

Facing World History: inspirations, institutions, networks

Carolien Stolte and Alicia Schrikker

‘A historian is before anything else, a person, a living human being’. — Om Prakash

The twenty-five historians who give face to this book, from Brij Lal to Ann Stoler, come from different regional and disciplinary backgrounds.¹ What they have in common is that they are world historians, even if they might be surprised to find themselves in each other’s company here. Admittedly, world history is a wide-ranging field of study, and the boundaries with related fields such as global history, universal history, or the more recent fields of big history, planetary history and deep history, are porous and much debated. This volume is not about those boundaries and debates. For those we refer to the excellent historiographies that have come out over the past decade.² Rather, this book is about what world historians do, how they work and how they have contributed to the development of the field through their publications, as well as through their teaching, academic entrepreneurship and travels. What these historians have in common is that they question the nation state-oriented, Eurocentric approaches that for so long dominated historical scholarship, and that they aim at critical, inclusive scholarship. We might follow Jerry Bentley’s understanding of the field of world history, which refers ‘to historical scholarship that explicitly compares experiences across the boundary lines of societies, or that examines interactions between peoples of different societies, or that analyses large-scale historical patterns and processes that transcend individual societies.’³

The type of world historian that appears in these interviews—if a type can be divined at all—is one who travels the world to unearth data and stories from the archives and to view, feel and experience the areas about which they write. World history, they show us, is something you *do*. Their research takes them from Fiji to Zanzibar and from Allahabad to Arnhem, and along the way they meet other historians and exchange their findings and ideas. Historians, as Om Prakash points out in his interview, make critical choices about which questions to ask, which answers to give, and

which material to study. After all, he says, they are human beings. More than anything else, this collection of interviews gives us an insight into the way that historians work and think. And as most of the historians interviewed were at the end of their careers, this means that their reflections reach back as far as the 1950s. Reading the interviews as a set, therefore, makes it possible to evaluate the role of career-making and academic networking in the development of scholarship over a considerable period.

This introduction is an attempt to analyse what drives these historians, and we have sought to link their stories to larger trends and developments in the field. We do this in full awareness that this collection has a strong bias, as most interviews took place in and around Leiden University for the journal *Itinerario*, and the interviewers were largely scholars with a connection to Leiden and the journal. Neither is the collection complete—many more of these interviews were held in the two decades covered by this book than can be published in a single volume, and more continue to be held every year. World history, like any discipline, is a collection of overlapping and intersecting networks, and this collection pertains to one such network within the larger whole.

This limits our claims to one branch of the family tree, but this has advantages too: as a by-product of this selection bias, this introduction also shows the way historians in Leiden participated in world historical debates, and highlights specific institutional preoccupations and blind spots. The result is an impression of how world historians work, based on specific individuals and institutions. We offer a layered analysis of the interviews that evolves around the following four questions: What inspired them? How did their training inform their research? What role did collaborations, institutions and personal networks play in their work? And to what extent was and is their work shaped by personal experiences on the one hand and the global context in which they operate on the other? This, we hope, will offer fresh insights to students who are new to the field as well as to our colleagues.

Old boys and new networks

‘A man becomes part of history only when he is part of the society’. —
Ashin Das Gupta

We teach our students that historians operate within historiographic trends and relate to the work of others in their writing. The interviews demonstrate that, invisible as it sometimes may be to their readers, such trends and debates are very much part of the lived experiences of

historians, and not merely of their work on paper. If one thing about the way historians work is apparent from the interviews, it is that they operate within networks, and that they tend to set up institutions and societies to facilitate exchange and debate. The interviews enable us to map out the lasting influence of such scholarly networks, tracing them back via the mentors of the interviewees into the interwar period, long before *Itinerario* was established.

Many of these mentors, however, were no strangers to the journal themselves. Several of the historians interviewed in the first collection of interviews, which covered the first two decades of *Itinerario*, influenced, taught and mentored those interviewed in this second volume. Ronald Robinson, interviewed in the first collection, here appears in the interviews with Leonard Blussé, Jürgen Osterhammel and Robert Ross. Philip Curtin and Jan Vansina play a role in the interview with Patricia Seed in this collection. Dharma Kumar worked closely with Om Prakash, collaborated with Chris Bayly and Leonard Blussé, and was eventually interviewed for *Itinerario* by Robert Ross. John Elliot, interviewed by a crowd of Leiden scholars in 1995, had his work discussed by Geoffrey Parker when the latter was interviewed at the exact same spot by the same people a few years later. His work also makes an appearance in the interview with David Armitage, held some fifteen years after that. But the interviews are equally informative about the connections they do not mention explicitly: Peter Reeves, whom Michael Pearson credits as his first teacher of Indian history in Michigan, collaborated intensively with Brij Lal, whose interview opens this volume.⁴ And although *Itinerario* never published interviews with them, Charles Boxer and Holden Furber are also never far away, connecting Jack Wills to Leonard Blussé in Taiwan, or Om Prakash to Michael Pearson in Philadelphia.

Mentors are crucial nodes in the networks that make up the discipline, and invaluable resources in navigating them. It is hard to overstate how much this applied to Professor M. A. P. Meilink-Roelofs. No single historian is mentioned in this collection as often as she is. Ashin Das Gupta calls her his 'guru'; Leonard Blussé refers to her as the 'iron lady'. She advised Om Prakash, Adrian Lapien and Jack Wills in the archives, and co-supervised Cees Brouwer's dissertation. If the connections between the interviewed in this volume had to be revealed through a single person, it would be Meilink-Roelofs, and if they had to be revealed through a single site it would be the place where she spent most of her career: the National Archives in The Hague.

For most of the people interviewed it was neither the scholars at Leiden nor *Itinerario* that first brought them to the Netherlands; it was the archives. And here they stand in a long tradition. For historians working on particular regions and eras in American, African and Asian history, the Dutch colonial and Company—VOC and WIC—archives are extremely rich repositories. Om Prakash recounts his first encounter with the VOC archives in the 1960s which were then hidden in the old Rijksarchief. He tells us about his struggle to read Dutch in seventeenth-century handwriting, and how it literally took him months to get a grip on the material. In the 1960s, studying Dutch sources for local Ghanaian, Indian, Sri Lankan and Chinese political and economic history gained momentum. Prakash, Wills and Das Gupta each speak with nostalgia about the mid-1960s when they, as young historians, formed the now (in)famous ‘coffee gang’ in the Algemeen Rijksarchief. For others, like Cees Brouwer, the reconstruction of local history through the VOC records became their lives’ work. In his case, this local history was the history of al-Mukhā, more popularly known as the coffee marketplace Mocha on the Red Sea coast of Yemen. Later, other scholars of Africa and Asia such as Robert Ross and Leonard Blussé made their mark by taking this approach—local history supplemented by Dutch records—further in their social histories.

Reading historical sources can become intense, we learn from Robert Ross, who attributes his slightly angry writing style in his *Cape of Torments* to the experience of reading court cases in which extremely violent punishments and treatment of slaves dominated. In other ways, too, doing archival research is a physical experience. Tony Reid refers to the cold and lonely journey to the colonial archives when they were still located near Arnhem in the 1950s and 1960s. Many of the interviewees see archives as much more than repositories of documents. The archive is also made up of its location, its mode of operation, its staff and its organisational logic; and just as important are the archival canteens as social habitats and the personal connections made over long waits for documents, over off hours and closing days. The collective experience of archival frustrations and the opportunity to share one’s new-found gems (ranging from turtles to shipping data) with others are part of the historian’s job. In that sense, the interviewed refer to ‘horizontal inspiration’ from their peers as much as to connections with more senior scholars. It is in the archive, doing fieldwork, that academic networks are created. Jack Wills speaks of the importance of local archives for getting a feel for places, something also emphasised in the conversations with Fred Cooper and Robert Ross. For

both, travelling in Africa and working in the archives contributed to their understanding of the peoples and societies whose past they studied. ‘The landscape,’ says Robert Ross, ‘is my favorite source.’

It is also in the travelling and archival research that historians develop new ideas and directions. For Natalie Zemon Davis the archive is central to piecing together individual lives in the past in the fullest and most sensitive way possible. Sometimes it is years after her ‘first encounter’ with a historical figure in the archives that she finds new traces, and picks them up to reconstruct their lives. Allison Blakely’s study of Dutch racism was triggered by his unexpected first-hand experience with racism in what he had thought was a tolerant Dutch society. He was doing fieldwork in the Netherlands in the late 1970s, not long after the decolonisation of Suriname. As a Dutch-speaking person of colour, he was mistaken for a post-colonial migrant and suddenly treated with shocking disdain in the public sphere, something that had not happened to him on previous visits to the country.

For Ann Stoler, being in the Netherlands, interacting with Dutch academia and working in the colonial archives made her understand better the questions about Dutch colonialism that historians in the Netherlands had neglected or hesitated to ask. She notes, ‘There were already two trajectories to my work: one was about “subaltern” politics and our knowledge practices; the other one, deeply historical, that kept me traveling back and forth to The Hague and Amsterdam and Leiden from Paris to work at the KIT, to the KITLV in Leiden, and to the archives in The Hague. I was frustrated by what I couldn’t find, but utterly taken by what was there, and more than ever amazed by what Dutch historians seemed to so assiduously circumvent and dismiss—but could not have missed.’ Explaining why she thinks her critical studies of Dutch colonialism and colonial society were not picked up in the Netherlands at the time, she describes the Dutch scholars in her field as a particular species, ‘homo hierarchicus’. She is implicitly referring to prominent male academics, some with colonial roots, who neglected or preferred to look the other way from colonial atrocities and tensions of the past. Stoler reminds us that scholarly interaction and experience shape schisms and debates as much as they do trends and networks.

Leiden through the lens of world historians

‘I was somewhat of an ugly duckling in the History Department’. — Leonard Blussé

The interviews with Om Prakash, Jack Wills and Ashin Das Gupta in a way narrate the prehistory of the Leiden-based IGEER (Institute for the History of European Expansion) and its journal *Itinerario*. Their generation met in the archives in the 1960s and continued to meet in the United States and elsewhere. It was only in the late 1970s that they started to frequent Leiden. By that time, Henk Wesseling, as the newly appointed professor of general history, had the idea of establishing an institute for the study of European expansion and global interaction. Working amidst historians of Europe, he decided to pull into the department historians working on the world beyond Europe. The interviews with three of his ‘vassals’, Piet Emmer (The Atlantic), Robert Ross (Africa) and Leonard Blussé (China and Southeast Asia) were selected for inclusion in this volume. Each advanced their respective fields during their careers, albeit in very different ways: Piet Emmer dominated the debates about slavery in the Netherlands, and was well-connected to many American scholars of slavery who excelled in reconstructing numbers and life stories of African slaves in the Americas. Robert Ross has had an enormous output on the history of South Africa and remains a pre-eminent authority in the field today. Leonard Blussé’s work covered early modern East and Southeast Asia, with a focus on overseas Chinese communities and political and diplomatic history. Each speaks with a different degree of nostalgia of the early years of IGEER, when the networks were built up and *Itinerario* was first published.

IGEER was a success, and it placed Leiden on the world history map. What emerges is a picture of an energetic group of young men, who sincerely tried to do something different from what their predecessors had done. They sought cooperation with Area Studies, and they gradually edged out from their respective regional specialties into the field of world history. Ross remembers cooperation across disciplines as a difficult exercise, in which institutional boundaries continued to stand in the way and where characters and egos clashed. Quite a few of the interviewees remember the apparently legendary ‘Delhi–Yogya–Cambridge–Leiden conferences,’ in which experts in the field of South and Southeast Asian studies met to compare various aspects of South and Southeast Asia—focusing principally, though not exclusively, on the colonial experience. The conference proceedings were co-published in three issues of *Itinerario*, and are still popular among scholars and students.⁵ From the introductions to the volumes we learn that more happened face to face than mere scholarly exchange: excursions and dance floors were part of the package, and the shared experience certainly strengthened the network and exchange of

ideas. As Chris Bayly notes, 'Some of the published work that came out of these meetings was very interesting. But it was the long-term effects of informal contacts and discussions with scholars in different fields, who were working in different ways, that really mattered.'

The tradition of co-organising conferences with colleagues in Asia and Africa persists in Leiden to this day and does much to strengthen ties and foster debate with local historians. Some of the interview locations are a by-product of this. Adrian Lapien was interviewed in Jakarta, Brij V. Lal in Fiji. The world-historical orientation that emerged out of the comparative history-oriented scholarship of IGEER and, later, the American professional organisation FEEGI (Forum on the History of European Expansion and Global Interaction, with which *Itinerario* is affiliated) still carries a strong focus on local and vernacular histories.

Although IGEER director Henk Wesseling retained a strong political focus in his work, others, in particular Emmer and Ross, shifted their focus to socio-economic approaches. The energetic activities of the Centre and the talents for networking and fundraising displayed by some members also resulted in a continuing tradition of workshop and conference organisation in Leiden, The Hague and Wassenaar, where the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies (NIAS) is located. From the mid-1990s, the history department's Crayenborgh honours class, co-founded by Blussé, became another such hosting institution. The twelve-session Crayenborgh course was organised annually around a big world historical theme, for which a variety of speakers were invited from abroad, many of whom were interviewed by Peer Vries, Leonard Blussé or Frans Paul van der Putten.

In the post-Cold War era, world history was much occupied with the debate around 'the rise of the west' and 'the great divergence'. This diversified the archivally-focused group of regular visitors somewhat. Through the Crayenborgh class and the activities of Peer Vries, Wim Blockmans and others, world historians came to Leiden who were not working on Dutch archival collections per se. Scholars like Patrick O'Brien and Mark Elvin were interviewed in this way, and graduate students from the history department at large, and not merely IGEER, became part of the conversation. The 'rise of the west' debate is one instance in which particular preoccupations and blind spots of the Leiden Institute were made visible. The debate, after all, is very much ongoing, and currently carried out in books ranging from *Why Nations Fail* and *Why the West Rules—For Now*, to *Empire of Cotton*.⁶ The great divergence debate has not so much ceased to be a research theme as become a focus of economic

historians. Books on the history of capitalism and global inequality appear every year. However, this branch of economic history has always been relatively underrepresented in Leiden generally, and specifically *Itinerario*, whose focus on ‘the human factor’ has only grown stronger over the years.

In the meantime, Blussé’s endeavours to publish and translate VOC sources further strengthened the centre’s expertise in the early modern history of maritime Asia. This brought in new visiting scholars and Ph.D. students from abroad, who were quickly pulled into the *Itinerario* network, as is witnessed by the participation in the interviews by scholars such as Martha Chaiklin.⁷ And so the interviews represent a loose but global community of scholars that, one way or the other, were connected to activities in Leiden or of Leiden scholars. With the TANAP project, which was essentially a training, research and conservation programme for the VOC archives in the Netherlands and abroad, these activities reached a new high. TANAP stands for Towards a New age of Partnership, a riff on the title of Holden Furber’s seminal work, *The Age of Partnership: Europeans in Asia before Dominion*. This was a project that secured cooperation with a wide variety of universities and archives in Asia, and resulted in around twenty Ph.D. dissertations focusing on regional political, economic and social history. Jack Wills, who was invited as a visiting scholar while the project was running, talks with great enthusiasm about working with this diverse set of students. The parallel with his own experience, meeting scholars from all over the world in the Rijksarchief in the 1960s, is easily drawn. And again, several TANAP laureates like Ghulam Nadri and Binu John were involved in the interviews. TANAP was embedded in Leiden’s Institute of Area Studies (then called CNWS, or Centre for Non-Western Studies), which reinforced the idea that collaboration between historians and regional specialists had become common practice. TANAP was succeeded by the Encompass (2006–11) and Cosmopolis (2012–17) programmes, which have secured transnational cooperation and language and archival training for the next generation of scholars.

Midway through the 1990s, ties were also strengthened with scholars in the US when FEEGI adopted *Itinerario* as its official journal. FEEGI was born out of concerns similar to those that had given rise to IGEER some years earlier: the need to study European interaction with the rest of the world in a comparative way. It was highly empirically focused and strove to promote the study of early modern Portuguese-, Dutch-, French-, and Spanish-language materials. This opened up new avenues for the journal and has led to a strengthening of submissions from FEEGI members on the early modern Atlantic in particular. After twenty years,

ties with FEEGI are still strong, and on several occasions FEEGI members were interviewed or conducted interviews themselves. As an organisation, FEEGI features regularly in the conversations. Patricia Seed, a former president of FEEGI, suggests in her 2003 interview that a FEEGI conference could be organised in cooperation with IGEER every three years or so. She will be happy to know that this actually materialised in 2015 with the first FEEGI-in-Europe conference, thanks to the initiative of Catía Antunes in collaboration with Carla Pestana, Linda Rupert and Phil Stern.

But among the fond memories of IGEER there are also critical voices. IGEER was a typical exponent of the Leiden liberal tradition, which tended to exclude the more critical Marxist-oriented scholarship that held sway in the 1980s and early 1990s. As far as academic reputations go, the theory-aversion of some of Leiden's historians has become a bit of a truism. But it is here that the interviews are especially informative, shedding light on how such disciplinary boundaries (or perceptions thereof) were actually created. On closer examination, several of the historians interviewed in this volume place themselves squarely in the Marxist historiographic tradition, or at least position their work with respect to it. What stood in the way of a more inclusive approach were informal personal networks and clashes of personality, as Robert Ross explains. IGEER in its early days was—as was much of the academic world at the time—a monkeys' rock where alpha males reigned. This greatly influenced the centre's reputation, something that lingers even today, as the recent interview with Ann Stoler demonstrates.

But Leiden has changed with the retirement of the old boys and the emergence of new girls like Catía Antunes, Nira Wickramasinghe and Marieke Bloembergen. And this has allowed for a more critical engagement with the Dutch, and global, colonial and Company past. The interdisciplinary 'global interactions' platform, in which historians, archaeologists, area specialists and anthropologists are stimulated to work together, has provided *Itinerario* with interviewees such as Fred Cooper and Ann Stoler. Yet, colleagues like Jos Gommans, Michiel van Groesen, Gert Oostindie and Jan Bart Gewald, who have in a way taken up the IGEER banner, continue the strong tradition of local and regional cooperation and interdisciplinary approaches. Anthropology, art and literature have become more central to the historical studies they propagate, and this trend is reflected, too, in the orientation of the journal and the scholars interviewed. The interviews with Jürgen Osterhammel, Natalie Zemon Davis and Kären Wigen are good examples. Trained by the old school

and working with the new, we as editors have always found ourselves in dynamic company.

The institutions have changed over time. Personal networks have possibly become a little less central. Robert Ross sees this as a positive development: ‘Leiden has professionalized,’ he says. But the legacy of the activities of the ‘old boys’ is still present in many ways. The practice of world history in Leiden continues to be marked by a strong local and regional focus. Empirical research in multiple source languages is treasured, and visiting scholars are still caught by the *Itinerario* crew for a good conversation.

Inspirations

‘I began to divide the Indonesian seas in the Braudellian way: the Java Sea, the Banda Sea, the Sulawesi Sea, et cetera’. —Adrian Lapien

The historians interviewed are connected by more than archival serendipities and institutional entrepreneurship. Conducted over the course of twenty-plus years, the interviews are evidence of particular shifts in approaches, as Brij Lal’s sensitive evaluation of the work on indentured labour of his predecessors makes clear. He explains his efforts to connect the Indo-Fijian experience of indenture to experiences elsewhere, broadening his horizons from the locally focused work of others. He also locates his work in a larger ‘human turn’, in attempts to represent the lived experience of indenture. This includes exploding certain myths around indentured labourers—in the case of Fiji, the ‘immoral character’ of *girmitiya* women. In this way, Lal’s interview sets the scene for a set of shifts that unites many of those interviewed: a focus on connected history, a focus on lived experience, and the deconstruction of colonial stereotypes and colonially-rooted tropes. It should go without saying that these historiographical shifts started long before this interview took place in 1997, but they resonate through many of the conversations.

By contrast, what slowly fades from view over the course of this volume is a preoccupation with the ‘rise of the west’ debate. It is still very much present in the interviews with Geoffrey Parker, Jack Goody and Patrick O’Brien in the late 1990s, but gradually disappears from the ‘must-ask’ list of interview questions. The selection of interviewers and interviewed is also a factor here, but we believe it is indicative of a large and noteworthy shift. Jack Goody fought Eurocentrism for much of his career. His work on family life demonstrated precisely how much the distinction between the ‘western’ nuclear family and the ‘non-western’ extended family has been

overstated in historiography. Moreover, his *The East in the West* centred on the argument that there are no structural, long-term differences between East and West.⁸ It is this argument that ends up deciding the course of the interview, and the echoes of older historical preoccupations are still very much present as the terms under which the debate takes place. Likewise, the interview with Geoffrey Parker devotes considerable space to applying his work on military history to the role of military factors in the expansion of the West.

The 'rise of the west' debate is most immediately present in the interview with Patrick O'Brien, whose research to that point had been concerned primarily with the study of industrialisation. His work in the 1980s was written in part as a response to Wallerstein's 1974 explanation of why Europe industrialised first, and so naturally had to deal with foreign trade and imperialism as contributing factors.⁹ By the time the interview was held in 1999, Kenneth Pomeranz's influential book *The Great Divergence* was about to be published and his argument was already making waves.¹⁰ Much as the *Annales* historians had set the terms of reference for many of the interviews in *Pilgrims to the Past*, the rise of the west debate shaped the first interviews in the present volume. This matches the historiographical progression perfectly, as the rise of the west debate is in many ways a continuation of issues first raised by the *Annales* school. In books like *The Great Divergence* the influence of *Annales* historians is very much present. But nowhere is this continuation of themes more visible than in the continued importance of Fernand Braudel and Marc Bloch.

As the interviews show, these two *Annales* scholars continue to inspire historians and draw students to the study of history to this day. Fully a third of the scholars interviewed in this volume refer to one or both of them. This appears somewhat counterintuitive, as the institutional framework of area studies has largely hardened regional boundaries in the academy, but the fact that the European focus of Bloch and Braudel's work is no impediment for their continuing global impact is a testament to their timelessness. It should also be noted that engagement with their work transcends gratuitous reference or the general admiration that Braudel's *La Méditerranée* habitually receives. The work inspired maritime historians such as Adrian Lapian, Michael Pearson and Anthony Reid, in all of whose work Braudel's influence is immediately obvious.¹¹ Likewise, Braudel's assertion that there is no single Mediterranean Sea but in fact many different seas on multiple spatial and temporal levels was attractive to scholars seeking to de-Europeanise the history of the Indian Ocean and the South China Sea. And in an even wider sense, *La Méditerranée*

inspires as a successful integration of methods from the social sciences in historiography, which is particularly attractive to scholars working on regions where primary sources may be other than written records. Finally, the word itself has become part of the academic idiom: Kären Wigen, who was based at Duke University when it became a hotbed of social theory and of questioning received notions, speaks of a ‘mediterraneanizing’ of the academy, when talking about connecting existing disciplines and areas in new ways.

The possibilities for mixed-method research that Braudel, Bloch and other *Annales* historians pioneered were also poignant for the project of decolonising historiography. Michel Foucault is referred to in this context, although Ann Stoler rightly notes in her interview how little Foucault actually refers to colonialism and empire in his own writing, even if he inspired many others to do so. It is interesting to note, further, how rarely the Subaltern School actually makes an appearance in these interviews. As noted above, it would be too easy to dismiss this as a lack of engagement with Marxist historiography or the post-colonial turn. Several of the interviewees presented here consider themselves Marxists. Neither is it an unwillingness to engage with the nature of the archive and what it can and cannot tell the historian. Rather, it seems to be a refusal to believe, as per many of the scholars in the subaltern studies collective, that the subaltern strata of colonial society are unknowable.¹² Robert Ross says this in so many words: ‘you have to think about how collections of written sources, which are filtered, which came into existence through the colonial society, through the colonial government, can tell you things about what is going on among non-colonial people. . . . The idea that you can’t actually say something about the subaltern classes of colonial society because the sources are colonial is of course a mistake. It is one-sided, but I have not found any better way out of it than anyone else.’ This echoes Ranajit Guha’s deconstruction of what can and cannot be found in the colonial archive in his famous essay, ‘The Prose of Counter-Insurgency’, although Ross is slightly more optimistic. Guha still concludes by stating that even historians seeking to write from the subaltern’s point of view are distanced from colonial discourse ‘only by a declaration of sentiment.’¹³

Conversely, Ashin Das Gupta acknowledges the impact of the subaltern studies group but does not actually buy into their image of academic revolutionaries. He calls it ‘more a brand name than a new way of doing history,’ positing that the approaches the subalterns pioneered are not all new:

To some extent one can't help but be influenced by them. But I suspect that the postmodernist emphasis on 'fragments' or the subaltern school's emphasis on resistance is actually a continuation of earlier trends in historical writing. The French *Annales* School made the real breakthrough long ago. The emphasis on the history of experience and on the autonomy of localities or individual actors goes right back to Marc Bloch in the 1930s. Again, subaltern history was anticipated by the writing of E. P. Thompson or Christopher Hill in their emphasis on resistance and the 'world turned upside down'.¹⁴

It is here, in Ashin Das Gupta's remarks, that we see the lasting influence of the *Annales* school once more. Although Thompson can indeed be credited with popularising the term 'history from below', the term was arguably first used by *Annales* historian Lucien Febvre, when he spoke of '*histoire vue d'en bas et non d'en haut*'.¹⁵

Colonial knowledge practices and colonial knowledge complexes are most directly interrogated in the interviews with Ann Stoler and Frederick Cooper. Stoler, in particular, talks at some length about the activist aspects of her work. But even so, Cooper cautions against jumping off a 'theoretical deep end', taking abstractions so far that they exist only in relation to other abstractions. But there is also an 'empirical shallow end' where facts speak for themselves, which, according to Cooper, they should not. It is the interplay between the two—the abstract and the concrete—that is productive, a position with which most of the historians in this volume would agree. And the internalisation of the idea that sources produced by trading companies or colonial states cannot be taken at face value—so much so that it is now a truism—can in itself be considered one of the subaltern collective's major successes.

Finally, there is a practical side to academic decolonisation, most directly present in the interview with Adrian Lapien, who organised Southeast Asian conferences for MIPI (now LIPI), which, he notes, 'was the first time when Southeast Asian scholars had worked together. Before independence, each of them was oriented towards their respective colonial metropolises'.¹⁶ His regional engagement, moreover, was rooted in one of the most famous moments of the history of decolonisation: the Bandung Conference, which he witnessed as a reporter for the *Indonesian Observer*. This unusual starting point marked much of his career. He enrolled at the Universitas Indonesia and attended courses given by the first generation of post-independence scholars, among them Husein Djajadiningrat, who taught the history of Islam and the Middle East, and Tjan Tjoe Som, a

Sinologist who taught the long story of China's past as well as Chinese historiography. His being a product of the late-colonial Dutch school system likewise contributed to a 'regional turn' in Lapien's thinking.

Towards World History?

'The idea that you do world history for an American audience doesn't mean you're doing it for the rest of the world, because other people are going to have different visions as to what constitutes the world'. —Patricia Seed

What world history is and what it is not is still hotly debated. This discussion is arguably best traced through the archive of H-World, the H-Net space where the issue has been discussed since 1994.¹⁷ World history as an academic field of enquiry emerged just as the Cold War was ending. All interviews in the present volume, therefore, were conducted when world history as a discipline was no longer a new and emerging field, but one with a professional organisation, although even today its institutional infrastructure remains limited. Whether one's work is or is not world history does not really come up in the interviews, as a few of the interviewees would object to the label, though some, such as Felipe Fernández-Armesto, advocate for it enthusiastically. But their understandings of the term do differ.

The World History Association (WHA) itself, established in 1988, has an inclusive definition of the field. It states that 'as long as one focuses on the big picture of cultural interchange and/or comparative history, one is a practicing world historian.' In this it sets itself apart from global history, which it considers to be limited to the 'the study of globalization after 1492'.¹⁸ This specific date would suggest that global history grew out of the historiography of European expansion, whereas world history did not. This is not a tenable viewpoint, and many scholars who self-identify as global historians, especially those who concentrate on the land-based trading routes of Eurasia, would strongly disagree. And, in fact, the mission statement of the *Journal of Global History* is not very different from that of the WHA. It seeks to clarify global change over time, 'to transcend the dichotomy between "the West and the rest", straddle traditional regional boundaries, relate material to cultural and political history, and overcome thematic fragmentation in historiography'.¹⁹ Patrick O'Brien's prolegomenon for the *Journal of Global History* frames it as a mission even more than a methodology: to construct disciplined, cosmopolitan, and trustworthy narratives of our universal heritage.²⁰

Indeed, if there is a separation to be drawn between world and global history, it can certainly not be drawn from these interviews.²¹ Especially in the earlier interviews, the economic focus sometimes attributed to global history was still very much 'world history.' Jack Goody cites Max Weber as a world historian, though he does so primarily to attack the Eurocentrist hypotheses that he sees as dominating the field.²² In the interview with Patrick O'Brien that economic focus is at the forefront. O'Brien is sympathetic to the mission of Andre Gunder Frank's *ReOrient: Global Economy in the Asian Age*, which is to prove that things happening in China fed back into world trade through India and via the Indian Ocean back to Europe.²³ But he does not believe in such integration on any meaningful level, in the sense that it actually influenced regional economic trajectories. He notes that Frank 'wants to say, and I do not agree with him, that there was already an economic world system way back in time. He has edited a book with Barry Gills with the title *The World System: Five Hundred Years or Five Thousand?* . . . There may be 5000 years of long distance trade, but there was no world system or anything a modern economist would recognise as globalisation.'²⁴

The interview with Patricia Seed is interesting because it talks specifically about the practice of world history in the United States. Asked whether World History in US academia is ideologically motivated, she notes that 'world history is a ground-up phenomenon, which is why there are no world historians at the Ivy League. . . . The course usually replaces the Western Civilization course—the one that began with Greece and Rome and ended with post-World War II United States. That course originated at a few elite universities early in the twentieth century, but never became popular until after the Second World War.' She goes on to explain some of the motivations behind the original 'Western Civ' course—to show that all European immigrants belonged in the US, and that this migration had been a positive development. As this migration itself globalised, the narrative had to follow suit and include the pasts of new immigrant groups as well. This development of world history as a bottom-up teacher's response to world events is not quite as true of Europe as it is in the United States, to which the strong world history tradition at Cambridge University and other places may attest. But, given the ubiquity of US-made academic textbooks, these origins are felt worldwide.

Seed claims that for a long time world history was not much more than 'Western Europe plus China'. Nonetheless, Chinese history does indeed inform several of the interviewees' thinking about world history. This is not limited to the discussion of *ReOrient* outlined above. Jack

Wills, for instance, ‘can’t think of a better starting point than China for thinking about the transformations of our own times and contributing to this strange new trend we call “world history”.’ In that connection, it is interesting to note that Wills’s confrontation with the world history/global history question was a very direct one: his *1688: A World History* was published as *1688: A Global History* at the request of his publisher. Natalie Zemon Davis would sympathise: in her interview, she notes that ‘global is becoming a publisher’s cliché.’

As a visiting professor at Leiden in 2004, Wills taught a course called ‘Big Books in World History.’ He notes that the students ‘were particularly taken with John R. McNeill’s *Something New Under the Sun*. . . . Clearly they see these big environmental problems as the policy challenges of their adult lives.’ It is interesting to see how often the environment comes up in the interviews in a world historical sense. Current preoccupations with climate change can feel very recent, and the interviews serve as a reminder of how intimately environmental history has been connected to the world historical project. When Wills was interviewed, Mark Elvin’s *The Retreat of the Elephants: An Environmental History of China* had just appeared, although Elvin explains in his interview that he had been interested in environmental history much longer.²⁵ Elvin’s view on the importance of the environment to world history is explicit: ‘you can’t put the economy out in a world of its own.’ This is seconded by Felipe Fernández-Armesto, who notes that ‘history is unintelligible except in the context of the environment that surrounds us and the ecosystem that sustains us. I don’t think you can make sense of what humans do unless you locate them in their ecological context.’ Fernández-Armesto also reminds us that Toynbee was a pioneer of environmental history.²⁶ Toynbee put stock in both climate regimes and climate change, and his work on environmental history dates back to the first volume of *The Study of History*.²⁷ Of course, given the sheer volume of Toynbee’s work and the fact that he is simultaneously reviled and revered means that he can be many things to many historians, but he was a world historian with an eye for environmental factors.

New Frontiers

‘The Pacific is still in the process of being discovered’. —Kären Wigen

Collectively, the twenty-five interviews collected here provide as many perspectives on the future of the field. If the field of world history has many pasts, as Patrick Manning reminds us, it also has many futures.²⁸ Not

all of these possible futures can be outlined here, but two developments deserve highlighting: the new approaches to the history of the sea, and the new possibilities offered by the expanding 'digital sea'.

Seen from the larger network of IGEER, the interviews collectively make clear that world history as it is practised today has developed far beyond the history of maritime trading companies that once made up the bulk of one of its branches, the 'history of European expansion.' The historiography of those trading companies themselves has transformed as well, and the same material is now being used to ask new and innovative questions, as FEEGI conference programmes continually demonstrate.²⁹ Seen in this light, it is interesting that this development has also included a 'return to the sea'. Oceans are popular again as spaces that connect, transform and hybridise people, goods and ideas. Today, however, this includes the privileging of non-European agency, before as well as during the age of empire. Important works in this regard range from Lincoln Paine's *The Sea and Civilization*, which is a rare example of a truly decentred maritime history of the world, to Enseng Ho's Indian Ocean-centred *Graves of Tarim* and Seema Alavi's recent *Muslim Cosmopolitanism*.³⁰

This new oceanic approach was pioneered by some of the historians interviewed in this volume, like Ashin Das Gupta and Michael Pearson. Building partly on their work, Indian Ocean studies has grown exponentially from the 1990s onwards. Centres and endowed chairs have emerged the world over. But old focal points remain: many of the Indian Ocean initiatives, for instance, centre on South Asia. This is no surprise, as historians of South Asia are over-represented among the pioneers of Indian Ocean history. Das Gupta and Pearson are cases in point. But the same focus is visible in centres such as Tufts University's South Asian and Indian Ocean Studies Center, or in books such as Sugata Bose's *A Hundred Horizons*.³¹

One exception remains, on which Kären Wigen dwells in some detail in her interview: the Pacific Ocean. Wigen co-directed a Ford Foundation-funded project the premise of which was that a reshuffling of area studies scholars into ocean-centric working groups would yield new insights. The Pacific working group was the hardest to hold together. As she notes in her interview, the Pacific is still in the process of being discovered: there is no consensus of the 'what, where, and when' of Pacific history. David Armitage, in his interview, clearly agrees when he states: 'I am also convinced the next frontier for oceanic history is Pacific History.' His Pacific Histories project, first convened at Harvard in 2012, likewise sought to create a pan-Pacific perspective.

If it is possible to point to ‘new directions’, then this is one. Recent years have seen a proliferation of studies on the Pacific.³² Rather than emphasising the North Pacific’s role in an Asian Century, many of these new studies underscore small islands, large seas and multiple transits. As Pacific historian Matt Matsuda notes, the point is ‘not to concentrate on the continental and economic “Rim” powers of East and Southeast Asia and the Americas to define the Pacific, but to propose an oceanic history much more located in thinking outward from Islanders and local cultures.’³³

If the Pacific Ocean is one of the major geographical frontiers for the discipline, the one most transforming the practice of doing history is digitisation generally, and the rise of digital humanities in particular. The 2003 interview with Patricia Seed, an award-winning pioneer of digital mapping who identified the educational potential of digital resources early on, provides an interesting baseline for this volume. More than a decade ago, she saw opportunities that would still be considered out-of-the-box today. ‘I use computer, board, and role-playing games as vehicles for teaching an introduction to history,’ she explains, ‘because by the time they reach university, undergraduates have spent a good part of their life playing games, dissecting, and criticising them. In short, they arrive with an existing critical apparatus that can be sharpened and refined by showing how narratives, plots, and arguments influence the way you re-tell history.’

Still, it is astounding to see the strides made between the interview with Seed and the one with David Armitage only eight years later. By that time, he and his interlocutors are speaking of digital libraries and massive online open courses (MOOCs) as staples of academic life—exciting ones whose potential has not nearly been reached, but staples nevertheless. This interview takes Seed’s quest to embed digitisation in historical practice and turns it outward. As Armitage asks in reference to the low retention rates in open online courses: ‘what are the university’s responsibilities towards a wider audience beyond its gates? How can faculty members reach out, under what circumstances, with what kind of encouragements?’ Armitage is not afraid to voice a prediction: he is ‘absolutely certain that we are in the midst of the single most transformative moment in academic life since the modern research university was created at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. In five years’ time, the landscape is going to be unrecognizable.’ This is a safe bet in one sense at least: it is a given that in less than a decade the digital frontiers discussed in his interview will also appear quaint.

While huge strides have been made in the democratisation of the archive, there are downsides as well. A looming digital divide creates new inequalities both between and within countries. It is not a given that open-access journals and source digitisation efforts will in fact create universal access to the world's knowledge or democratise the writing of history. As a vision, it will require the sustained effort of a critical mass of committed advocates. But the interview with Armitage does afford a glimpse of a potential world in which it is possible to work productively with classes of tens of thousands of students.

Given the indisputable potential of digital humanities, it is interesting that several of the historians interviewed here point to the mixed blessing that is digitisation: the era of spending months on end in reading rooms with the same researchers, while not fully dead, is over for many people in many places. Funding concerns, programme rigidity and pressure to produce Ph.D.s at ever-increasing speed do play a role, but many of those interviewed caution against what one misses in the 'point-and-click' approach to visiting archives.

Many of these historians have important messages for their early career counterparts in other areas of life as well. If there is one single thread that runs through all the interviews, it is this: do not be afraid of choosing your own path. Learn from your mentors, but decide how, and when, and why, and where, to apply that information. Frederick Cooper uses the most vivid metaphor: 'being influenced by what other people are doing is perfectly fine, the question is what one does next—whether you want to jump on a bandwagon because it's a bandwagon, or to see where it takes you and to jump off when the time has come to jump off it.' Armitage likewise urges young scholars to stop and think about why they take a particular approach to history: 'we need to be more reflexive about exactly why we choose those things, rather than the path-dependency of historiographical activity.' Finally, Wills is vocal about the perverse incentives in the way academic funding is structured: it actively punishes risk-taking, making the discipline less diverse. He notes that 'one of the reasons I'm glad to be retired is . . . that I was fed up with the status anxiety that is so prevalent in American academia. About a hundred American universities aspire to be in the inner circle, the top twenty. A few do improve their relative standing, but at the cost of not doing anything different from those who already are in the circle.' Leonard Blussé expresses a similar sentiment not at the institutional but at the personal level when he laments that the current output-focused climate rewards the unimaginative.

Adventures of History, History as Adventure

'I am sorry that I do not have the standard stories of how I spent six months on a banana boat, chatting to the Indonesian crew. . . . I am sorry I do not have more glamorous or romantic stories for you!' —David Armitage

Above, David Armitage eloquently apologises for his lack of maritime adventures, and presents himself as an exception to the 'standard adventurous historians' that grace *Itinerario's* pages. Yet he does emphasise the wanderlust of some of his family members as the possible source of his own wanderings in global academia. But the question remains whether, when read as a collection, it is indeed possible to identify character traits of this 'generation' of world historians. The interviews provide an opportunity for self-fashioning, so how do the interviewed tend to represent their lives, their work and the choices they made? We might rephrase this question in the words of Herman Paul, a student of the scholarly persona: What kind of talents, skills and virtues do these historians cultivate?³⁴ Has this changed over time and, if so, how? And does it differ between, say, China-oriented scholars and those focused on the history of colonialism? Some generalisations have already been made above. All, however, have their exceptions—most of the historians interviewed are men, but not all. Most had received an elite education before entering academia, yet some, such as Brij Lal (being of *girmitya* background), came a long way and worked their way up by their innate talent and with the help of mentors.

The reason that some thoughts on the world historical scholarly *persona* can be offered here at all is due entirely to the fact that the 'personal' was folded into the 'professional' from the very first interviews. The standard was set by Blussé and George Winius, who were interested not only in the scholarly trajectory of their interviewees, but also in the personal experiences of doing history and the motivations behind it. Real revelations about the latter two required a comfortable setting, a nice dinner and the right conversation partners. The aim was, as Blussé puts it, 'to speak with prominent people active in the field. . . . George and I loved to ask colleagues about their backgrounds, their personal interests and their approaches to teaching and research.' A number of the conversations recorded in this volume were led by Blussé in this way. But he was also 'put on the rack' himself, and excels in presenting a personal history that combines 'accidental scholarship' with maritime adventure.

Felipe Fernández-Armesto plays down the historian's craft by stating that 'everyone can be a historian.' In his view, there is nothing particular

about historians as a group. And indeed, the image of the ‘accidental historian’ that dominated the first volume of interviews has not disappeared in the second. It is still present in several stories: Blussé wonders whether he should not have continued in shipping, which would have been a good outlet for his entrepreneurial talents and lust for adventure. The Indonesian historian Adrian Lapien was bound for journalism and converted fully to the writing and teaching of history only late in his career. Pearson’s adventurous stories of his exploration of the history of the Indian Ocean are thrilling and one would have loved to be part of his crew when he was sailing. Bayly tells us that his fascination for Indian history really started during his travels, especially the time he lived in Allahabad as a young student. It was then that he gained a sense of Indian urban history, and that he could decentre the Raj as organising principle. Robert Ross’s tale of being chased by the police during his fieldwork in Tswana in 1970s apartheid South Africa likewise speaks to the imagination.

Inspiration was found not only in location, but also in politics. Both the Vietnam War and the anti-apartheid movement appear in the interviews as moments that decisively shaped the choices historians made in their field. Cooper explains how the Vietnam War actually motivated him to study African history. The fact that Africa was in the process of decolonising gave the young anti-imperialist a sense of hope. Many historians interviewed reveal a great degree of societal and political engagement, which one way or the other influenced their work. On one side of the spectrum is Piet Emmer, who actively voiced his liberal views on slavery and migration in public debates about immigration in the Netherlands. On the other end of the spectrum we find Nathalie Zemon Davis’s personal confrontation with McCarthyism in the United States. It brought her to Paris, and it was in French history that she made her first incursions into the micro-history for which she has become famous. Brij Lal, when interviewed, had just started as a member of Fiji’s constitutional committee, which enabled him to influence the future of his country.

For Ann Stoler, political activism and research are intertwined, and she talks about her career mainly in terms of battles—struggles against dominant views (particularly those of Clifford Geertz) and politics (especially ideologies of neo-imperialism). Her adventures go beyond the political, though. Like many of the others interviewed, her work is characterised by the crossing of disciplinary boundaries, merging anthropological and historical approaches. Perhaps the real champion in this respect was Jack Goody, who moved from anthropology in Africa to the field of European mediaeval demography.

Perhaps the adventurous element is exactly what characterises this group of historians. They are enterprising in the way they feed their curiosity, through travelling the globe and through crossing methodological demarcations, eras and areas of expertise. The societal engagement of many of those interviewed, whether in terms of inspiration or in terms of practice, is remarkable. The scholars whose lives are recorded in this volume are anything but ivory-tower academics, and that is what makes these conversations such exciting reads.

Notes

- 1 We are grateful to Peer Vries, Adriaan van Veldhuizen, Lincoln Paine, and the anonymous reviewers of Leiden University Press for their thoughtful comments and suggestions on this introduction.
- 2 Including, but certainly not limited to David Christian, 'The Return of Universal History', *History and Theory* 49 (2010): 6–27; Patrick O'Brien, 'Historiographical Traditions and Modern Imperatives for the Restoration of Global History', *Journal of Global History* 1 (2006): 3–39; Bruce Mazlish, 'Comparing Global History to World History', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 28:3 (1998): 385–95; Jerry H. Bentley, 'The New World History', in Lloyd S. Kramer and Sarah C. Maza, eds., *A Companion to Western Historical Thought* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 393–416; Fred Spier, 'Complexity in Big History', *Cliodynamics* 2 (2011): 146–66.
- 3 Bentley, 'The New World History', 393.
- 4 Brij Lal and Peter Reeves, *The Encyclopedia of the Indian Diaspora* (Singapore: Didier Millet, 2006).
- 5 India and Indonesia from the 1920 to the 1950s: The Origins of Planning, *Itinerario* 10:1 (1986); India and Indonesia from the 1830s to 1914: The Heyday of Colonial Rule, *Itinerario* 11:1 (1987); The Ancien Regime in India and Indonesia, *Itinerario* 12:1 (1988).
- 6 Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson, *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty* (New York: Crown, 2012); Ian Morris, *Why the West Rules—For Now* (London: Profile, 2010); Sven Beckert, *Empire of Cotton* (New York: Knopf, 2014).
- 7 Martha Chaiklin's first book was published in Leiden as *Cultural Commerce and Dutch Commercial Culture, The Influence of European Material Culture on Japan, 1700–1850* (Leiden: CNWS, 2003).
- 8 John Rankine Goody, *The East in the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

- 9 Immanuel M. Wallerstein, *The Modern World System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Academic Press, 1974).
- 10 Kenneth Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence: China, Europe and the Making of the Modern World Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- 11 Especially Reid's *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce, 1450–1680*, vol. 1, *The Lands below the Winds* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988) and *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce, 1450–1680*, vol. 2, *Expansion and Crisis* (New Haven, Yale University Press 1993); Adrian Lapien's *Orang laut, bajak laut, raja laut: sejarah kawasan laut Sulawesi pada abad XIX* (Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada, 1987); and Michael Pearson's *The Indian Ocean* (London: Routledge, 2003) and *The World of the Indian Ocean, 1500–1800: Studies in Economic, Social and Cultural History* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishers, 2005).
- 12 Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' in Carry Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, eds., *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 271–313. For a critical reflection see, among others, David Ludden, 'A Brief History of Subalternity' in David Ludden, ed., *Reading Subaltern Studies: Critical History, Contested Meaning, and the Globalization of South Asia* (London: Anthem Press, 2001), 1–39.
- 13 Ranajit Guha, 'The Prose of Counter-Insurgency', in Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Spivak, eds., *Selected Subaltern Studies* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1988) 45–85: 84.
- 14 E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Gollancz, 1963); Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (New York: Viking Press, 1972).
- 15 Lucien Febvre, 'Albert Mathiez: un tempérament, une éducation', *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale* 4:18 (1932): 573–76: 576.
- 16 The Majelis Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia (Indonesian Sciences Council), established in 1956, was succeeded by the Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia (Indonesian Institute of Sciences) in 1967.
- 17 See the discussion logs of H-World: <https://networks.h-net.org/h-world>.
- 18 See <http://www.thewha.org/about-wha/what-is-world-history/>.
- 19 <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-global-history>.
- 20 O'Brien, 'Historiographical Traditions and Modern Imperatives for the Restoration of Global History', 37–38.
- 21 Many historians, including William McNeill, would argue that there is simply no difference. See Mazlish, 'Comparing Global History to World History', 388.
- 22 See also Jack Goody, *The Theft of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

- 23 Andre Gunder Frank, *ReOrient: Global Economy in the Asian Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).
- 24 B. K. Gills and A. G. Frank, eds., *The World System: Five Hundred Years or Five Thousand?* (London: Routledge, 1993).
- 25 Mark Elvin, *The Retreat of the Elephants: An Environmental History of China* (London: Yale University Press, 2004). See also Mark Elvin and Liu Ts'ui-jung, eds., *Sediments of Time: Environment and Society in Chinese History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- 26 See, especially, Arnold Toynbee, *A Study of History*, 12 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934–61) on the relationship between 'civilization' and the environment; and idem, *Mankind and Mother Earth: A Narrative History of the World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976).
- 27 John R. McNeill, 'Toynbee as an Environmental Historian', *Environmental History* (2014): 1–20: 12.
- 28 Patrick Manning, *Navigating World History: Historians Create a Global Past* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 3–15.
- 29 <http://feegi.org/conferences/html>.
- 30 Lincoln Paine, *The Sea and Civilization: a Maritime History of the World* (New York: Knopf, 2013); Enseng Ho, *The Graves of Tarim: Genealogy and Mobility Across the Indian Ocean* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); Seema Alavi, *Muslim Cosmopolitanism in the Age of Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015).
- 31 Sugata Bose, *A Hundred Horizons: The Indian Ocean in the Age of Global Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006). Bose is a South Asian historian and Gardiner Professor of Oceanic History and Affairs at Harvard.
- 32 See, among others, David Armitage and Alison Bashford, eds., *Pacific Histories: Ocean, Land, People* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
- 33 Matt Matsuda, 'AHR Forum: The Pacific', *The American Historical Review* 111:3 (2006): 758–80, 759.
- 34 Herman Paul, 'The Heroic Study of Records: The Contested Persona of the Archival Historian', *History of the Human Sciences* 26:4 (2013): 67–83; idem, 'Introduction: Repertoires and Performances of Academic Identity', *BMGN – Low Countries Historical Review* 131:4 (2016), 3–7.