the University of Oxford on 10 May 1991* (Oxford University Press, 1996).
- J. H. Hexter, ‘Discussion of H. R. Trevor-Roper: “The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century”, III’, *Past and Present* 18.1 (1960), 14-18
- Ghobrial, John-Paul A, ‘The Secret Life of Elias of Babylon and the Uses of Global Microhistory’, *Past and Present* (2014) 222 (1): 51-93. *
- Hexter, J.H., “Fernand Braudel and the *Monde Braudellien*”, *Journal of Modern History*, 44 (1972): 480-539.
- Hobsbawm, E. J., ‘The General Crisis of the European Economy in the 17th Century’, *Past and Present* 5.1 (1954), 33-53.
- Hobsbawm, E.J., ‘Discussion of H. R. Trevor-Roper: “The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century”, II’, *Past and Present* 18.1 (1960), 12-14.
- ‘How Size Matters: The Question of Scale in History’ (Participants in the AHR Conversation: Sebouh David Aslanian, Joyce E. Chaplin, Kristin Mann and Ann McGrath), *American Historical Review* 118, no. 5 (Dec. 2013) 1431-1472.*
- Illies, Florian, *1913: Der Sommer des Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 2012), translated into English as *1913: The Year Before the Storm* trans. Shaun Whiteside and Jamie Lee Searle (London: Melville House, 2013).
- Innes, Joanna, ““Networks” in British History’ in *East Asian Journal of British History*, 5 (2016), 51-72.
- Irvine, Akira ed., *Global Interdependence: The World after 1945* (Belknap press, 2014).
- Ittersum, Martine van, ‘Hugo Grotius (1583–1645): The Making of a Founding Father of International Law’ in: *Handbook on the Theory of International Law*, ed. Anne Orford (OUP, 2016), ch. 4.*
- Ittersum, Martine van, and Jacobs, Jaap, 'Are We All Global Historians Now? An Interview with David Armitage', *Itinerario / Volume 36 / Issue 02 / August 2012*, 7-28.*

- Jansen, Jan C. and Jürgen Osterhammel, *Dekolonisation: Das Ende der Imperien* (Munich 2013, expanded American edition with Princeton University Press: January 2017).
- Jorzick, Regine, *Herrschaftssymbolik und Staat. Die Vermittlung königlicher Herrschaft im Spanien der frühen Neuzeit, 1556-1598* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1998).
- Junge, Hans-Christoph, *Flottenpolitik und Revolution. Die Entstehung der englischen Seemacht während der Herrschaft Cromwells* (Stuttgart, 1980).
- Kocka, Jürgen, *Capitalism: A Short History* (Princeton University Press, 2016).
- Mandler, Peter, 'RHS Letter Regarding the EU Referendum' (12 July 2016), available at <http://royalhistsoc.org/rhs-letter-regarding-eu-referendum/>
- Martin, Colin and Geoffrey Parker, *The Spanish Armada* (London: W.W. Norton & Co., 1988).
- McNeill, J.R., review of Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*, (Princeton University Press, 2014) in: *American Historical Review* 120. 4 (2015) 1440-1441.
- Mousnier, Roland, 'Discussion of H. R. Trevor-Roper: "The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century", IV', *Past and Present* 18.1 (1960), 18-24.
- Osterhammel, Jürgen, 'Global History and Historical Sociology', in: James Belich, John Darwin, Margret Frenz, Chris Wickham eds., *The Prospects of Global History* (Oxford University Press 2016), 23-43.
- Osterhammel, Jürgen, *The transformation of the world. A global history of the 19th century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014; original German edition, Munich 2009).*
- Osterhammel, Jürgen and Niels P. Petersson, *Globalization: A Short History*, transl. by Dona Geyer, Princeton University Press 2005.
- Osterhammel, Jürgen, *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, transl. by S. L. Frisch, Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers, 3rd ed. 2009.
- Osterhammel, Jürgen, 'Globale Horizonte europäischer Kunstmusik,' in: *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 38 (2012), pp. 86-132
- Parker, Geoffrey, *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road 1567-1659: The Logistics of Spanish Victory and Defeat in the Low Countries' Wars* (CUP, 1972; second edition, CUP, 2004).
- Parker, Geoffrey and Lesley M. Smith eds., *The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (London & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978; revised edition, London: Routledge, 1997).
- Parker, Geoffrey ed., *The Thirty Years' War* (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984).
- Parker, Geoffrey, *The Military Revolution: Military Innovation and the Rise of the West, 1500-1800* (CUP, 1988).
- Parker, Geoffrey, *The Grand Strategy of Philip II* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998).
- Parker, Geoffrey, *Global crisis. War, climate change, and catastrophe in the 17th century* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014; original edition 2013).*
- Parker, Geoffrey, Benton, Lauren, Headrick, Daniel, Miller, Joseph C., and Pestana, Carla Gardina, 'Special Forum: The Afterlife of Geoffrey Parker's Global Crisis', *Journal of World History* 26, no. 1 (March 2015) pp. 141-180.

- Parker, Geoffrey, "The Genesis of *Global Crisis*", *Historically Speaking* 14. 5 (2013), 29-30
- Pomeranz, Kenneth W., *The Great Divergence: China, Europe and the Making of the Modern World Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- Reinhard, Wolfgang ed., *Empires and Encounters, 1350–1750*, (Belknap Press, 2015).
- Richards, John, *The unending frontier: an environmental history of the early modern world* (Berkeley : University of California Press, 2003).
- Roberts, L., 'Name and Honor. A Merchant's Seventeenth-Century Memoir', in S. Frühstück and A. Walthall, eds., *Recreating Japanese Men* (Berkeley, 2011), 48-67.
- Romaniello, M.P., 'Moscow's Lost Petition to the Tsar, 2 June 1648', *Russian History* 41 (2014): 119-25.
- Rosenberg, Emily S. ed., *A World Connecting: 1870–1945*, (Bellknap Press, 2012).
- Schilling, Govert, 'Did Quiet Sun Cause Little Ice Age After All?', *Science*, 26 May 2011, available at <http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2011/05/did-quiet-sun-cause-little-ice-age-after-all>
- Subrahmanyam, Sanjay, "Connected Histories: Notes Towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia," *Modern Asian Studies* 31, 3 (1997), 735–62.*
- Subrahmanyam, Sanjay, "Connected Histories: Notes Towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia," *Modern Asian Studies* 31, 3 (1997), 735–62.
- Tomlinson, Jim, 'The Deglobalisation of Dundee, c. 1900–2000', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies* 29, no. 2 (2009), 123-140.*
- Trevor-Roper, H. R., 'The General Crisis of the 17th Century', *Past and Present* 16.1 (1959), 31-64.
- Kossmann, E. H., 'Discussion of H. R. Trevor-Roper: "The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century"', I, *Past and Present* 18.1 (1960), 8-11.
- Weber, Andreas and Gommans, Jos, "'You turn a page and then there is suddenly something on a turtle'. An Interview with Jürgen Osterhammel', *Itinerario* 35, issue 3 (2011), 7-16.
- Weintraub, Stanley, 'Churchill's War', *Washington Post*, December 4, 2005.

¹ The Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland appointed Geoffrey Parker as Carnegie Centenary Professor at the University of St. Andrews in spring 2016. Interviews with both Geoffrey Parker and Jürgen Osterhammel have appeared in *Itinerario*: Leonard Blussé, "I end up with the question "why", but I don't start with it": Interview with Geoffrey Parker," *Itinerario*, 21, issue 2 (1997) pp. 8-19; and Andreas Weber and Jos Gommans, "'You turn a page and then there is suddenly something on a turtle'. An Interview with Jürgen Osterhammel," *Itinerario* 35, issue 3 (2011) pp. 7-16. Tristan Mostert assisted the organizers in compiling this report.

² For more on Parker's historical roots, see his essay "'A man's gotta know his limitations': Reflections on a Misspent Past," in Tonio Andrade and William Reger, eds., *The Limits of Empire: European Imperial Formations in Early Modern World History. Essays in Honor of Geoffrey Parker* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 309-75

³ Geoffrey Barraclough, *The Times Atlas of World History* (London: Times Books, 1978. In 1993, Parker himself edited the third edition of the *Atlas*, and in 1995 also *The Times Compact Atlas of World History*.) Parker's other books include *The Dutch Revolt* (1975; 3rd edn., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984); *Europe in Crisis, 1598-1648* (1979; 2nd edn., Oxford: Blackwell, 2000); *The Spanish Armada* (with Colin Martin, 1988; 2nd edn., Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999); *The Military Revolution: Military Innovation and the Rise of the West, 1500-1800* (1988; 3rd

edn., Cambridge: CUP, 2006); *The Grand Strategy of Philip II* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998); and *Imprudent King: A New Life of Philip II* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014). All have been translated into Spanish, and most into Dutch and other languages.

⁴ Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the 19th Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014; original German edition, Munich: Beck, 2009).

⁵ Jürgen Osterhammel, *Britischer Imperialismus im Fernen Osten: Strukturen der Durchdringung und Einheimischer Widerstand auf dem Chinesischen Markt 1932-1937* (Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1983).

⁶ See, for example, Jürgen Kocka, *Capitalism: A Short History* (Princeton University Press, 2016).

⁷ Jan C. Jansen and Jürgen Osterhammel, *Decolonization: A Short History* (Princeton University Press, forthcoming 2017). Three volumes of the *History of the World* series have appeared so far in English: *Empires and Encounters, 1350–1750*, ed. Wolfgang Reinhard (Belknap Press, 2015); *A World Connecting: 1870–1945*, ed. Emily S. Rosenberg (Belknap Press, 2012); *Global Interdependence: The World after 1945* ed. Akira Iriye (Belknap press, 2014). A fourth volume on the period c. 1750-1870 is so far only available in German (2016). The American version will be published in fall 2017.

⁸ Sebouh David Aslanian, Joyce E. Chaplin, Kristin Mann and Ann McGrath, 'How Size Matters: The Question of Scale in History', *American Historical Review* 118, no. 5 (2013), 1431-1472 (available in open access on the website of the *American Historical Review*, i.e. <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/american-historical-review>).

⁹ <https://school.bighistoryproject.com/bhplive>.

¹⁰ Martine van Ittersum and Jaap Jacobs, 'Are We All Global Historians Now? An Interview with David Armitage', *Itinerario*, 36 (2012), 7 -28.

¹¹ See, for example, Fernand Braudel and A. Coll, "Histoire et sciences sociales: La longue durée," *Réseaux*, 5:27 (1987), 7-37.

¹² Van Ittersum and Jacobs, 'Are We All Global Historians Now?'

¹³ John Darwin, *After Tamerlane: The Rise and Fall of Global Empires, 1400-2000* (Penguin, 2008)

¹⁴ Geoffrey Parker, Lauren Benton, Daniel Headrick, Joseph C. Miller, and Carla Gardina Pestana, "Special Forum: The Afterlife of Geoffrey Parker's Global Crisis," *Journal of World History* 26, no. 1 (March 2015) pp. 141-180.

¹⁵ Nicholas A. Lambert, *Planning Armageddon: British Economic Warfare and the First World War* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012), chapter 5.

¹⁶ Richard Rhodes, *The Making of the Atomic Bomb* (1986; 2nd edn., New York: Simon and Schuster, 2012), chapter 1 and p. 214.

¹⁷ See <https://globalhistory.org.uk>.

¹⁸ See <http://standrewstransnational.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/>.

¹⁹ See the the Portal de Archivos Españoles (PARES), <http://en.www.mcu.es/archivos/CE/PARES.html>.

²⁰ See the Indonesian National Archives portal: <https://sejarah-nusantara.anri.go.id/> and the Dutch National Archives portal: <http://www.gahetna.nl/>.

²¹ Sebastian Conrad, *What is Global History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016)

²² *Ibid.*, p. 206.

²³ Peter Mandler, 'RHS Letter Regarding the EU Referendum' (12 July 2016), available at <http://royalhistsoc.org/rhs-letter-regarding-eu-referendum/>. In his letter, Mandler cites the figures produced by Luke Clossey and Nicholas Guyatt in their article 'It's a Small World After All: The Wider World in Historians' Peripheral Vision', *Perspectives on History* (May 2013), available at <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/may-2013/its-a-small-world-after-all>.

²⁴ Van Ittersum and Jacobs, 'Are We All Global Historians Now?', p. 16.

²⁵ Florian Illies, *1913: Der Sommer des Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 2012), translated into English as *1913: The Year Before the Storm* trans. Shaun Whiteside and Jamie Lee Searle (London: Melville House, 2013). https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/1913:_Der_Sommer_des_Jahrhunderts

²⁶ *Das Kaiserreich Transnational: Deutschland in Der Welt 1871-1914*, ed. Sebastian Conrad and Jürgen Osterhammel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).

²⁷ Christopher A Bayly, 'History and World History', in: Ulinka Rublack (ed.), *A Concise Companion to History* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 3-25. For an obituary, see "Sir Christopher Bayly: Leading Historian of Indian Who Took An Asian-Centred View of the British Empire," *The Guardian*, 23 April 2015, available at <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2015/apr/23/sir-christopher-bayly>.

²⁸ Kenneth W. Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence: China, Europe and the Making of the Modern World Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

²⁹ Conrad, *op. cit.*, 210-212.

³⁰ Conrad, *op cit.*, 219.

³¹ B.S. Capp, *Cromwell's Navy: The Fleet and the English Revolution, 1648-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1989); Hans-Christoph Junge, *Flottenpolitik und Revolution. Die Entstehung der englischen Seemacht während der Herrschaft Cromwells* (Stuttgart, 1980); Alejandro Cañeque, *The King's Living Image: The Culture and Politics of Viceregal*

Power in Colonial Mexico (New York: Routledge, 2004); Regine Jorzick, *Herrschaftssymbolik und Staat. Die Vermittlung königlicher Herrschaft im Spanien der frühen Neuzeit, 1556-1598* (Vienna, 1998).

³² John Richards, *The unending frontier: an environmental history of the early modern world* (Berkeley : University of California Press, 2003) p. 3.

³³ Conrad, op cit, 224. On p. 226, Conrad also critiques global history's alleged "obsession" with mobility and movement.

³⁴ Sanjay Subrahmanyam, "Connected Histories: Notes Towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia," *Modern Asian Studies* 31, 3 (1997), 735–62. Cf. John-Paul A. Ghobrial, "The Secret Life of Elias of Babylon and the Uses of Global Microhistory," *Past and Present* 222.1 (2014), 51-93.

³⁵ For a recent overview of different historiographical approaches to network theory, see Joanna Innes, "'Networks' in British History" in *East Asian Journal of British History*, 5 (2016), 51-72.

³⁶ Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in world history: power and the politics of difference* (Princeton University Press, 2011).;

³⁷ Ghobrial, 'The Secret Life of Elias of Babylon and the Uses of Global Microhistory' is not only a prime example of 'global microhistory', but also raises some of the connectivity issues addressed above.

³⁸ J.H. Elliott, 'Rats or Cheese?', *The New York Review of Books*, 26 June 1980.

³⁹ J.H. Elliott, *National and Comparative History: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered Before the University of Oxford on 10 May 1991* (Oxford University Press, 1996) p. 11.

⁴⁰ Natalie Zemon Davis, "Martin Luther, Martin Guerre and Ways of Knowing," *Common Knowledge* 20, no. 1 (2014) 4-8; Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Harvard University Press, 1984)

⁴¹ See also Geoffrey Parker, "The Genesis of *Global Crisis*", *Historically Speaking* 14. 5 (2013), 29-30.

⁴² For Jack Eddy's reflections on the public impact of his work, particularly among historians, see "Interview with Jack Eddy, April 21, 1999, In Michigan by phone", conducted by Spencer Weart for the American Institute of Physics, available at https://www.aip.org/history/climate/eddy_int.htm.

The debate on the connection between the absence of dark sun spots and the 'Little Ice Age' of the seventeenth century is far from over. See, for example, Govert Schilling, 'Did Quiet Sun Cause Little Ice Age After All?', *Science*, 26 May 2011, available at <http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2011/05/did-quiet-sun-cause-little-ice-age-after-all>

⁴³ See E. J. Hobsbawm, 'The General Crisis of the European Economy in the 17th Century', *Past and Present* 5.1 (1954), 33-53; H. R. Trevor-Roper, 'The General Crisis of the 17th Century', *Past and Present* 16.1 (1959), 31-64; E. H. Kossmann, 'Discussion of H. R. Trevor-Roper: "The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century." I', *Past and Present* 18.1 (1960), 8-11; Hobsbawm, 'Discussion of H. R. Trevor-Roper: "The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century." II', *Past and Present* 18.1 (1960), 12-14; F. H. Hexter, 'Discussion of H. R. Trevor-Roper: "The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century." III', *Past and Present* 18.1 (1960), 14-18; Roland Mousnier, 'Discussion of H. R. Trevor-Roper: "The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century." IV', *Past and Present* 18.1 (1960), 18-24; J. H. Elliott, 'Discussion of H. R. Trevor-Roper: "The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century," V', *Past and Present* 18.1 (1960), 25-30.

⁴⁴ *The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Geoffrey Parker and Lesley M. Smith (London & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978; revised edition, London: Routledge, 1997).

⁴⁵ Winston Churchill, *The World Crisis*, 5 vols. (London: T. Butterworth, 1923-1931); Max Egremont, *Balfour: A life of Arthur James Balfour* (London: Collins, 1980), 321. Winston Churchill served as Liberal MP for Dundee in the period 1908-22.

⁴⁶ The colleagues were Paul Bushkovitch (Yale) and Ronald P. Toby (Illinois.) By chance, since completing *Global Crisis*, articles about both Pommerenning and Enomoto have appeared: M. P. Romaniello, 'Moscow's Lost Petition to the Tsar, 2 June 1648', *Russian History* 41 (2014): 119-25; and L. Roberts, 'Name and Honor. A Merchant's Seventeenth-Century Memoir', in S. Frühstück and A. Walthall, eds., *Recreating Japanese Men* (Berkeley, 2011), 48-67.

⁴⁷ Weber and Gommans, "'You turn a page and then there is suddenly something on a turtle,'" p. 14; for more information on The Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study, click here: <http://www.nias.knaw.nl/>

⁴⁸ Christopher A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).

⁴⁹ Weber and Gommans, "'You turn a page and then there is suddenly something on a turtle'" p. 15.

⁵⁰ Isaiah Berlin, *The Hedgehog and the Fox: An Essay on Tolstoy's View of History* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1953); Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Patrick Camiller (Princeton University Press, 2014), review by J.R. McNeill, *American Historical Review* 120. 4 (2015) 1440-1441.

⁵¹ *On Ethics and History: Essays and Letters of Zhang Xuecheng*, trans. and introduced by Philip J. Ivanhoe (Stanford University Press, 2009) p. 16.

⁵² Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Patrick Camiller (Princeton University Press, 2014), review by J.R. McNeill, *American Historical Review* 120. 4 (2015) 1440-1441 (quotations on p. 1441). See also Jürgen Osterhammel, 'Global History and Historical Sociology', in: James Belich, John Darwin, Margret Frenz, Chris Wickham (eds.), *The Prospects of Global History* (Oxford University Press

2016), 23-43.

⁵³ Carla Gardina Pestana, 'The Afterlife of *Global Crisis*', *Journal of World History* 26. 1 (2015), 169-180, n10.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

⁵⁵ Quoted and contextualized in the wickedly perceptive article by J. H. Hexter, "Fernand Braudel and the *Monde Braudellien*", *Journal of Modern History*, 44 (1972): 480-539.

⁵⁶ On the REF, see <http://www.ref.ac.uk/> and <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/research-excellence-framework-review>

⁵⁷ Fernand Braudel, *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II*

(Paris, 1949: second expanded edition, Paris: Colin, 1966), translated into English as *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper & Row, 1972-1976); Fernand Braudel,

Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme XVe-XVIIIe siècle, 3 vols. (Paris : Armand Colin, 1979), translated into English as *Civilisation and Capitalism, 15th-18th century*, 3 vols. (London: Collins, 1981-84).

⁵⁸ https://www.facebook.com/UoDHumanities/photos/?tab=album&album_id=1726123354321179 and

https://www.facebook.com/journalitinerario/photos/?tab=album&album_id=1043733085713716