



## CHAPTER 6

World History and Global Studies at the  
University of Leipzig*Matthias Middell and Katja Naumann*

The University of Leipzig has a long tradition of transnational and global perspectives on the past, in both teaching and research. Along with this tradition has gone an unusual degree of institutionalization reaching back in time as far as the seventeenth century, when Johann Burkhard Mencke was appointed chair in universal history. In precisely this period, history as a field of study was at a turning point from a “*Historia Sacra*” to a more secularized concept, following the ideas of the Enlightenment. Mencke clearly represented this kind of early modern historiography. His interest in a broad historical understanding, together with the support of the university, is only one expression of how the discovery of a whole new world outside of Europe, mirrored in the philosophies of the Enlightenment, was taken up by historians and integrated into academic structures. The recent history of studying and writing world history in Leipzig, however, might be more interesting and significant for embedding current efforts in their wider context.

In 1891 Karl Lamprecht became professor in Leipzig and immediately introduced new directions in conceptualizing historical thinking. Firstly, he pleaded for an enlargement of research perspectives from the prevailing focus on socio-economic developments of smaller regions (mainly through geographical lenses) to what he called “cultural history,” an interest in broad historical entities and contexts. Secondly, he developed an emphasis in historical mentalities. And thirdly, he began to work on what would today

be called transnational history, starting with his habilitation thesis on German and French entanglements in economic and cultural affairs since the late Middle Ages. Although his approaches were heavily criticized by the majority—one might fairly say the mainstream—of his German colleagues,<sup>1</sup> he was able to establish the “Institut für Kultur- und Universalgeschichte” (Institute for Cultural and Universal History) in 1909 as a second institution within the university, next to the History Department, that dealt with historical questions. This institute became the first place within the German academic system where research and teaching of comparative and world history was institutionalized beyond the level of single chairs and individual professors.<sup>2</sup> It immediately stimulated parallel efforts, but Leipzig remained for a very long time the only place in Germany where world history was not only an intellectual horizon but also the topic of a structured teaching program.<sup>3</sup> Lamprecht’s institute was particularly famous for its library, with historical writings covering all regions of the world, and for its practice of guest lectures, which brought scholars from Japan, China, the U.S., and various European countries to Leipzig. The intellectual stimulus that arose around the institute, with its rich resources for research, influenced intellectuals as different as Marc Bloch from France, Nicolai Iorga from Romania, Henri Pirenne from Belgium, and Cai Yanpei from China.<sup>4</sup>

At Lamprecht’s death in 1915 the double structure of a concentration on national history in the History Department and a focus on comparative, transnational, or universal approaches at the “Institut für Kultur- und Universalgeschichte” had become well established: each of the structures attracted around 300 students per year. An attempt to close the institute developed but failed, and thus the project of implementing world history in teaching and in historiographical study could continue—ironically under one of the former critics of Lamprecht, Walter Goetz, who was appointed to Lamprecht’s chair and who started in 1928 to edit the popular “Propyläen Weltgeschichte” (Propyläen World History).<sup>5</sup>

The tradition in world history was further strengthened by the next director of the institute, the sociologist Hans Freyer. It is well-known, of course, that Freyer’s appointment was a result of his close relationship to the National Socialist regime in the 1930s, but then he was never member of the Nazi Party. And he was far away from Leipzig and Germany from 1938 to 1945, while leading the “German Institute” in Budapest. Furthermore,

when he published his “World History of Europe” in 1948, nothing of any former idea of German or European superiority was left. On the contrary, Freyer declared Europe’s dominance over the rest of the world to have been definitively overcome by new powers and a new world order which had, in his opinion, to be taken as the starting point for world historical analyses.<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless his work from the early 1930s, in which he argued for a “revolution from the right,” provided sufficient ground for heavy attacks and accusations after 1945, when the universities in the Soviet zone were undergoing a drastic change of personnel implemented by the communist government. When Freyer left Leipzig to go to Münster, where his works on “industrial society” became influential, the institute was confronted once again with an uncertain future.

With the employment of Walter Markov in 1948, however, a continuous development of more than four decades began. Markov had been an assistant professor at the University of Bonn but his open resistance to the Third Reich (from 1935 he spent ten years in prison) did not provide him with a warm welcome on his return to Bonn. In Leipzig, on the other hand, from his appointment in the late 1940s to his retirement as director of the institute in 1974, he was to become a widely recognized specialist in international and comparative history as well an innovative practitioner of a “history from below,” that was inspired by Marxist thoughts and theory. He was accepted and honored not only within Germany and the Eastern bloc, but also in the Western world. During his career, which was interrupted a few times through conflicts with the communist party, (including his suspension from the party in 1951), he was a leading figure in the East German academic landscape. He supervised more than 200 dissertations and coordinated the re-establishment of area studies (African and Arab Studies as well as Eastern European History) at Leipzig. Under his guidance, the tradition of comparative history was carried into the 1950s and 1960s and was enriched by a close cooperation of historians and social scientists, which found its expression in the establishment of an interdisciplinary “Center for Studies in Africa, Asia and Latin America” in 1967. This center, working mainly from an area-studies-perspective, developed a truly global perspective once Manfred Kossok, a disciple of Markov and a specialist in modern Latin American history, became the chair. Within a couple of years he transformed the center into a “Center for the Comparative Study of Revolutions in

Modern Times,” thus making research on revolutions a central concern of world history in Leipzig during the period from 1974 to 1993.<sup>7</sup>

Both Markov and Kossok revised, rethought, and re-conceptualized world history approaches with new categories inspired by Karl Marx, but this did not lead to a harsh break with traditional narratives. Quite the contrary, seen from today it was part of a constant, eighty-year effort to promote global perspectives on history by stimulating theoretical and methodological considerations of useful research categories and by initiating empirical research from the level of graduate study to broad syntheses. To be sure, the institute never replaced other forms of historiography, notably national history, but it always challenged them and created an atmosphere of intellectual competition that led to innovative thinking.

The succeeding directors of the “Institut für Kultur- und Universalgeschichte” published their specific versions of world history, and they did so in different ways: from single-volume monographs to multivolume collections of essays. From an overall perspective, world history turned from a comparative history of civilizations and world regions by Lamprecht to a more culturally based narrative in the case of Walter Goetz; it changed again from a theoretically ambitious history of the decline of Europe by Hans Freyer to the remarkable introduction of non-Western history in Markov’s studies on Africa, Asia, and Latin America, only to be once more broadened by Kossok’s concept of a world history of revolutions.

When Bruce Mazlish and Ralf Buultjens organized a conference in the late 1980s with the idea of turning traditional concepts of world history into a new practice of global history,<sup>8</sup> Kossok’s contributions marked simultaneously the peak of the intellectual developments in Leipzig and the beginning of a new era. After all, this was precisely the time when the “peaceful revolution” of 1989 started in Leipzig, leading to German unification and the implementation of a new political, social and economic order for the former German Democratic Republic. This historical moment could not but challenge world historians in Leipzig to reflect upon and to react on the closely experienced interplay of local events and global developments, which stimulated another round of reconsideration and rethinking of the theory and practice of world history.

The resulting restructuring of the whole university system of Eastern Germany, to conform to the standards and structures of the Federal Republic,

brought a serious setback, at least for the efforts of world history. In Western Germany transnational history—not to mention world history—had always stayed at the edges of the academic system, lacking a strong impact on curricula and research structures. This is not to say that national history was not perceived and embedded in transnational narratives (“europäisches Abendland”/ the West, Europe and European integration), but these broader narratives remained implicit, were fragmented, and remained far from being critically reflected.

A first effort in 1992 to return to the institutional heritage of Lamprecht’s institute and the interdisciplinary centers—and therefore to the tradition of an independent but integrated structure within the university—was not successful. The president of the “Historikerverband” (Association of German Historians), Wolfgang Mommsen, responded in 1992 to Manfred Kossok that he could only imagine an institute devoted to world history within German academia as part of the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft—a state-founded network of excellent research institutes, independent of the university system. To those familiar with the German academic system, it might be obvious that this would have meant a decisive change, but could also have been a new starting point. But such an endeavor would not come to pass: instead world history in Leipzig was to take a different path.

With the structural renewal of the university, neither was the option of an independent research institute outside of the university discussed nor was an institution within the university seriously considered. World historical perspectives were, however, strengthened through the appointment of several area-studies specialists—in African, Latin American, North American, Near and Middle Eastern, and Comparative Culture history. Their work soon became closely connected with two newly established research institutes: the “Center for the History and Culture of East Central Europe” and the “Simon Dubnow Institute for Jewish History,” both associated with the University of Leipzig. These developments steadily increased the potential circle of historians dealing with various aspects of world history. But it was only in 1994, with the founding of the interdisciplinary Center for Advanced Study (CAS), that a stable basis was recreated for intensive collaboration between the individual efforts and the various institutional contexts towards global perspectives.

## **Graduate Programs and Research in Transnational and Global History**

In 2001 the work done at the CAS led to the establishment of an international PhD program in transnational history (“Transnationalization and Regionalization from the Eighteenth Century to the Present”), generously funded by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) with a grant for ten years. The funds were and are still used to develop multidisciplinary curricula and international cooperation, i.e., bringing graduate students from other countries to Leipzig and enriching the teaching program by bringing visiting scholars from abroad. Over the last six years of its existence the program has attracted more than 80 PhD students from over 30 countries, mostly from Eastern Europe, Africa, Asia, and Latin America, although some also arrived from Western Europe and North America.<sup>9</sup> With the CAS as institutional basis, the funding of the DAAD, and the growing number of students, a dynamic of improvement and reworking of the study program evolved, leading to more integrated forms of teaching and to research projects crossing disciplinary boundaries. It soon became visible in research agendas, stimulating new questions and issues.

A first group of such projects was largely devoted to a methodological reflection on theory and practice of world history. These projects examined the basic assumptions, theoretical frameworks, and research categories of world history, and worked on ways of translating them into methods applicable to empirical studies. This interest was accompanied by an intensive and empirically based study of the history of world history writing. With the support of a five-year grant from the European Science Foundation, a collaborative research project took form, relying on a network of European scholars from around 25 countries, and aiming primarily at an examination of the historiographical construction of nations from the nineteenth century onwards. Secondly, this project deals with regional and transnational alternatives to national history, including traditions of world history writing, and asks in which ways they posed a challenge to the narratives of national history.<sup>10</sup> Other research projects, including several dissertations, are more concerned with the role of area studies within the humanities and social sciences in Europe, particularly from a comparative perspective. Another emphasis in this first group is research on the historiography of empires in various national frameworks and their influence on both national and

transnational perspectives. The question that brings all these efforts and projects together is whether or not there are European perspectives on globalization that differ from viewpoints in other regions of the world; and if so, how they historically emerged and what consequences they imply. After all, any kind of international collaboration in the field of world and global history can be successful only in so far as the participants are aware of the differences in intellectual traditions, institutional settings, and also political circumstances.

A second group of research projects historicizes the emergence of different world regions and its current position in processes of globalization. It addresses topics such as “Failing States in Africa,” “Transnational Companies in East-Central Europe,” and the “Transnational Region of Francophone Countries” with its international organization including areas in Europe, Africa, Asia and the Americas. All studies in this group are characterized by strong collaboration among area-studies specialists at the CAS, to transcend the boundaries of “regions” through a thorough analysis of their construction, looking critically at those colonial and post-colonial perspectives that argue for a fundamental difference between non-Western parts of the world and Western countries. While some early projects started with the problematic assumption that world regions can be taken for granted as a valuable framework of analysis, the debates within the group led to a collective learning process. The result of it was that the curriculum of the PhD program turned increasingly towards constructivist approaches and insights provided by the “spatial turn.” in the humanities and social sciences.<sup>11</sup> In practice this means that the analyses do not take spatial categories like nation-states or empires as stable and unchanging, but historicize them as products and constructions by concrete historical actors who translate their specific experiences of being in the world into spatial references. These references, or better their claim and contest, are understood as providing for the frameworks for social and symbolical action in both the past and present.<sup>12</sup> Added to that, the basis of the program lies in an understanding of transnational and global history as a field of study that is, on the one hand, interested in flows of people, goods and ideas crossing national borders (interactions as well as entanglements of any kind in human history) but, on the other hand, also tries analytically to understand the emergences of various regimes of territorialization. These regimes are understood as a form of world

ordering, which sets the frameworks and determines the condition for any exchange and connectivity. In addition global processes of differentiation and integration, which result from interactions, are understood in these broader terms as representations of territorial orders. In recent years the description and explanation of changes in territorial regimes has become the central focus of the research done in the PhD program: currently, scholars from more than fifteen disciplines work together at the CAS and in the PhD program, trying to expand our knowledge about the spatial construction of empires, nations, or supra-national entities like the EU or Mercosur, thus about the historical emergence of the today's multifold and complex spatial constitution of the world.

In 2006 the PhD program came to be complemented by an interdisciplinary research group and graduate program concentrating on the analysis of "Critical Junctures of Globalization."<sup>13</sup> With funding from the "Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft" (German Research Council), twenty PhD students with three-year scholarships work together, aiming firstly at a diachronic comparison of historical and current conflicts resulting from the changing regimes of territorialization, and secondly at a synchronic comparison of several world regions, among others East Asia, North Africa, and Europe.

In 2006, both the international PhD program in transnational history and the interdisciplinary Research Group on "Critical Junctures of Globalization" became part of a Graduate School, "Understanding Space. Area Studies, Geography, and World History in an age of globalization," within the newly established "Graduate Centre in the Humanities and Social Sciences" of the "Research Academy Leipzig." Two other centers of the Graduate School address the relationship between nomadic and settled (and therefore territorialized) societies and the emergence of new social and transnational spaces within Europe. The "Graduate Center in the Humanities and Social Sciences" at the University of Leipzig seeks decisively to foster its character as a research institution in the field of globalization studies, deriving its particular position from the integration of world and global history, areas studies, and human geography, based on the theoretical assumptions of the "spatial turn." To put the guiding ideas in a nutshell, it can be said that the Graduate Center took as the starting point for its activities the observation that,

Since 1989, the decline of historical master narratives, the crisis of the nation state and the re-definition of territorial regimes has troubled history, geography and area studies alike. Because of real-world developments, which have been described by post-modern approaches in terms of an increased 'space-time compression' or as dynamic dialectics between processes of de-territorialization and the search for new forms of re-territorialization, these disciplines are facing major irritations which, in turn, also affect their methodological foundations. The productive nature of these irritations has led to a renewed interest in world history approaches and a re-reading of the relationship between space and territory in different disciplines.<sup>14</sup>

To deal analytically with these developments and irritations, the common notion of spatial entities as containers of individual or collective action was turned into an understanding that conceives of them as results of processes of constructing spatial references. With such an actor-centered perspective, social actors again play an active role in the historical creation of spatial orders.

Naturally these assumptions challenge traditional disciplinary perspectives: therefore, responses within the university towards this methodological problematic varied, but in general it encountered interest and a positive reaction. Moreover the support received from a whole range of departments made it possible to implement, at the Graduate Center, a substantially cross-cultural perspective including Western, Central, and Eastern European Studies; South-East and Southern European Studies; as well as Middle East, African, American, and East Asian Studies. It also led to the multi-disciplinary teaching of methods and theories from both the social and cultural sciences. The results will enable the students to bring comparative perspectives together with the study of cultural transfer and interactions.

The Graduate Center also incorporated a M.A. program in "Global Studies." This program was established in 2004 as a European Master's program bringing together the competences of four academic institutions: the London School of Economics and the universities of Wroclaw in Poland, Vienna in Austria, and Leipzig.<sup>15</sup> Students are required to spend their two years of study at two of these institutions, earning a double degree from the

chosen partners. Furthermore they can profit from related programs offered at non-European partner universities: the University of California at Santa Barbara (U.S.), Macquarie University at Sydney (Australia), the University of Dalhousie (Canada) and the University of Stellenbosch (South Africa).

The European Master's program is funded by the European Union Commission with €1.3 million per year, providing grants for students from non-European countries to study in Europe and encouraging European students to study abroad. The number of enrolled students clearly shows that the program is increasingly recognized within and outside of its core countries: while the program started with 36 students, in the second year 54 students were enrolled; now, in the third year the program chairs are confronted with 280 excellent applications from around the world, making entry highly competitive. The fact that more than 60% of the students come from Asia, Africa, the Americas, and Eastern Europe indicates that this particularly European teaching program goes far beyond Europe—in its intellectual perspectives, its student body, and its faculty.

“Global Studies” as concept and teaching program includes world and global history, but history is only one of several disciplinary approaches bound together in the program, integrating research methods from the main areas of the social and cultural sciences and humanities. Although the study programs of the four core institutions differ according to their respective competences, in general the first semester is spent with an introductory unit in global history and a seminar on theories and methods (useful for research on processes of globalization). The next two semesters are devoted to study in greater detail of at least two regions of the world, although the connections among these areas are constantly emphasized in accompanying tutorials and discussion sections. The last semester is filled with the research-oriented master's thesis, but students are also asked to choose between teaching units to gain expertise in economic or cultural aspects of current processes of globalization. The role of world and global history in the program is one of challenging traditional, ahistorical explanation of globalization in teaching the intellectual skills of a radical historicization of the present. How far back in time such an examination goes depends less on general decisions than on the explanatory power of global perspectives for each respective issue and topic. Although the program is still young, it can be said that students have

appreciated it, particularly the irritation, the disorder and the intellectual challenge evolving sometimes from conflicting disciplinary perspectives.

These positive experiences and the strong cooperation among all participating institutions suggested seeking contacts with other “Global Studies” programs. During the year 2006 the first exchanges developed, leading in February 2007 to a meeting at the University of California at Santa Barbara which brought the foundation of a Global Consortium in Global Studies.<sup>16</sup> In addition to the already mentioned academic institutions with their respective teaching programs, other institutions from Tokyo, Shanghai and Seoul have now become part of the cooperation. “The purposes of this consortium,” as it was agreed upon, “are to promote and facilitate graduate teaching programs in global studies and to foster cooperation among them. The consortium is open to any academic program in the world that offers a graduate M.A., M.Sc., M.Phil., or PhD related to global studies.”<sup>17</sup> The first steps of the newly founded Consortium will be to organize the necessary structures for an exchange of curricula and teaching materials, cooperative teaching projects (for example distance learning opportunities), internship opportunities in the countries of the participating universities, student and faculty exchange agreements, and comparative studies on employment areas and career paths of students with this particular education. Ideally these efforts will help to overcome parochialisms inherent in many programs which claim to be global in their outlook, and to create a truly global learning atmosphere for students.

### **Instruments for Strengthening Teaching and Research**

During the last ten years the University of Leipzig has developed into an internationally recognized interdisciplinary center of transnational and global history. Its teaching programs and research groups have stimulated the establishment of two journals and several books series as well as a European-wide organization of scholars interested in this comparatively new field of study.

Among the forums presenting the research done in Leipzig (but also in other places) the academic journal *COMPARATIV* must be mentioned first. Established in 1991 and published in six thematic issues per year, it has become an important instrument for bringing together perspectives

from various disciplines and diverse national contexts. Authors from more than 40 countries have contributed to the ongoing concern of the journal, addressing a range of topics including slave trade, coerced labor, concepts of time and space, gender relations, and environmental policy, to mention only a few.<sup>18</sup> This print journal was supplemented in 2004 by an online forum, “geschichte.transnational” (history.transnational). It is the result of cooperation between the CAS and a research group on “Cultural Transfers” at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, in Paris. Both editors, Michael Espagne and Matthias Middell, together with a German-French editorial group, seek to offer an easily accessible, multi-lingual discussion forum transcending national academic borders and bringing together as many as possible of those working on issues of transnational and global history. Its purposes are to offer rapid publication of new approaches and research results, to create a forum for critical discussions of the increasing number of publications in the field, and to provide an instrument of information about activities. Within the last two years more than 2500 subscribers have expressed their interest in this service, 280 books reviews have been published, and over 300 conferences, workshops and other academic events were brought to wider attention. Moreover, this discussion list conveyed a debate on the potentials, risks and challenges of transnational historical perspectives, in which 22 authors were inspired to comment on a concept of transnational history offered by the two editors of the forum.<sup>19</sup> In 2007 *geschichte.transnational* and the American-based *H-World* started to cooperate, providing one step further in turning transnational and global history into an endeavor and practice that reaches beyond established borders and separated academic communities.

In addition to these two journals, since 1994 the CAS has published several books series on various aspects of world history (for example “History of Historiography in the 20th Century” and “Theory and Practice of Studies on Cultural Transfers”), which now total more than 60 collective volumes and monographs. Recently a new series has been launched under the title “Global History and International Studies.” Its main aim is to combine the strengths of new scholarship with the needs of an increasing European textbook market. A combination of research and teaching at an advanced level, this series is intended to diminish the prevailing distinction between textbooks and research-based monographs.

In 2002, at a meeting of the summer school of the PhD program in transnational history, the idea of a European organization of scholars dealing with world, global or transnational history arose. It was turned into reality by founding the European Network in Universal and Global History (ENIUGH), which transformed the Karl-Lamprecht-Gesellschaft, an affiliate of the World History Association (WHA), into an international organization based on German legislation for non-profit scientific associations. It was formed as an answer to the rapidly growing interest in world history across Europe and the related demand for efficient structures of cooperation as well as platforms for communication within Europe and with colleagues from other continents. The major aims of the network are: to regularly organize a European congress on themes of world and global history, to publish the periodicals *COMPARATIV* and “*geschichte.transnational*” and other research on global linkages from a historical perspective, and to offer administrative help for bi- and multilateral cooperation in the fields of master’s and PhD programs.<sup>20</sup>

The First European Congress in World and Global History was held September 22–25, 2005 in Leipzig.<sup>21</sup> The announcement of the conference received much more attention than originally expected: more than 350 participants from all over Europe and overseas met in 47 thematic panels, each with four to six papers. The meetings were accompanied by a book exhibition where more than 50 publishers presented recent publications and thereby made clear that transnational and world history has reached the European book market.<sup>22</sup> The next congress will take place in Dresden in 2008, with “world orders in global history” as its framing theme. The selection of this topic responded to the recent scholarly interest in world orders, i.e. in general patterns and coordinates emerging from the conditions of an entangled and globalized world. The fruitful differences in the ways in which scholars approach and understand world orders are underpinned by the shared observation that the multifold linkages and networks, the connections and mutual influences across the world, both create and are shaped by specific sets of power relations, institutions and ideas. These structures—economic, social, political or cultural—result from conflicts among various claims for and challenges to domination and regulation in contrast to efforts to preserve autonomy and self-control against hegemonic encroachments. Although they are subject to constant change

they represent global constellations, which for different periods of time constitute spheres of stability, structures of governance and frameworks of orientation, thus providing order in a complex, incalculable world. So far this research emphasis has been particularly strong in the Anglo-American context, whereas European scholars have rather reluctantly approached this area. Empirical research in many European countries, however, has addressed a whole range of historical situations and developments, which can be bound together to provide insights into world orders. Therefore the second European Congress in World and Global History seeks to bring these potentials together and to discuss their empirical results, focusing on issues of enforcements and contestations of world orders in economic, social, political and cultural spheres. Interpretations of global history are shaped by many disciplines, and so does the understanding of world orders depend on contributions from a wide range of areas in the social sciences and humanities. Therefore the following but not exclusive themes will be under consideration from an interdisciplinary perspective: 1. ideas, conceptualizations and ideologies of world orders, master narratives for its enforcements as well as forms of reaction and resistance against established orders; 2. structures of global governance and in politics and economics (trade, finance, production); 3. labor migration as a challenge to or reinforcement of prevailing international divisions of labor; 4. forms of international cooperation (NGO's, international organizations, transnational networks, multinational corporations); and 5. world orders in areas like literature and art, and in education.<sup>23</sup>

As all these activities show, within the last few years the field of transnational and world history has become a practice that can be found in many places, has led to many forms of transnational collaboration, and has been successful in testing a multi- or even post-disciplinary approach in teaching and research. But as much as these developments simplify, they also complicate the matter. Although it has become comparatively easy today to integrate scholars from different national background into a common endeavor, the translation of the intellectual insights and research results originating in a global scholarly network into local institutional settings has continued to be challenging. During the last ten years, and hopefully also in the future, globally interested historians in Leipzig have been successful in interacting globally while remaining bounded locally. This would have

not been possible without the collective effort of many colleagues from various departments; neither could it have been done without the enormous engagement of the graduate students taking the risk of entering a relatively uncertain and unexplored field of education, nor without our partners in Europe and outside. But even as the first milestone is reached, the journey has just begun.

### Notes

1. For a comprehensive biography of Lamprecht, see Roger Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht. A German Academic Life 1856–1915* (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1993). For a first attempt to compare the German and North American organizational and intellectual environments for the institutionalization of world history, see Matthias Middell and Katja Naumann, “Institutionalisierung der Lehre in Welt- und Globalgeschichte in Deutschland und den USA—ein Vergleich,” *Comparativ* 16, 1 (2006): 78–121.
2. On the history of Lamprecht’s institute and the context of its foundation, see Matthias Middell, *Weltgeschichtsschreibung im Zeitalter der Verfachlichung und Professionalisierung. Das Leipziger Institut für Kultur- und Universalgeschichte 1890–1990* (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2005), vol. 1.
3. A few years later Bernhard Harms in Kiel founded the “Weltwirtschaftsarchiv,” while others, including Kurt Breysig in Berlin, were not as successful.
4. On the international influences of Lamprecht’s institute see: Luise Schorn-Schütte, “Karl Lamprecht und die internationale Geschichtsschreibung,” in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 67 (1985): 417–464; Schorn-Schütte, “Karl Lamprecht weiterdenken,” in Gerald Diesener, ed., *Universal- und Kulturgeschichte heute*, (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1994).
5. Wolfgang V. Weigand, *Walter Wilhelm Goetz 1867–1958. Eine biographische Studie über den Historiker, Politiker und Publizisten* (Boppard: Boldt Press, 1992). The original *Propyläen* was a periodical published by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and Heinrich Meyer, 1798–1801.
6. Hans Freyer, *Weltgeschichte Europas*, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden: Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1948; 2nd edition: Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1954). On Freyer, see Jerry Z. Muller, *The Other God That Failed: Hans Freyer and the Deradicalization of German Conservatism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).
7. In addition to a collection of eleven volumes on comparative history of revolutions and a textbook on world history from the fifteenth century to the early twentieth century, see the articles collected in Manfred Kossok, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, vol. 1, *Kolonialgeschichte und Unabhängigkeitsbewegung in Lateinamerika*; vol. 2, *Vergleichende Revolutionsgeschichte der Neuzeit*; vol. 3, *Zwischen Reform und Revolution: Übergänge von der Universal- zur Globalgeschichte* (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2000).
8. Manfred Kossok, “From Universal History to Global History,” in Bruce Mazlish and Ralph Buultjens, eds. *Conceptualizing Global History*, (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1993), 93–111.
9. For more information on the program see: [www.uni-leipzig.de/zhs](http://www.uni-leipzig.de/zhs).
10. [www.uni-leipzig.de/zhsesf/](http://www.uni-leipzig.de/zhsesf/); see also Matthias Middell and Lluís Roura y Aulinas, “Challenging the national history paradigm. Remarks on the ‘spatial other’ in European historiography,” *Storia della Storiografia* 50 (2006), 99–116.

11.

11. Constructivist approaches reacted as part of the criticism of linear and large-scale master narratives as framework for historical research and historiography, and argued—whether consciously or not—for a fragmentation of overall narratives that would open up for a much more differentiated and inclusive perspective of the past. With this they provided the basis for the spatial turn, i.e. the challenge of the historian's former concentration on time and his ignorance of space as a similar complex process. A common ground of its theoretical assumptions is to understand "space" as a process of the "restless formation and reformation of geographical landscapes" and therefore to challenge oversimplified spatial categories and seemingly stable divisions like East/ West, the three worlds, or North/ South. Quote from: David Harvey, "The Geopolitics of Capitalism," in: Derek Gregory and John Urry, eds., *Social Relations and Spatial Structures* (London: Macmillan, 1985), 105. A more elaborate discussion of these issues can be found in Matthias Middell, "Die konstruktivistische Wende, der *spatial turn* und das Interesse für die Globalisierung in der gegenwärtigen Geschichtswissenschaft," in *Geographische Zeitschrift* 93 (2006), 33–44.
12. Very useful contributions for understanding the mechanisms of historically specific results of the construction of space have been formulated by Charles Maier, "Consigning the 20th Century to History. Alternative Narratives for the Modern Era," *American Historical Review* 105 (2000): 807–831; and Jacques Revel, *Jeux d'échelles. La micro-analyse à l'expérience* (Paris: Gallimard-Le Seuil, 1996).
13. The director of this research group is Ulf Engel, professor of contemporary African politics. The teaching staff includes scholars from a range of fields and departments: Japanese Studies, Political Science, Sociology, East-Central European History, African History, Geography, Economic History, and Global History. For further details: [www.uni-leipzig.de/zhs/bruchzonen](http://www.uni-leipzig.de/zhs/bruchzonen). For an elaborated discussion of the research category, "critical junctures of globalization," see Ulf Engel and Matthias Middell, "Bruchzonen der Globalisierung, globale Krisen und Territorialitätsregimes—Kategorien einer Globalgeschichtsschreibung," *Comparativ* 15, 5–6 (2005): 5–38.
14. Research Plan of the Graduate Centre in the Humanities and Social Sciences at the Research Academy Leipzig (2006), p. 1.
15. For more details on the European Master's program, see its website at [www.uni-leipzig.de/zhs](http://www.uni-leipzig.de/zhs).
16. The following institutions participated: the London School of Economics, the universities of Wrocław in Poland, Vienna in Austria, Stellenbosch in South Africa, and Leipzig in Germany, as well as the University of California, Santa Barbara (USA).
17. Global Consortium in Global Studies, Statement of Purposes, Santa Barbara 2007 (Ms.), p. 1.
18. See for an exhaustive bibliography of all the articles and book reviews published since 1991, see the brochure, "10 Jahre Karl-Lamprecht-Gesellschaft" (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2002). In the near future all articles from 1991–2005 will be online at [www.comparativ.net](http://www.comparativ.net).
19. [www.geschichte-transnational.clio-online.net/forum](http://www.geschichte-transnational.clio-online.net/forum); the debate took place between January 2005 and March 2007; contributions to this debates came from Volker Berghahn (New York), Andreas Eckert (Berlin/ Cambridge), Ekaterina Emeliantseva (Zurich), Michel Espagne (Paris), Ulrike Freitag (Berlin), Eckhardt Fuchs (Mannheim), Adrian Gerber (Zurich), Christian Gerlach (Pittsburgh), Michael Geyer (Chicago), Peter Haslinger (München/ Regensburg), Hartmut Kaelble (Berlin), Isabella Löhr (Leipzig), Barbara Lüthi (Basel), Jochen Meissner (Leipzig), Hans-Heinrich Nolte (Hanover), Alexander Nützenadel (Köln), Klaus Kiran Patel (Berlin), Margrit Pernau (Erfurt/ Bielefeld), Dominic Sachsenmaier (Santa Barbara/

- Durham), Pierre Yves Saunier (Lyon), Hannes Siegrist (Leipzig), Eva-Maria Stollberg (Bonn), Matthias Middell (Leipzig), Katja Naumann (Leipzig).
20. For further information see: [www.eniugh.org](http://www.eniugh.org)
  21. The steering committee for the congress comprised: Carol Adamson (Stockholm), Ida Blom (Bergen), Cathérine Coquery-Vidrovitch (Paris), Margarete Grandner (Vienna), Frank Hadler (Leipzig/ Berlin), Miroslav Hroch (Prague), Attila Melegh (Budapest), Matthias Middell (Leipzig), Patrick Karl O'Brien (London), Edoardo Tortarolo (Turin), Peer Vries (Leiden), Susan Zimmermann (Budapest), and for the hosting institution Katja Naumann and Hannes Siegrist (University of Leipzig).
  22. For detailed reports on most of the panels and an overall description of the conference see the special thematic issue of *Historical Social Research* (Cologne) 31, 2 (2006).
  23. The steering committee consists of scholars from various European countries and includes: Gareth Austin (London School of Economics and Political Sciences), Carol Adamson (Stockholm), Margarete Grandner (University of Vienna), Frank Hadler (Centre for the History and Culture of East Central Europe at the University of Leipzig), Miroslav Hroch (Charles' University, Prague), Marcel van der Linden (International Institute of Social History Amsterdam), Attila Melegh (Central European University Budapest), Matthias Middell (University of Leipzig), Patrick O'Brien (London School of Economics and Political Sciences), Diego Olstein (Hebrew University of Jerusalem), Kapil Raj (EHESS Paris), Shalini Randeria (University of Zurich), Eric Vanhaute (University of Gent), Peer Vries (University of Leiden). For more information visit: [www.eniugh.org/congress](http://www.eniugh.org/congress).