

## World Histor(iograph)y Education and Research from an Australian Angle<sup>1</sup>

Over the past decade, there has been a dramatic shift towards the provision of global and world history programs in secondary schools and universities across the globe. The example of the United States stands out, with recent estimates suggesting that over 65% of tertiary and high school students now undertake some form of study in world history.<sup>2</sup> Anecdotal evidence points as well to the steady growth of postgraduate coursework offerings in continental Europe, China and Japan. World history research appears to be flourishing, as seen in the emergence of journals (eg *The Journal of World History*, 1990–, *World History Connected*, 2003–, and *The Journal of Global History* 2006–), publications lists, professional organizations, electronic discussion forums, postgraduate research training programs and historiographical surveys such as *Writing World History 1800–2000*, *Navigating World History* (2003), *Palgrave Advances in World Histories* (2005) and *Globalisierung und Globalgeschichte* (2005).<sup>3</sup> Yet as Patrick Manning has noted, internationalisation remains a key priority. Daniel Headrick has raised the same issue with the provocative question: is the world history movement ‘unwittingly, part of the same Anglo-American conspiracy to “globalise” the planet that has given us Coca-Cola, rock-and-roll, and the internet’?<sup>4</sup>

- 
- 1 An earlier version of this paper was presented at the World History Education conference sponsored by the German Historical Institute in Washington DC in March 2005. I would like to thank the Institute, the organisers Eckhardt Fuchs, Benedikt Stuchtey and Christof Mauch and the scholars present for their support and comments.
  - 2 A. Lintvedt, *The Demography of World History in the United States*, in: *World History Connected*, 2003, vol. 1(1), online at <http://www.whc.uiup.edu>.
  - 3 B. Stuchtey/E. Fuchs (eds), *Writing World History 1800–2000*, Oxford 2003; P. Manning, *Navigating World History: Historians Create a Global Past*, Basingstoke 2003; M. Hughes-Warrington (ed.), *Palgrave Advances in World Histories*, Basingstoke 2005; and M. Grandner/D. Rothermund/W. Schwentker (eds), *Globalisierung und Globalgeschichte*, Wien 2005.
  - 4 P. Manning, *Navigating World History*, p. 19; and D. Headrick, *Review of The New World History Reader*, *The Journal of World History*, 2002, vol. 13(1), p. 186.

The recent growth of the field of world history, and questions raised about its cultural inclusiveness, serve as the mainspring for this paper. It is evident that Anglo-American scholars have made prominent contributions to world history research and teaching. It could be argued, though, that the perception of their efforts as dominant is symptomatic of the limited view that world historians have of the history and historiography of their field. With a wider historical understanding, Anglo-American writings may be seen anew as particular instances that jostle with many intersecting and even competing ways of viewing the world. It is with this limited view that we begin our analysis of world history education and research, an analysis that takes us via a discussion on the form of world history to the conclusion that recognising the embeddedness of historiography in world history – world histor(io-graph)y – is the key to a wider view.

### Content without Form?

World history education and research appear to be flourishing, but much work remains to be done to address their treatment as marginal sub-fields in historical studies. It is not possible in the space of this paper to illuminate, challenge and re-articulate all of the historiographical assumptions that explain the marginalisation of world history, but there is one that stands out as formative. This is the perception of world history as a field of content without form. In relation to world history education, this view is to be found in various global contexts, but is typified in a recent report on trends in university education by the Australian Historical Association. Within Australia, New South Wales is the only state or territory that maintains a national rather than a global historical curriculum at secondary level, and just over half of universities offer a world history course to first year students.<sup>5</sup> Not all university educators, though, see this as a positive development. In their view, the rise of world history courses confirms the decline of student exposure to the study of history in secondary school, increased provision for ‘generalist, non major’ students and the ‘relentless downsizing’ of history departments. As the authors of the report, Carly Miller and Mark Peel have argued:

If many students have been exposed to little, if any, history before attending university, the response of history programs is to attempt to provide that introduction, and a sampling of the rich possibilities of

---

5 C. Miller/M. Peel, *Canons Old and New? The Undergraduate History Curriculum in 2004*, in: *History Australia*, 2004, vol. 2(1), pp. 14-16.

history, in the first year and to a range of students, a good number of whom will not pursue history much further. For those who do, the common expectation is of a corresponding shift in the curriculum: from accounts of the sweep of national or global change to more specialised thematic subjects.<sup>6</sup>

Underpinning this view is the idea of world history as a thoroughfare – one that compensates for educational poverty and that prepares students for more specialised studies – or as a one-stop destination for students with majors other than history. The same report confirms the growth of upper level undergraduate programs in world history, which tend to be organised on thematic lines (eg studies of migration, or war, or biological and cultural exchange). There is a perception, though, of these being overshadowed by the ever-present first year survey that ‘sweeps’, surveying change on a large scale in a way that cannot satisfy educators, researchers and upper level students.

As currently conceived, the world history survey addresses those with a limited historical knowledge in a fashion that is itself historiographically limited. In the ‘sweep’ of the survey, details are omitted, events are telescoped and the uncertainties or ‘perhapses’ that historians use when evidence is lacking, inconclusive or contradictory are pushed aside in the rush to master the textbook. The past becomes a warehouse that is plundered for test questions, and history making is collapsed into the activity of ‘getting through the content’. This stereotype of the world history survey as content mastery is problematic for at least two reasons. First, it rests on the untested assumption that world history is outside of the optimal spatial and temporal scales for studying and making history. John Gaddis and David Christian have unpacked and rebutted this assumption by likening histories to maps. Maps are conventionally on smaller scales than the phenomena they represent; maps on the same scale as the phenomena they represent are not very helpful, because to find a feature, we would have to walk as far on the map as we would in the world.<sup>7</sup> Achieving such compression involves selection and thus the omission of particular details. But maps are also available on more than one scale, and maps of different scales serve different purposes. A map of a street, for example, includes different information to that of a map showing a country, or the world. Histories, like maps, can similarly be on different scales; they may be or more or less detailed and can serve

---

6 Ibid., p. 16.

7 J. L. Gaddis, *The Landscape of History: How Historians Map the Past*, Oxford 2002, p. 32; and D. Christian, *Scales*, in M. Hughes-Warrington (ed.), *Palgrave Advances in World Histories*, pp. 64–89.

different purposes. The scales of histories are those of space and time: a work may range over universal, global or local issues and consider events that took place in an hour or over 13.7 billion years. For example, the field of world history takes in both Mark Kurlansky's analysis of events in 1968 and Christian's account of changes from the origins of the universe.<sup>8</sup> Scholars may also shift scales within works, moving from the analysis of an individual's actions through to global phenomena. In practice such shifts are unusual, and certain scales have been favoured over others, namely, the analysis of an individual or a community in a single or small number of cultural contexts. While these kinds of histories may highlight important issues and ideas, others remain obscured from view. When we step back and consider changes over hundreds of thousands of years, for instance, the dramatic and unprecedented nature of human population growth in the last two hundred years becomes apparent. World histories written on larger scales need not replace the scales of history writing that researchers and educators are more accustomed to, rather, they offer a complementary view.

Second, it is mistaken to assume that the large spatial and temporal scales implied in world history surveys come at the expense of historiographical form. Compare any two survey texts or curricula and it will be evident that even 'sweeps' have different narrative structures or 'shapes'. As I have argued elsewhere, the many and varied shapes of world histories may be credited to decisions by writers, publishers and audiences.<sup>9</sup> The past is not packaged for interpretation and telling. There is no necessary or absolute beginning, end or size to any event that happened in the past. Nor is there anyone necessary or absolute way of analysing it or presenting it. A world history need not imply a chronological ordering of events, for example, as Sima Qian's *Shiji* attests. Even within chronologically arranged texts or curricula, some phenomena are emphasised over others, and variations in emphasis give shape to the narrative. If a world historian emphasises the emergence of agriculture, for instance, it might be seen as shaping or even determining everything that follows. If, on the other hand, an historian emphasises Western industrialisation, the preceding events might be presented in such a way as to suggest that they lead to it. Emphasis might be apparent from the amount of space given to the discussion of an event or phenomenon or the favouring of particular kinds of themes or evidence, as with, for

8 M. Kurlansky, 1968: *The Year that Rocked the World*, New York 2005; and D. Christian, *Maps of Time: An Introduction to Big History*, Berkeley 2004.

9 M. Hughes-Warrington, *Shapes*, in *Palgrave Advances in World Histories*, pp. 112-134.

instance the disproportionate space given to the discussion of post-eighteenth century economic developments in many world histories today. Histories, Hayden White writes, are as much about the relationships between events and phenomena as they are the events and phenomena themselves.<sup>10</sup> World history survey texts and curricula are thus far from formless, and their forms are worthy of study for reasons I will sketch out below. Before attending to that, though, I would like to shift our attention to world history research.

When we think of world history research, as Pat Manning notes, it is hard to call to mind any particular methods or materials that help to distinguish it from other fields.<sup>11</sup> Indeed the range of works covered in his *Navigating World History* is so wide that it is difficult to detect where the territory of world history begins and other approaches to historical research (eg. transnational, imperial, regional and diasporic) end. Why is the concept of 'history' commonly conjoined with qualifiers such as 'world' or 'European'? Is it because, like Paul Hirst and Michael Oakeshott, we believe that knowledge can be divided into a number of discrete fields on the grounds of characteristic concepts and relations of concepts (logical structure), truth tests and particular skills and techniques?<sup>12</sup> Or is it, as R. G. Collingwood would have it, that each of the fields of history is related to the others as a greater or lesser instantiation of the concept?<sup>13</sup> We might find in Collingwood's view justification for the belief in a hierarchy between national and world history. But are there fields of history? On this question, Jacques Derrida's writings on metaphysics are helpful. The language of fields implies that the 'historical' activities we engage in are instantiations of, are united by, and can be traced back to something called 'history'.<sup>14</sup> What Derrida seeks to question, however, is whether any mode of representation refers to some real meaning external to language, whether it be a transcendental truth or human subjectivity. At best, texts bear the traces of and constantly refer to other texts in a parodic circle. Thus national histories are as

---

10 Ibid., p. 94. For a range of views on periodization in world history, see R. E. Dunn (ed.), *The New World History: A Teacher's Companion*, New York 2000.

11 P. Manning, *Methods and Materials*, in: *Palgrave Advances in World Histories*, pp. 44-63.

12 P. H. Hirst, *The Forms of Knowledge Re-visited*, Knowledge and the Curriculum, London 1974, p. 84; and M. Oakeshott, *Experience and its Modes*, Cambridge 1933.

13 R. G. Collingwood, *Speculum Mentis*, Oxford 1924.

14 J. Derrida, *Limited Inc.*, ed. G. Graff, trans. S. Weber, Evanston 1998, p. 236.

much 'a textual labyrinth panelled with mirrors' as are world histories.<sup>15</sup> Neither are *forms* of truth telling, but are practices that might be described as language games. Building on this argument, I believe that there is no 'history' apart from historical practices, and thus no world history apart from world histories. Nor, in consequence, is there any logical, universal or unchanging reason to talk of one practice as 'more historical' than another. When we dismiss world history research as lacking distinct methods or materials, or as a derivative amalgam of smaller approaches and dependent on the historiographical presuppositions and methodologies of them, we position particular assumptions and practices as a solid and desirable foundation for history. If we value some historical practices over others, let us be clear, it is because of historical decisions. And because our views on what history is are themselves historical, they are subject to re-evaluation and change.

### World Histo(riograph)y

History, researchers and educators around the world have argued with more and more force, cannot be understood without an appreciation of different historical practices. Students are to be inducted to the practice of history or as David Sylvester puts it, "'to do" history, not merely receive it'.<sup>16</sup> The impact of this historiographical turn, however, is undercut in many places by the unquestioned alignment of historiography simply with debate.<sup>17</sup> Historiography, many students and scholars believe, belongs to the various 'history wars', to the *Historikerstreit*, to Irish revisionism, and so on. Conversely, many historians and educators are reluctant to acknowledge the value of examinations of uncontested historical practices. To their view, attention to historiography retards or even prevents historical research. This view of historiography is mistaken because it presumes that it is ancillary to historical practices and can be disentangled from them. Historiography is embedded in world historical practices, hence my use of the term 'world histor(iograph)y'. Every historical practice establishes or affirms assumptions that define, refine, contract or extend our understanding of 'history'. Some assumptions are subject to great historical and cultural variation, while others are supported so often and for so long that they appear to be universal

15 Ibid., p. 195. See also id., *Of Grammatology*, trans. C. Spivak, Baltimore 1976, pp. 14, 43.

16 D. Sylvester, *Change and Continuity in History Teaching 1900–93*, in: H. Bourdillon (ed.), *Teaching History*, London 1994, p. 16.

17 See the NSW Board of Studies HSC History Extension syllabus at <http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au>.

and permanent. Some are openly debated, while others are so deeply held that they cannot be clearly enunciated. Regardless, as I suggested above, all historiographical assumptions are subject to change and open to question.

The explicit, critical consideration of historiographical assumptions is no easy matter, and historians and history students may struggle to bring into focus what they so often take for granted. But the illumination and analysis of historiographical assumptions is worth undertaking for at least three reasons. First, historical practices are infused by decisions or affirmations of what world history ought to be. Selections, methods, representations, definitions and labels support or establish patterns of relations among various peoples – past and present – animals and our geophysical environment. Put simply, historians privilege and they exclude. Historiographical reflection is valuable because it can bring patterns of privilege and exclusion to light, and may encourage historians and history students to augment or even rearticulate their practices and goals. Second, historiographical reflection might help to address the questions of those who are unsure as to just what world histories are and what world historians do. Far from a formless thoroughfare, world history promises insights that complement the efforts of other researchers and educators. Third, the historiographical analysis of world histories has broad social significance because world histories inform public culture. In different contexts, world histories function in different ways, such as supporting or promoting visions of community and environment, guiding economic programs, working as a morally acceptable route to literacy or enhancing feelings of social security or disorder. Exploring what is expected of world histories, when, and by whom, may help to cast critical light on contemporary geopolitical discourses such as that on the health and clash of civilisations.<sup>18</sup>

### World Histo(riograph)y from a Macquarie Angle

Although the value of historiography to world history education may be recognised in principle, it might be quite reasonably asked how it may be delivered in practice. How can we work within existing programs and offer new ones? In the final part of this paper, I would like to sketch out how the more explicit recognition of historiography in world history has been used to reinvigorate and expand the undergraduate world history program at Macquarie University in Sydney, Australia. This program

---

18 S. Huntington, *Clash of Civilizations the Remaking of World Order*, New York 1998.

encourages students to see world history as world histories, recognising the decisions of inclusion and exclusion of past and present 'world makers'.

Although it has not yet been systematically documented, even the most cursory glance at library and archival materials suggests that world histories and world history syllabuses are not a recent phenomenon in Australian history. Universal, 'general' and 'cyclopedic' histories circulated in state and private collections in the nineteenth century, and a number of Australian historians such as G. V. Portus, A. G. L. Shaw and Geoffrey Blainey have tried their hand at teaching and writing world history.<sup>19</sup> In 1942, A. H. McDonald even set himself the task of sketching out the features of world history 'from an Australian angle'. To him it was clear that the study of world history ought to be:

Based upon sound local historical research, which provides the evidence for general conclusions; yet local work is stimulated by the broad perspective of world history. Both must go on together, each strengthening the other in its own way, for the common purpose of giving society the knowledge by which it may approach its problems in a national manner.<sup>20</sup>

McDonald's yoking of world history to national goals continues to be echoed in syllabuses and research schemes that require scholars and educators to articulate 'national benefit'. But his call for the recognition of the interplay of the local and the global, and the play of scales that this entails, is only now being realised.

Australia has a national curriculum on paper but not in practice. After being ratified in 1996, the states and territories continued to pursue state-based policies and syllabuses.<sup>21</sup> With the exception of New South Wales (NSW) and the Australian Capital Territory (ACT), primary and high school studies in history are to be found in social studies 'global education' programmes. Ostensibly, world history would seem to fit well in these programs, but practical considerations (eg time constraints and a lack of suitable local resources) and local political aspirations have meant that students are instead offered an amalgam of national and re-

19 G. V. Portus, *The Wanted to Rule the World*, Sydney 1944; A. G. L. Shaw, *Modern World History: Social, Political and Economic Development 1780–1950*, Melbourne 1961; and G. Blainey, *A Short History of the World*, Ringwood 2000.

20 A. H. McDonald, *The Study of World History from the Australian Angle* (28 July 1942), in: *Royal Australian Historical Society Journal and Proceedings*, 1943, vol. 29(1), p. 3.

21 K. Piper, *Riders in the Chariot: Curriculum Reform and the National Interest 1965–95*, Camberwell 1997.



gional histories. In Tasmania, for instance, 'A History of Australia in the Pacific' satisfies the requirements of 'studies of society and environment'. Once we have noted that the official policy of the ACT is that it does not have a formal syllabus that leaves only NSW. NSW is the only state in Australia that identifies history as a discrete subject in high school. Split into ancient and modern strands, the syllabus of this most populous state requires students to study Australian history until they are sixteen. After that point, students are able to complement their studies with an 'extension' syllabus that is focused on historiographical debates. The growing popularity of NSW 'History Extension' has generated the production of a cohort of first year university students that are keen to explore different approaches to history making. While student awareness of historiography as a result of 'History Extension' may be seen as a feature peculiar to NSW, it is important to note that 'Extension' students comprise only around one half of first-year enrolments in world history at University. The support of the other half of students for the world history program at Macquarie suggests that the approaches sketched out below might enjoy a wider application.

Since the mid-1990s, world history education at Macquarie University has opened with not one, but two surveys that work on different scales and with different methods and materials. The first, HIST112: An Introduction to World History is the unit that launched what David Christian calls 'big history'. Described first in an article for *The Journal of World History* called 'The Case for "Big History"', Christian set out his arguments for the use of world history education to tell the biggest story of all, that of the origins and evolution of human beings, life, earth and the universe some 13.7 billion years ago.<sup>22</sup> Though Christian's account of the past, present and future in 'Case' differs from that set out in the recently published book *Maps of Time*, all of his writings on this sub-field of world history stress that it offers a 'map of reality' or 'a single, and remarkably coherent story, a story whose general shape turns out to be that of a Creation Myth, even if its contents draw on modern scientific research'.<sup>23</sup> Ostensibly, creation myths are about the past, about origins, about how things began. On closer inspection though, Christian argues, creation myths provide coordinates within which people can think about what they are and might be in wider contexts.

---

22 Christian, D., The Case for "Big History", in: *Journal of World History*, 1991, vol. 2(2), pp. 223-238.

23 D. Christian, *Maps of Time: An Introduction to Big History*, Berkeley 2004, pp. 2-6.

Big history is, as Alfred Crosby has noted, an act of provocation.<sup>24</sup> Contemporary historiography asks us to be wary of coherent stories in world history, portraying them as ‘metanarratives’ that legitimate some views and gloss over others. ‘Myth’ is also problematic term, denoting either ahistorical beliefs or ‘naturalised’ assumptions that reinforce the power of particular groups. Further, few historians would see the territory of their discipline extending back before the appearance of writing, let alone *Homo sapiens sapiens*. These three focuses – coherence, myth and the natural sciences – do not appear to sit well with conventional contemporary understandings of world history and even history. But that is the point of Christian’s work, for he wants us think carefully about our commitment to models of world history and history making that in his view make little use of the many scales of view that are available to historians, underplay the interactions between humans and the biosphere and give short shrift to people who are not literate or who do not reside tidily within the boundaries of particular empires or nation states.

Much of contemporary historiography – and history making influenced by it – has a similarly disorienting effect, although it achieves that end through the selection of smaller and smaller units of study. Christian’s large-scale approach is worthy of consideration as an alternative, however, for at least three reasons. First, our struggle with it highlights the (often) unquestioned connection of historical meaning with the study of individuals or selves alone. Second, his use of many forms of scientific evidence and explanation taps into the burgeoning fields of world environmental history and science communication. It is recognised that many contemporary global problems require the collaborative efforts of arts and science researchers, so why not extend that thinking to the problems of the past? Third, Christian’s decisions of inclusion, exclusion and emphasis are writ large, making it easier for readers new to world history to respond critically to his views than more familiar textbook or specialised approaches.

Not everyone, though, is predisposed towards Christian’s decision to focus on the ‘big’. A number of the students who enrol in HIST112 are shaken by their first encounter with *Maps* and with the course. They come to university with expectations about what history is, with little recent experience in the study of science, and sometimes with firm religious beliefs. ‘This is not history’ is a common protest offered in the first weeks of semester. Until the appearance of writing in week seven, the course is akin to a roller coaster ride, and not everyone stays in their seats. But for the majority who do, the reward for persistence is an ex-

---

24 Review on the back cover of D. Christian, *Maps of Time*.

panded view of science, history and their own critical thinking skills. Students who experienced fear and humiliation in science class at high school are eager to talk about scientific discoveries about the past reported in the news. Others with an interest in environmental history or classical archaeology learn the value of looking backwards and considering evidence furnished by those in the natural sciences. Still others chase up the footnotes and further references to extend or argue against Christian. And some, even though they continue to advance that the invention of writing marks the beginning of history, learn how to more adequately articulate and defend that view.

Those who argue against Christian, though, are in the minority. While the majority of students start out suspicious of big history, they tend to end the unit very firmly in favour of its arguments and methods. On the one hand, this might be considered an educational success. On the other hand, the treatment of HIST112 as a sufficient treatment of world history supports the stereotype of world history as a thoroughfare outlined above. To address this problem, staff and students alike work to draw out and put names to controversies and questions that Christian either omits or downplays in the interests of rendering a 'coherent story'. Key examples are the weeks discussing the origins of life and agriculture. Christian's one account of the origins of life is now supplemented by references to four other theories in the lectures and tutorial readings, and conflicting views over the supposed connection of agriculture with inequality are highlighted. Lectures and tutorials also model the approach students are encouraged to take in their assessment tasks: the critical presentation and analysis of evidence and rigorous referencing. Finally, students are encouraged to take a reflexive stance in assessment tasks, offering 'their historian's perspective' of a scientific theory (assessment task 1), of the differences between big history and other approaches to world history (option in assessment task 2) and of a theme that they consider to be important in the unit (assessment task 3).

Perhaps the most important factor in encouraging students to see big history as one of a number of competing approaches to world history, though, is the second survey, HIST114: *The World Since 1945 from an Australian Perspective*. With its comparatively tiny timescale and use of a national frame, this unit provides a strong contrast to big history. It clearly announces through its title that it is not a continuation of, or more of the same approaches and ideas employed in HIST112. In combination, these surveys embody the 'play of scales' that can show students the possibilities of world history writing and research, possibilities that McDonald alluded to. The combined use of two surveys also high-

lights the pliable form of world histories, and shows students that they are constructed worlds.

Drawing connections across units of study and highlighting differences in focus and method continues in upper level units that focus on the 'Atlantic world' after 1492 (which includes online discussions involving students at Northeastern University, Boston), war and peace in the ancient and modern world, travellers and travel writing from the eighteenth century and the spread of Indian ideas and practices in South-East Asia. Macquarie resembles many other universities in Australia and abroad in its use of thematic frames for upper level world history education. How it differs from other programs, though, is that these thematic studies are not the end of world history study. At the highest level of undergraduate study, historiographical and historical questions relevant to the field come to the fore as the program shifts from a focus on 'world history' to 'world histories'. HIST359, 'World Histories', offers students the chance to uncover and reflect on the shapes of world history making in many different social and historical contexts.

Working through chronologically arranged lectures and thematic tutorial (class) and online discussions held in conjunction with the global studies program at Leipzig University, students unpack forms of terminology (eg, universal, new world, global and general history), methodologies, beginning and end points, scales, approaches to gender and debates on postmodernist and postcolonialist world histories and study the relationships between the makers, distributors and readers and auditors of world histories. One of the major aims of the unit is to show that current historiographical surveys of the field rely too heavily on a limited body of works by European writers, and that they may be revised and expanded in at least five ways, through the extended consideration of world histories made before 1400<sup>25</sup>; world histories made outside of university settings by male and female writers for male, female and child audiences; traditions of world history making in China and Islamic centres<sup>26</sup>; world histories made by social and natural scientists in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries; and 'holistic' histories of Indige-

---

25 See for example A. Momigliano, *Greek Historiography*, in: *History and Theory*, 1978, vol. 17(1), pp. 1-28; R. Mortley, *The Idea of Universal History from Hellenistic Philosophy to Early Christian Historiography*, Lewiston 1996; J. M. Alonso-Núñez, *The Idea of Universal History in Greece: From Herodotus to the Age of Augustus*, Amsterdam 2001; and K. Clarke, *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World*, Oxford 1999.

26 See for example C. Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, Cambridge 2003; and G. Hardy, *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo: Sima Qian's Conquest of History*, New York 1999.

nous groups such as Aboriginal Australians. This expanded view helps to highlight the decisions made by historiographers about how world history is to be understood and shows us that Anglo-American world histories are thus only some among many ways of world making.

In HIST 359, students are encouraged to see that historiographers of world history, as well as world historians, make worlds. But more importantly, they begin to reflect on their own potential contribution to world history making. This reflection is fostered in part by the requirement that they design their own research project and formulate critical questions in response to the classes and readings. But is also triggered by hearing fourth year 'honours' and graduate students talk about their work in 'research spotlights' that run across the semester. In combination, these activities show undergraduates that world history research is both manageable and topical. Just as no survey covers everything, so students come to understand that no world history research project covers everything. Most of the current cohort of world history PhD students at Macquarie report that these activities were instrumental to their decision to pursue honours (fourth year) and graduate study.

Having built up a teaching and graduate research program, two key research and teaching goals remain. The first is to undertake further historical and historiographical research into world history making in communities around the world. Through the study of world histories produced before 1400, by 'popular' authors after 1800 (including women and children's authors), outside of Western Europe and by Indigenous communities, we hope to better align the cultural and historical scope of studies in the historiography of world history with those in world history itself. The second is to further internationalise our undergraduate and graduate training programs through exchanges and the enrolment of more international students at undergraduate and graduate levels. There is no better way to understand world history than by experiencing the world.

The dynamic growth of world history education and research is nothing to be dismayed about. Minus the prevailing view of the first-year survey as a formless thoroughfare, students, teachers and researchers have the opportunity to see the varying shapes of world history as new vistas on history as well as on the world.