



TRANS-PACIFIC CONVERSATIONS

Doing History in a Global Age

跨洋话史

在全球化时代做历史

王希 肖红松 主编



SINCE 1897

商務印書館
The Commercial Press

Trans-Pacific Conversations
Doing History in a Global Age

跨洋话史

在全球化时代做历史

王希 肖红松 主编



创立于1897

商务印书馆
The Commercial Press

2017年·北京

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

跨洋话史：在全球化时代做历史 / 王希，肖红松主编.
—北京：商务印书馆，2017

ISBN 978-7-100-12862-9

I. ①跨… II. ①王…②肖… III. ①世界史—研究
IV. ①K107

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字 (2017) 第001722号

权利保留，侵权必究。

跨洋话史

在全球化时代做历史

王希 肖红松 主编

商 务 印 书 馆 出 版

(北京王府井大街 36 号 邮政编码 100710)

商 务 印 书 馆 发 行

北京图文天地制版印刷有限公司印刷

ISBN 978-7-100-12862-9

2017 年 1 月第 1 版 开本 787×960 1/16

2017 年 1 月北京第 1 次印刷 印张 34

定价：69.00 元

河北大学历史学院世界史系列丛书

2014年初夏，河北大学历史学院与美国宾夕法尼亚州印第安纳大学（Indiana University of Pennsylvania，简称IUP）历史系在古城保定联合举行了“全球化时代的世界史研究与教学”研讨会。来自两校的30多位历史学者在会上分享各自的近期研究内容，交流在中美高校讲授历史课程的心得体会，并针对全球化时代历史学家共同面临的挑战进行了非常热烈的讨论。会议之后，两校学者对论文进行了修订和补充。这里呈现的是这次极为难忘的国际学术合作的成果。

我们生活在一个全球化时代，这已经是一个不争的事实。不同经济体之间的冲突、渗透与融合，资本、技术、思想与人口的跨国快速流动，核武器的存在与扩散，以及环境、气候和资源构成的挑战，正在改写传统的经济规律和政治秩序，将人类命运更加紧密地锁定在一起。虽然全球化的进程始于5个世纪之前的地理大发现，但我们比过去任何时候都更加强烈地感受到它的冲击和影响。居住在不同地区的人群对全球化有不同的理解和感受，但所有人都分享一种共同的感受：在全球化的时代，我们需要重新反思过去和重新想象未来。

历史研究与历史教学也面临同样的挑战。传统的信息屏障被打破，无数埋没的史料得以发掘，知识的分享达到了前所未有的速度、深度和广度，历史的讲述变得更为多元，讲述的方式不断翻新，讲述的材料也更为丰富多彩，所有这一切对传统的知识结构、思维方式、历史叙事，甚至价值观念都提出了挑战，也迫使历史学家反思史学知识的生产与传播。如何在全球化时代从事历史研究和历史教学，成为历史

学家不得不思考的一个大问题。

在某种意义上，本书代表了对这个“大问题”进行思考的一种努力，但它提供的不是一个直截了当的回答——目前可能也没有人能够提供这样的回答。本书呈现的可谓是一种“思想碎片的组合”。如何理解呢？本书 23 篇文章按主题大致可以分为史学方法介绍、史学史梳理、专题研究、历史教学法讨论、历史研究与教学的国际案例等几类。每篇文章讨论的是某个领域内的具体问题，作者的训练背景和他们服务的大学体制也非常不同，有些繁杂。然而，他们却分享一个共同的职业身份——历史学家，并且分享对全球化时代的史学研究和教学的深切关怀。正是这种共同的身份和共同的关切，构成了对上述“大问题”共同进行思考的基础，因此也就有可能产生意义相关的“思想碎片”。

就史学方法的介绍而言，波琳、莫思特、康艾琳、慧黛米分别介绍了老年史学、数字史学、口述史学和环境史学的近期发展与研究方法。老年史学在西方学界的兴起的历史也不长，在国内则可能是一个全新的领域。波琳对“老年”作为新分析概念所具有的跨学科潜能的讨论应该对国内学者具有启发性。在 2015 年第 22 届国际历史科学大会在济南举行之后，数字史学似乎已在国内形成先声夺人之势，但莫思特的切入角度十分独特，他除了介绍该领域在美国史学界的起源和发展之外，也讨论了如何“合理合法地”将其纳入现行专业评估体制的程序。康艾琳刻意在讨论中加入对中国口述史传统的梳理，彰显这一学科并非是西方学界的独创。慧黛米对影响力巨大的《大自然与权力》的深入点评则展示了环境史学在纵横双向上具有的广大研究空间。

讨论史学史的 6 篇文章中，韩玲和卢淑贞分别梳理了两个不同领域——中国的美国移民政策史研究和美国的冷战史研究——的史学史，覆盖的时段都是从 20 世纪 80 年代开始至今。两者分别提及研究方法和研究视角的变化，包括从宏观研究走向微观研究（韩玲），从注重政治和国内因素到注重文化和国际因素（卢淑贞）。如康艾琳一样，卢淑贞也讨论了中国的冷战史研究对美国冷战史学的贡献，而她列举的文

化分析和跨国史研究的著作案例应该对对外关系史领域的学者极有帮助。包安廉与薄卫恩虽然讨论的学术史主题——美国的现代中国史和美国革命史——不同，但写作却很相似。他们在讨论史学史之前，都事先描述各自领域的起源与变迁，这种综述可以帮助国内读者弄清讨论的语境。包安廉的史学史不是综述，而是精选该领域的3部近著，展现西方学界对中华民国史研究的新的切入角度——职业精英、公众舆论、民间组织的社会网络。薄卫恩则结合自己的研究，提出用区域史和新军事史的方法来测试美国革命史领域中那些理所当然的结论。两者都表现了对传统的宏观叙事史学模式的质疑。贝柯丽文章的重心放在公元10世纪伊斯兰帝国的史学史之上，但质疑的是后世历史学家过度倚重由不同王朝编撰的带有偏见的史料。她实际上提出了传统和当代史学家都必须面临的一个经典问题——如何追求史料本身的“平衡”与“公正”。刘研的文章严格地讲不是讨论史学史，而是对《独立宣言》中的关键观念及其汉译的质疑，而他企图用中国古典哲学的观念来解读18世纪末美国政治家的思想也不失为一种别出心裁的努力。

专题研究的选题虽然是多样化的，但都反映出作者的现实关怀。程爱勤通过追溯东南亚文明的产生及其与汉文明和古印度文明的关系，提供了一个文明交融的古代案例；而郭云艳讲述的罗马—拜占庭帝国与丝绸之路贸易关系的故事，则说明即便在古代，“国内”的政治与社会变化对“国际”贸易有不可避免的外延影响。从中世纪到近代国家的转型一直是世界史研究的重点领域，现代化是其中的一个经典课题，张殿清、张家唐、欧保罗、连会新、宋东亮分别写作的5篇文章在不同程度上分享这一宏观背景。张殿清叙述了都铎王朝时代英国王室领地在数量和管理方面发生的变化，从而揭示了英国从领地财政走向议会财政的过程；欧保罗则考察了意大利自由主义在思想、文化、民族认同和阶级组合方面的纠结，并叙述了它最终如何在20世纪初与法西斯主义合流的过程；连会新通过分析明治宪法与生俱来的专制成分，探讨了二战前日本政党政治为何失败的原因；张家唐通过讲述波菲里

奥·迪亚斯的崛起与衰落，勾画了墨西哥在 19 世纪后期至 20 世纪初走向现代化所经历的波折；宋东亮对美国现代化做了一种宏观意义上的观察，并提出领土、资源、移民、文化精神和政治体制等是“拓荒性”资本主义在美国成功的主要原因。在另外两篇专题文章中，马约夫通过观察美国内战之前天主教修女的教育和慈善活动，第一次提出了“修道院革命”的概念，并认为其具有的社会进步性可以与 19 世纪其他组织化的妇女慈善社团所从事的公益事业相媲美。海安迪对 20 世纪中叶美墨劳工领袖的跨境组织活动的研究在多重意义上具有开拓性：它可以为卢淑贞关于跨国史的综述提供一个有用的实例，也代表了劳工史、移民史和农业资本主义史研究的方向，还可以为宋东亮对美国“拓荒性”资本主义的宏观观察提供一些具有商榷意义的细节。

在关于历史教学的论文中，孙艳萍针对国内《世界古代史》课程面临的挑战，提出了一系列改革的建议，包括整合和改革教材、利用现代信息、扩宽教学渠道、组织参观、实施双语教学等。费凯伯则讲述了他带领学生走完法国和西班牙境内 500 英里长的朝圣之旅的故事，来展示他称之为“体验式教学”在中世纪宗教史课程中的运用与效果。在史学研究和教学的国际案例方面，傅雪仑考察了芬兰的教育体制，尤其讲述了这个北欧国家的中学历史教育以及中学教师的训练对该国教学成功的影响。王希勾画了美国史研究与教学在中华人民共和国第一个 60 年中的发展，指出外国史研究与教学不可避免地受到国内外政治的影响，但历史学者不是完全没有发挥能动性的空间。

这些文章是否回答了全球化时代如何“做”历史的问题，我们并不确定，但我们可以确定的是，它们共同引发我们去思考超出各自研究之外的问题，并至少在三个方面给我们带来了一些重要的启示。首先，在研究视野方面，以民族国家为基础的历史研究虽依然占据主流位置，但力图突破和跨越这种传统分界的主题研究正在蓬勃兴起，标志着历史学家希望重新发现那些被“民族国家”的思维框架所遮掩和淡化的历史，跨国史研究对于认识民族国家历史本身也是极为重要的。

这种新的视野不光体现在老年史、妇女研究、环境史、移民史、国际商贸史、古代文明交流史的研究中，而且在较为传统的政治史、经济史、外交史、军事史、思想史和劳工史中也得到采用。其次，在研究方法方面，我们观察到，“跨域借鉴”正在成为一种普遍的史学实践。“跨域借鉴”是卢淑贞教授在描绘外交史领域的史学史发展时使用的词，可以直白地理解为是一种跨学科的研究方法。但我们认为，“跨域借鉴”的含义更为深远和丰厚。它的含义不单是指从其他学科借鉴研究方法或解释模式，它并不主张在方法论上的生搬硬套，它也不否认史学拥有独特的实践形式。在哲学意义上，“跨域借鉴”有一种更高的期许——它赋予历史学家一种新的观察和想象历史的眼光，它鼓励历史学家摆脱过去那种以单一知识结构、单一方法训练和单一语言和单一种类的材料（包括口述和文字材料）作为基础来生产历史知识的模式。历史学家必须以一种更为开放的心态和眼光来做历史和开辟新的史学路径。再者，在研究工具与研究技能方面，我们注意到，随着电子技术的发展，历史材料的收集、整理、保存和呈现已经发生了革命性的变化，变化的速度远远超出我们的预料。这种变化直接影响到此刻和未来的研究质量，也决定着历史学作为一个学科的发展。我们深感，历史学家不仅需要熟悉和驾驭电子化的史料资源，而且还需要积极参与到电子化史料的建设之中，这已经成为不可避免的趋势。“工欲善其事，必先利其器”，这句古训在全球化时代并不过时，未来历史学家的训练必须加强针对电子化信息的使用的技能训练。

我们同时认为，至少在另外两种意义上，本书具有独特的价值。首先，它是中美学术一次特殊合作的历史记录。中美学术交流的历史源远流长，形式多样，但发生在历史学者之间的、以专业院系为基础的集体交流与合作，应该并不多见，很有可能这是第一次，所以意义非同寻常。其次，本书也是一次打破“行业隔阂”的尝试。因为专业分工的原因，隔行如隔山，不同史学领域的同事，即便在同校同系共事，也很少有机会坐在一起，就共同关心的史学问题进行有深度的交

流或合作出版文集。本书则力图显示，不同背景的历史学者能够坐在一起，通过思想的冲撞，学会欣赏彼此的工作，并找到能够分享的东西。应该说，这也是一种将我们对全球化时代历史学者工作方式的想象付诸实践的结果。

2014年会议和本书的出版得到了河北大学和 IUP 校方的鼓励和全力支持。两校签署的学术合作协议为历史院系的交流奠定了坚实的基础。河北大学历史学院和 IUP 人文社会科学学院为会议和文集提供了特别项目基金的支持。河北大学副校长杨学新教授、河北大学原副校长王凤鸣教授、河北大学原人事处处长冯军教授、河北大学历史学院领导班子和郭献庭教授、IUP 人文社会科学院院长伊奥·阿什莫博士、IUP 历史系主任莫思特教授、IUP 亚洲研究项目主任包安廉教授为促成此项合作给予了坚定、持续和热情的支持。河北大学张殿清教授为本书出版的前期工作付出了大量心血。IUP 教授卢淑贞、包安廉、庞瑾、波琳等校读了全部或部分译稿。卢淑贞与慧黛米还对文章题目和书名的翻译提出了及时的修订建议。河北大学孙艳萍副教授帮助修订和校读了部分文稿。北京大学历史学系博士研究生张大鹏应邀通读和订正了全书文稿。谢明光博士阅读了欧保罗教授的文稿，并提出了专业的改正意见。IUP 历史系行政助理葛丽斯为项目提供了高质量的技术支持。我们对上述所有人提供的帮助和支持表示由衷的感谢。

最后，我们向本书所有的作者致谢，感谢他们为会议和本书贡献文稿。我们也衷心希望读者能够从阅读他们的文章中获益，并一起来思考在全球化时代如何“做”历史和如何“做更好的”历史的大问题。

编 者

2016年7月31日

In the early summer of 2014, the History College of Hebei University (HBU) and the History Department of Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) held a joint international symposium, in the ancient city of Baoding, devoted to discussing the "Study and Teaching of World History in a Global Age." The symposium was attended by more than thirty HUB and IUP historians, who presented their research findings, shared teaching experiences, and engaged in an inspiring conversation on how to meet the challenges confronting historians across the globe. Papers written for the symposium were subsequently revised, updated, and translated; they eventually evolved into the present volume, which may duly claim to be the fruit of this memorable international collaboration between Chinese and American historians.

We indisputably live in an age of globalization, which has witnessed the conflict, penetration and integration of different economic systems; the rapid movement of capital, technology, ideas and people has challenged conventional economic and political systems. The diffusion of weapons of mass destruction, the challenges posed by the deteriorating environment and limitations on natural resources, have interlocked our fates as human beings and societies more intimately than before. As a historical process, globalization may have begun five centuries ago with the Voyages of Discovery, but now more than ever do we feel its impact and influence. People living in different parts of the world may understand globalization differently, but none would deny that we are compelled to reevaluate the past and reimagine the future in this global age.

The profession of history also confronts similar challenges. Traditional barriers to the flow of information have been dismantled, innumerable amounts of new historical materials have been uncovered, and knowledge of great breadth and depth has been transmitted with unprecedented speed. As a result, history is now being told much more diversely, the way it is told is changing more frequently and the materials used for telling history have been greatly enriched. All of these

developments have posed serious challenges to historians' knowledge structures, ideological patterns, narratives and even basic values, and have compelled them to rethink the production and diffusion of historical knowledge. Thus, how historical research and teaching should be conducted in our time has become an unavoidable "big question" for historians.

To some extent this book represents an effort to address the "big question" although it does not provide a straightforward and simple answer. No one, perhaps, can provide such an answer at this moment. What the book presents, however, might be described as "a collection of fragmented ideas" derived from varied thinking of the "big question." How do we approach this? As far as themes or subjects are concerned, the twenty-three articles included in the volume may be classified into such categories as historical approach, historiography, specialized research, pedagogy and international case studies, with each focusing on a specific topic in a specialized area. The authors' professional backgrounds and training experience vary, as do the academic cultures of the institutions they serve. Inevitably, the subject matter represented here is less cohesive than that appears in a more traditional collection of essays. In spite of this apparent diversity, all contributors share a common identity as historian, who have a profound concern about historical research and teaching in the age of globalization. This common identity and concern are the foundation for the participants' willingness to engage in this conversation about the "big question," thus making it possible to produce this diverse but related set of ideas on common concerns.

The category of historical approaches and historiography include contributions from Lynn Botelho, Scott Moore, Erin Conlin and Tamara Whited, who respectively introduce the latest developments in the fields of old age studies, digital history, oral history and environmental history. Old age studies, as a field of academic study, has not existed for long even in the West and can be safely called as a brand new field in China. Botelho's discussion of "old age" as an analytic conception and its potential usefulness for cross-disciplinary studies will surely serve as a welcome inspiration for Chinese scholars. Digital history, as a fledging field of history in China, has been developing rapidly since the 22nd International Congress of Historical Sciences, which was held in Jinan, China, but Moore's approach to the subject is rather unique. In addition to a narrative of how the field originated and evolved in American academy, he offers a substantive discussion of how the scholarship of the new field should be "legitimately" handled by the current systems of faculty evaluation. In her article on oral history, Conlin includes a discussion of the history of Chinese oral history tradition to demonstrate that the field is not

exclusively a product of Western scholarship. Whited's penetrating critique of Joachim Radkau's influential *Nature and Power* outlines the vast potentials of the field of environmental history, both vertically and horizontally.

Of the six pieces devoted to historiographical changes in various fields, the articles by Han Lin and Soo Chun Lu respectively cover the post-1980s development in two fields – the Chinese study of the history of American policy-making regarding immigration and Cold War studies in the United States. Both highlight the changes in research methodology and perspective, including research foci shifting from grand topics to more concrete issues (Han) or from political and domestic factors to cultural and international factors (Lu). Like Conlin, Lu also discusses Chinese scholars' contributions to American Cold War studies, furthermore the works she lists as successful examples of cultural analysis and transnational history should be very helpful to Chinese scholars in the field. Alan Baumler and Wayne Bodle discuss the historiography of two seemingly unrelated fields—the history of modern China and that of the American Revolution—but their essays share a similar structure, that is, a concise narrative of the evolution of the field preceding the discussion of the field's recent scholarship. Such an arrangement offers a useful context for Chinese readers and enables them to appreciate the intellectual richness of their discussions. Instead of giving a sweeping synthesis, Baumler carefully selects three representative monographs for his discussion, demonstrating how American China specialists have adopted new perspectives—looking at professional elites, public opinion, and the social networks of non-governmental organizations—to study the history of Republican China. Bodle, on the other hand, makes use of his own current research to suggest that two new approaches—regional history and the new military history—can be used to challenge some of the conclusions commonly taken for granted in the conventional histories of the American Revolution. Both authors express strong skepticism about the accuracy and durability of traditional grand-theme-based narratives. In her study of the writings on the Islamic empires of the tenth century, Christine Baker expresses concerns that historians have so heavily relied on historical sources that were created and retained by various dynasties. Here she raises the most fundamental question that confronts both past and present historians—how historians should deal with historical evidence in order to pursue and maintain a legitimate and fair-minded balance in historical research and presentation. Liu Yan's article in this category, strictly speaking, is not a historiographical inquiry but a study of some key concepts of the American Declaration of Independence and the validity of their Chinese translations. His effort to interpret the ideas of the 18th century American

political thinkers alongside ancient Chinese philosophies is a rather creative exercise in comparative history.

Specialized research is characterized by diversity in topics, but all the authors in these category reveal how historians' writing remains driven by contemporary concerns. Through his discussion of the origins of Southeast Asian culture and how it was related to the ancient Han and Hindu civilizations, for example, Cheng Aiqin offers a case study of civilizational interactions and adaptations in ancient times; similarly, in her story focusing on the interactions between the Roman and the Byzantine Empires and the Silk Road trade, Guo Yunyan shows that, even in ancient times, "domestic" politics and social upheavals inevitably disrupted the order of "international" trade relations.

The evolution of modern state seems to be a prominent and shared topic in world history and modernization, as a subject, never loses its perennial appeal. This grand context is shared in the contributions from Zhang Dianqing, Zhang Jiatang, Paul Arpaia, Lian Huixin, and Song Dongliang. Zhang Diaqing studies how the scale and management of English royal manors was transformed under the Tudor monarchs and how this process had led England to evolve from essentially a royal-manor-based fiscal state to a parliamentary-controlled fiscal state; Arpaia examines how the evolution of Italian liberalism was shaped by other contemporaneous developments, including national identity, class division, cultural debates and foreign affairs, and how it ultimately merged with the idea and practice of fascism in the early twentieth century; Lian Huixin, by analyzing the authoritarian elements inherent in the Meiji Constitution, explores the factors that contributed to the failure of party politics in Japan before World War II; Zhang Jiatang outlines the trajectory of Mexican modernization from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century by telling the story of the rise of fall of Porfirio Diaz; and finally, Song Dongliang offers a sweeping review of the historical experience of the modernization of the United States, arguing that the nation's successful modernization lay largely in what he calls the "frontier-pioneering capitalist development model," which relied on spectacular territorial growth, liberal immigration, "pioneer-oriented" culture, and durable political system. From a different but related angle, Joseph Mannard looks at the process of American modernization by studying the rapid growth of Catholic convents during the antebellum period and proliferation of educational and social services that such growth had created. In this highly original piece, Mannard, for the first time, articulates the concept of a "convent revolution," which, in his view, was a movement comparable to the other 19th century women's organized charity and benevolence societies. Andrew Hazelton's study of

the transnational labor organization between Mexico and the United States in the 1950s is groundbreaking in several ways: it provides an effective example for Soo Chun Lu's synthesis of transnational history; it represents renewed efforts to study the history of labor, immigration and agricultural capitalism, and, finally, it offers some critical historical details that challenge Song Dongliang's "frontier-pioneering capitalist development model."

Among the papers on the teaching of history, Sun Yanping discusses the challenges she has encountered when teaching *Ancient World History* and makes a number of suggestions to improve pedagogy, including integrating and revising the textbooks, making use of modern information, exploring new instructional methods, incorporating museum visits, and adopting bilingual instruction. Caleb Finegan shares his experience of taking students on a 500-mile trek along the Camino de Santiago (pilgrim trail) across Northern Spain, demonstrating the use of what he calls "experiential learning" in his course on medieval religious history. In an international case study of historical research and teaching, Sharon Franklin-Rahkonen examines the educational system of Finland and its evolution, with a focus on how the Finnish middle-school history curriculum and middle-school teachers' training have contributed to the educational success of this northern European nation. Wang Xi, in his study of the evolution of American history research and teaching in the People's Republic of China from 1949 to 2009, examines the relationship between international and domestic politics and the study of "foreign histories" and the role played by historians in producing and diffusing historical knowledge.

Have these articles answered the question of how to do history in the global age? We are not sure. What we can be sure, however, is that the articles have jointly inspired us to think beyond the limits of our individual research topics and have brought us important revelations in at least three aspects. First, in terms of research perspective, although historical research based on the traditional boundaries of nation-states continue to dominate much of the profession, new research themes are on the rise, signaling historians' strong desires for rediscovering the histories that have been overshadowed or ignored by nation-state-based histories. This transnational turn is in fact vital to understanding national history. Such perspectives are not only used in the studies of old age, women, the environment, immigration, international trade and ancient civilizational exchange, but is also adopted by those who do more traditional histories, including political history, economic history, diplomatic history, military history, intellectual history and labor history. Second, in terms of approaches, we notice that "cross-pollination" has increasingly become a common practice for historians. The term "cross-pollination" is used by

Professor Soo Chun Lu in her discussion of the trends of Cold War studies and may be literally understood as a method of cross-disciplinary research or merging research methods from different disciplines into one. But in our understanding, “cross-pollination” means much more. Its meaning is not confined to borrowing research methods or interpretative models from other disciplines. It does not advocate a mechanical transplantation of research methodology. It does not deny that history as an academic discipline has its own form of practice. Philosophically, “cross-pollination” has a higher expectation—it equips historians with a way of envisioning history; it encourages historians to cast off the old methods of producing knowledge that rely on a single disciplinary method, a single language or type of text (including oral and written sources), or single way of organizing knowledge. Historians must now *do* history and *break new grounds* with a more open-ended mindset and vision. The third revelation comes from the area of research instruments and skills. With the advance of digital technologies, revolutionary changes have already occurred in the collection, organization, preservation and presentation of historical sources. The speed with which the changes occurred went far beyond our expectations. Such changes directly affect our current and future research and will inevitably shape history as an academic discipline. We feel it urgent for historians not only to familiarize themselves with and ultimately master digitized historical sources but also to take part in the process of constructing them. The old Chinese saying—“In order to do a good work, one must first sharpen his tools”—remains applicable even in the age of globalization. Research skills for using digitized information cannot be neglected in training the coming generations of historians.

We also believe that the volume is valuable in two other respects. First, it is a historical testimony to a special cooperation between Chinese and American academics. Sino-American academic exchange has come a long way and taken many different forms, but it has been rather rare to have a scholarly collaboration of historians issuing from two departments. This might well be the first and only volume of its kind and therefore is especially significant. Second, the book is an attempt to break disciplinary barriers among historians. Specialization in historical studies has prevented historians from learning from each other. Even among colleagues from the same department or institution, historians seldom have the opportunity to sit down to have a conversation on mutually interesting academic questions, much less write a book together. We intend to show that it is quite possible for historians with different training and backgrounds to sit together to learn and appreciate one another’s work. In other words, the book represents an effort to put into practice

what we have imagined about how historians should be working in the global age.

In the process of preparing the conference and the volume, we have received encouragement and full support from HBU and IUP. The agreement signed by both universities provided a solid foundation for the collaborations of two history departments. The History College at HBU and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences at IUP provided special grants to respectively cover the cost of conferences and publication. A number of individuals from HBU deserve our special thanks for their firm and warm support for the project, including Professors Yang Xuexin (Vice President of HBU), Wang Fengmin (former Vice President of HBU), Feng Jun (former head of Office of Human Resources at HBU), Guo Xianting (former director of Office of International Exchange at HBU), and the leadership group of History College at HBU. We also want to thank Dr. Yaw Asamoah (Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences at IUP), Professor Scott Moore (Chairperson of the History Department at IUP), and Professor Alan Baumler (Director of the Asian Studies Program at IUP) for their unwavering support. Professor Zhang Dianqing of HBU has made painstaking efforts to ensure the success of the conference and book. Four IUP faculty members, including Soo Chun Lu, Alan Baumler, Pang Jin and Lynn Botelho read all or part of the translated texts and made timely and important corrections. Soo Chun Lu and Tamara Whited also made valuable suggestions to improve the English titles and text. Professor Sun Yanping of HBU helped with revising the manuscript and proofreading. Zhang Dapeng of Peking University devoted considerable time to proofreading the entire manuscript. Dr. Xie Mingguang generously lent his expertise to help us read and edit the translated text of Paul Arpaia's article. Ms. Denise Gryczuk of the History Department at IUP provided effective administrative support throughout the process. We wholeheartedly thank everyone as mentioned above for their generous assistance and support.

Last but not the least, we want to thank all of the contributors for sharing their scholarship at the conference and within the volume. We sincerely hope that readers will benefit from their writings and will, as the result of reading, join us in thinking of the big questions of how we should do history—and do it better—in the age of globalization.

Editors

July 31, 2016