

International History

Academic year 2019-2020

Global Cities in History

HI112 - Spring - 6 ECTS

Tuesdays 10.15–12 / S1

Course Description

Cities have long been regarded, in Lewis Mumford's words of 1938, as "a point of maximum concentration for the power and culture of a community." But they served not only as centers of regional or national communities but also as nodal points of long-distance connections. Looking at urban areas through the lens of global history, the seminar will explore the role played by cities in a world connecting and ask in how far the development of cityscapes was affected and shaped by conditions of global connectedness. The seminar focuses on selected case studies since the nineteenth century. We also explore the effects of asymmetrical power relations that produced segmented, unequal, and unmixed cityscapes. In sum, the seminar aims at furnishing historical tools for a better understanding of the intersections between globalization and urbanization.

> PROFESSOR

Michael Goebel
michael.goebel@graduateinstitute.ch

Office hours

Tuesdays 14:00–16:00

> ASSISTANT

Daniel Dossou
ayode.dossou@graduateinstitute.ch

Office hours

Wednesdays 16:15 – 18:00

Syllabus

Course Requirements

1. Term Paper: 50% of final grade; 4,000 words; deadline June 14, 2020 (by email to professor and TA)

Term papers of 4,000 words (including the footnotes, but excluding the bibliography) should deal with a clearly circumscribed historical topic and address a viable research question. Topic and question should be related to urban history, be developed by the student, and discussed in advance with the instructor. For this purpose, students must submit (by email, to professor and TA) a 300-word abstract by April 3, which states the title, topic, question, and structure of the future paper. This serves as a basis for discussion in the office hour. Once you submitted your abstract please make an appointment here:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ECmV28YZOkGQrTE6_UVThlx8BmjLw2MfYvmGhN6Tzq4/edit#gid=0

For general reference of how to write term papers, please read the guidelines (available on Moodle) carefully. One session will be devoted to academic writing. When in doubt you can also refer to this online guide for writing academic research papers: <https://writing.wisc.edu/Handbook/index.html>

2. Book Presentation and Review: 20% of final grade; 800–1,000 words; deadline Friday noon before class presentation.

From the week-by-week list below you must choose one book to present in class and write a review of it. Book reviews are standalone pieces of 800–1,000 words, which should summarize the book's content (ideally not on a chapter-by-chapter basis, but as a whole), approach, and main arguments in relation to the wider historiography of the relevant topic. They should also contain explicit praise and/or criticism. For reference, please read through the book reviews of the *American Historical Review* as well as prior reviews of the book that you pick. **The reviews must be submitted to all course participants by Friday noon before your presentation of the book.** Feedback on the written reviews will be provided in the office hour (ideally together with discussing your abstract, if possible).

The book presentation in class should be concise (7 minutes as an absolute maximum) and refrain from summarizing the book's content once more, which through your written review will be known to all course participants before your presentation. Rather, it should relate the book's arguments to the general required reading of the session in which you present the book. Does it support or complement the arguments made in the required reading? In what way? Does it shed a different light on them or contradict them? Your presentation should thus serve as an opener of the discussion rather than as a standalone review.

3. Class Participation: 30% of final grade

Just like an orchestra, a history seminar is only as good as the individual effort of all its participants. Please come to every class equipped with a thorough reading of the assigned texts, prepared answers to the questions that you find below for each session, as well as questions of your own. Make yourself heard in class and we will all benefit as a group.

Course Structure

The course begins with three sessions in which we query the relationship between the social-science literature on “global cities” or “world cities” and urban history: Can urban scholars learn anything from history? Must they? The main middle block of the seminar deals with cities around the world in nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the histories of which we approach through the lens of their relationship with globalization. In particular, we will discuss how close the link between industrialization and urbanization was in this period, comparing the urban history of Europe to that of other world regions. Colonialism and semi-colonialism (on the basis of the example of Shanghai) will be discussed as an alternative driver of urban growth and transformation. Three sessions deal with the question of how global forces, such as colonialism and migration, impacted on ethnicity in urban space, through the prisms of “cosmopolitanism” and “segregation.” The final session concerns the potential gains of the comparative method for urban history and seeks to take up the various themes of the seminar as a whole.

1. February 18: Introduction

Who are we? Distribution of presentations.

Methods and Techniques:

How to prepare and deliver a good presentation. The 5–7-minute rule, brevity, and precision.

2. February 25: Global Cities. Theoretical Inroads

Topic/Question:

As social scientists and the public at large increasingly debated “globalization” in the 1990s, talk of “global cities” surged too, associated especially with a book by Saskia Sassen, which concentrated on the importance of global finance in particular. In this session we deal with three main questions: a) What are the essential ingredients of the concept of the “global city”? b) To what extent can the “global city” be historicized? c) What does the concept have to do with the history of urban history, and particularly with differences in how Europeans have thought and written about cities compared to North Americans?

Required Reading:

Diane E. Davis, “Cities in Global Context: A Brief Intellectual History,” *International Journal of Regional and Urban Research* 29, no. 1 (2005): 92–109.

Saskia Sassen, “The Global City: Introducing a Concept,” *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 11, no. 2 (2005): 27–43.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Saskia Sassen, *Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton, 1991).

3. March 3: What is Urban History and Why Have It?

Topic/Question:

As a discrete disciplinary subfield, urban history grew alongside social history in the 1960s. But thinking and writing about cities, with their distinctive degree of social differentiation, has had a longer trajectory among sociologists, whose discipline arguably was midwived in part by urban growth itself. In this session, we will familiarize ourselves with some classic writings about urbanism, by both historians and sociologists. What do they think is distinctive of cities? And what is distinctive of urban history according to their accounts? Though barely raised as a separate topic in these writings, we should also discuss to what extent their approach to cities can be seen as historically specific to European high modernity.

Required Reading:

Georg Simmel, “The Metropolis and the Mental Life,” in *On Individuality and Social Forms: Selected Writings*, ed. Donald Nathan Levine (Chicago, 1971), 324–39.

Louis Wirth, “Urbanism as a Way of Life,” *American Journal of Sociology* 44, 1 (1938), 1–24.

Shane Ewen, *What is Urban History?* (Cambridge, 2014), 1–9.

Charles Tilly, “What Good is Urban History?” *Journal of Urban History* 22, no. 6 (1996): 702–729

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Peter Hall, *Cities in Civilization: Culture, Innovation, and Urban Order* (London, 1999).

Lewis Mumford, *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects* (New York 1961).

4. March 10: Global Cities and History

Topic/Question:

Historians—in this session represented by Pierre-Yves Saunier—often lament that not enough people listen to them. This complaint is especially pertinent in relation to the social scientists who have dominated debate about

“global cities,” who have been charged with being overly present-minded. But why should they know more about history? Does urban history have any added value for their writings? How would their accounts change if they read more history?

Required Reading:

Janet Abu-Lughod, *New York, Chicago, Los Angeles: America's Global Cities* (Minneapolis, 1999), 1–16.

Neil Brenner, “World City Theory, Globalization and the Comparative Historical Method,” *Urban Affairs Review* 36, no. 6 (2001): 124–147.

Pierre-Yves Saunier, “Introduction: Global City Take 2: A View from Urban History,” in *Another Global City: Historical Explorations into the Transnational Municipal Moment, 1850–2000*, ed. Pierre-Yves Saunier and Shane Ewen (New York, 2008), 1–18.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Sven Beckert, *The Monied Metropolis: New York City and the Consolidation of the American Bourgeoisie, 1850–1896* (Cambridge, 2001).

5. March 17: Industrialization, Globalization, and Cities in the 19th Century (A)

Topic/Question:

In much of the older European and North American literature about urban history, urbanization and industrialization had been seen as two inextricable parts of a master process that was often given the shorthand “modernization.” In this session and the next, we will query this connection: this week with a specific focus on the comparison between Europe and China, which through Kenneth Pomeranz’s work has played a large role in the global economic history produced during the last twenty years. To what extent does the intrinsic linkage between urbanization and industrialization hold up when we include China?

Required Reading:

C.A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1914* (Malden, Mass., 2004), 170–198.

Ho-Fung Hung and Shaohua Zhan, “Industrialization and the City: East and West,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Cities in World History*, ed. Peter Clark (Oxford, 2013), 645–663.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Harold Platt, *Shock Cities: The Environmental Transformation and Reform of Manchester and Chicago* (Chicago, 2005).

Kenneth Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy* (Princeton, 2001).

6. March 24: Industrialization, Globalization, and Cities in the 19th Century (B)

Topic/Question:

This session follows on directly from the previous one and essentially pursues the same question, but from a more global angle. Jan de Vries’s review of Osterhammel’s book, perhaps in conjunction with de Vries’s book on

urbanization, will serve as a particularly clear example of asserting the link between cities and industry. More broadly, we will inquire about the role of Eurocentrism in urban history in this class.

Required Reading:

Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton, 2014), 241–321.

Jan de Vries, “The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century. By Osterhammel, Jürgen. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014,” *The Journal of Economic History* 76, no. 1 (2016): 226–229.

Joseph Ben Prestel, “Paris Everywhere? The Challenge of Eurocentrism in Global Urban History,” *Global Urban History Blog*, April 5, 2016: <https://globalurbanhistory.com/2016/04/05/paris-everywhere-the-challenge-of-eurocentrism-in-global-urban-history/> (accessed July 24, 2018).

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Friedrich Lenger, *European Cities in the Modern Era, 1850–1914* (Leiden, 2012).

Jan de Vries, *European Urbanization, 1500–1800* (Cambridge, Mass., 1984).

7. TBS: How to Write a Good Term Paper

Please read carefully the guidelines and come prepared to discuss specific matters that in your eyes arise from these guidelines.

8. April 7: Global Cities and Colonialism

Topic/Question:

An obvious alternative to industrialization as a driving force of city growth would be colonialism, to which this session will be devoted. The issue concerns both cities that were colonial foundations, such as Singapore, and cities that significantly changed as a result of it, which of course is true also of London. Apart from asking quite how crucial colonialism was in the long-term making of global cities, we will therefore also discuss whether “colonial cities” are a useful analytical category in urban history.

Required Reading:

Anthony D. King, *Global Cities: Post-Imperialism and the Internationalization of London* (London and New York, 1990), 3–68.

Thomas R. Metcalf, “Colonial Cities,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Cities in World History*, ed. Peter Clark (Oxford, 2013), 753–769.

Source (also required reading):

Jackson Plan, Singapore, 1822.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Anindita Ghosh, *Claiming the City: Protest, Crime, and Scandals in Colonial Calcutta, ca. 1860–1920* (Oxford, 2016).

John Curtis Perry, *Singapore: Unlikely Power* (Oxford, 2017).

9. April 21: Trade and Treaties: The Case of Shanghai

Topic/Question:

Dealing with treaty-port Shanghai, this session concerns a city that was not formally colonial, but had many elements of colonialism. Our class can thus be taken as a further element in discussing the usefulness and the boundaries of the category of “colonial cities” in global history. Yet, diving deeper into the specificities of a case study will allow us to tease out more tangibly how imperialism, international relations, and trade intersected in the making of a global city. At the same time, the session can be taken as an opener to the subsequent classes about cosmopolitanism and segregation.

Required Reading:

Kristin Stapleton, “In Search of Frameworks for Productive Comparison of Cities in World History,” *Journal of Modern Chinese History* 10, no. 2 (2016): 230–247.

Marie-Claire Bergère, *Shanghai: China’s Gateway to Modernity* (Stanford, 2009), 50–83.

Jeffrey Wasserstrom, *Global Shanghai: A History in Fragments, 1850–2010* (New York, 2009), 34–47.

Sources (also required reading):

“Rules of 1869, Mixed Courts at Shanghai,” in *American Consular Jurisdiction in the Orient*, ed. Frank E. Hinckley (Washington, DC, 1906), 245–247.

Two maps of Shanghai, 1875 and 1918.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Isabella Jackson, *Shaping Modern Shanghai: Colonialism in China’s Global City* (Cambridge, 2017).

Robert Bickers, *Britain in China: Community, Culture and Colonialism, 1900–1949* (Manchester, 1999).

Methods and Techniques: Finding and dealing with primary sources

10. April 28: Cosmopolitanism and Urbanism

Topic/Question:

As will become from reading chapters of the books by Lewis and Zandi-Sayek, there has been a paradigm change in the historiography of empires and cities in recent decades: Whereas earlier scholarship highlighted ethnic (or communal) divisions in ports like Singapore, Yangon, Izmir, or Alexandria, historians have more recently highlighted the fluidity of boundaries as well as cross-ethnic exchange within their urban spaces. Will Hanley, by contrast, objects to the celebration of past cosmopolitanism. Which approach do we find more convincing, also in the light of a contemporary description of Izmir (Smyrna)?

Required Reading:

Su Lin Lewis, *Cities in Motion: Urban Life and Cosmopolitanism in Southeast Asia, 1920–1940* (Cambridge, 2016), 47–94.

Sibel Zandi-Sayek, *Ottoman Izmir: The Rise of a Cosmopolitan Port, 1840–1880* (Minneapolis, 2012), 1–46.

Will Hanley, “Grieving Cosmopolitanism in Middle East Studies,” *History Compass* 6, no. 5 (2008): 1346–1367.

Sources (also required)

Démétrius Georgiadès, *Smyrne et l'Asie mineure au point de vue économique et commercial* (Paris, 1885), 93–96.

A map of Izmir, 1885.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Will Hanley, *Identifying with Nationality: Europeans, Ottomans, and Egyptians in Alexandria* (New York, 2017).

11. May 5: Segregation

Topic/Question:

As the book presentation(s) will make clear, racial segregation reached endemic proportions in mid-twentieth-century American cities and therefore concerned generations of scholars. But how specifically American a story is this? And what caused such segregation? Can there be “good segregation,” as geographer Ceri Peach provocatively states? Through the main reading by Carl Nightingale we will pursue these and related questions and situate his arguments within the preceding and the following session.

Required Reading:

Carl H. Nightingale, *Segregation: A Global History of Divided Cities* (Chicago, 2012), 1–16 and 159–192.

Ceri Peach, “Good Segregation, Bad Segregation,” *Planning Perspectives* 11 (1996): 379–398.

Source (also required):

S.R. Christophers and J. W.W. Stephens, “The Segregation of Europeans,” in *Further Reports to the Malaria Committee of the Royal Society* (London, 1900), 17–19.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Tom Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (Princeton, 2014 [originally 1996]).

Douglas Massey and Nancy A. Denton, *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993).

Richard Rothstein, *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America* (New York, 2017).

12. May 12: Migration and Residential Patterns: The Case of Buenos Aires

Topic/Question:

Though more neutrally entitled “residential patterns,” this session pursues much the same question as the previous one, with a focus on late-nineteenth-century Buenos Aires. Both by Moya and other authors (such as Baily, below), Buenos Aires is usually seen as an immigrant metropolis in which there was rather little clear-cut segregation. Why is this? We should also try to compare Moya’s *approach* to Nightingale’s and consider the implications of different ways of dealing with the topic of segregation.

Required Reading:

José C. Moya, *Cousins and Strangers: Spanish Immigrants in Buenos Aires, 1850–1930* (Berkeley, 1998), 123–204.

Sources (also required)

Three maps of Buenos Aires: 1859, 1892, and 1928.

A manuscript census sheet of Buenos Aires's parish census, 1855.

Extract from published results of the Argentina census of 1914 (vol. 2/2).

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Samuel L. Baily, *Immigrants in the Lands of Promise: Italians in Buenos Aires and New York City, 1870–1914* (Ithaca, NY, 1999).

Benjamin Bryce, *To Belong in Buenos Aires: Germans, Argentines, and the Rise of a Pluralist Society* (Stanford, 2018).

13. May 19: Urban History, Transnationalism, and Comparison

Topic/Question:

This session wraps up the main themes of the seminar, with a specific view to the terms “transnationalism” and “comparison.” What are their implications and how do they relate to one another? Does urban history really benefit from, or need, a transnational turn as well as comparison, as these authors uniformly argue?

Required Reading:

Nicolas Kenny and Rebecca Madgin, “‘Every Time I Describe a City’: Urban History as Comparative and Transnational Practice,” in their (eds.) *Cities Beyond Borders: Comparative and Transnational Approaches to Urban History* (London and New York, 2015), 3–23.

Jennifer Robinson, “Cities in a World of Cities: The Comparative Gesture,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35, no. 1 (2011): 1–23.

Andrew Sandoval-Strausz and Nancy Kwak, “Why Transnationalize Urban History?” in *Making Cities Global: The Transnational Turn in Urban History*, ed. Sandoval-Strausz and Kwak (Philadelphia, 2018) 1–12.

Possible Presentations / Reviews:

Doug Sanders, *Arrival City: How the Largest Migration in History is Reshaping Our World* (London, 2011).

14. May 26: To be planned